

An Investigation of ecological potentiality of Polanyi's thought
: Tamanoi and Illich as Polanyian successors

Chikako Nakayama (Tokyo University of Foreign Studies)

<Abstract>

This paper investigates the potentiality of Polanyi's thought in exploring the conceptual development of shadow work and shadow economy by Ivan Illich in the 1970s and 1980s. Around the same time, a Japanese economic theorist, Tamanoi Yoshiro, who had also been influenced by Polanyi, was extending his vision of economy and ecology and got acquainted with Illich at the beginning of 1980s. Through the auxiliary locus of the collaboration between Illich and Tamanoi, we understand Polanyi's implication for ecology or economy in a wider sense than economizing very well.

1. Introduction

This paper investigates the potentiality of Polanyi's thought for ecology, through the conceptual development by Ivan Illich¹, taking Illich's relation to his contemporary Japanese economist, one of the earliest introducers and translators of Polanyi's works, Yoshiro Tamanoi (1918 – 1985), in consideration. The term of ecology can be defined in different ways, but here we define it as the economy of interchange of human beings with their natural and social environments for their living and dwelling. This definition corresponds to Polanyi's concept of economy in the substantive sense (Polanyi 1957, p. 243), which has mainly been investigated in the research field of economic anthropology. But we do not restrict our investigation only to such writings of Polanyi, but examine also his other works in general, including *The Great Transformation*.

The Influence of Karl Polanyi on Ivan Illich was explicit. For example, at the very beginning of the introduction of his book in 1981, *Shadow Work*, Illich distinctly mentioned his indebtedness to Polanyi: 'From Karl Polanyi I take the idea that modern history can be understood as the "disembedding" of a market economy. However, I do not analyze this uniquely modern, disembedded economy from the perspective in which the concepts of formal economics can be meaningfully applied to it. Rather, I am interested in its shadowy underside' (Illich 1981/ 2009, p. 1).

Certainly, the concepts of embeddedness was one of the important concepts for Polanyi in GT, and Illich's fundamental motivation to investigate the shadowy side —as the title of the book, *Shadow Work*, indicated - came from Polanyi's analytical frame. Further we discuss that Polanyi's influence was not confined within a theme of one book for Illich. As Tamanoi explained, Illich gave special respect to Polanyi as 'his teacher of thoughts' (Tamanoi 1981/ 2006, p. 301), which was shown in the afterword of the Japanese translation of Illich's *Shadow Work*². In fact, Illich explained to Tamanoi in a dialogue that he had investigated the history of people

¹ Illich, Ivan (1926 – 2002) was born in Vienna and studied natural science in Florence and in Rome, theology and philosophy in Rome, and got doctoral degree of History at the University of Salzburg. In 1951 he went to New York to work as a parish priest and was appointed vice rector of the Catholic University of Puerto Rico in 1956, where he founded and directed the Center of Inter-cultural Communications. Then he established the Centro Intercultural de documentacion (CIDOC) in Cuernavaca, Mexico. After dissolved this center in 1976, he taught at several universities in the United States and in Europe. He died in Bremen in Germany in 2002. (Summed up by CN mainly from the description by Mitcham in Hoinacki and Mitcham (ed.) 2002, p. 9).

² Tamanoi was the translator of *Shadow Work* into Japanese in 1981, but for the new editions in 1990 and in 2006 after Tamanoi had passed away, Akira Kurihara became the co-editor.

under a common assumption of economics, the scarcity³, for about fifteen years, which then turned out to be a mistake, so that he would try to go beyond it (Illich and Tamanoi 1981/ 1982, p. 232). For such a wider examination, Polanyi's idea became one of the main frames of reference for Illich. Illich and Tamanoi understood deeply with each other, and the inheritance from Polanyi's thought seemed to have played an indispensable role in their friendship and intellectual collaborations⁴.

Since 2009, an online journal, *The International Journal of Illich Studies*, has supplied an interdisciplinary, intellectual platform of open access to investigate Illich's ideas. Certainly, Illich wrote many books and articles, giving lectures and seminars, mainly from the 1970s throughout his lifetime, to criticize different institutions of industrialized world. His theme ranged widely from the critic of education and schooling (*Deschooling Society* in 1971), large-scale technology (*Tools for Conviviality* in 1973), energy and transportation system (*Energy and Equity* in 1974), to the critic of health dependent on the force of medicine and hospitals (*Medical Nemesis* in 1976). But in spite of the existence of such a platform, there has not been many researches to explore Polanyi's influence on Illich in detail⁵.

On the contrary, according to our understanding, this influence meant much for Illich, and what's more, Illich's works, via catalytic role of Tamanoi, an economic theorist, shed light on interesting and important aspects of Polanyi's thought. In this paper, we examine Illich's conception of shadowy underside in two points: First in connection to work and labor, and then in connection to nature and the commons and home (oikos). We discuss that both were connected to Illich's critic of development and of economic peace, which was also in harmony with Polanyi's thought.

2. Shadow work

First we deal with Polanyi's influence on Illich's concept of shadow work. As Illich explicitly credited, he made this conception, getting Polanyi's idea of dis-embeddedness. We trace some genealogy by looking into the theoretical and historical context of this idea of Polanyi, with the help of Tamanoi's investigation, and then discuss Illich's contributions.

³ Illich expressed his indebtedness also to the conversation with Jean-Pierre Dupuy in the footnote only in the French (not in the English) translation, which we can read also in Japanese translation (Japanese translation of Illich 1981/2009 in 2006, p. 254).

⁴ Illich told that he had got acquainted with Tamanoi's name through Tamanoi's article on Marx and Polanyi (Tamanoi 1983), and that he had wanted to see Tamanoi personally on the occasion of visiting Japan in 1980 (Illich and Tamanoi 1981/1982, p. 228).

⁵ Mitcham indicated the influence (Hoinacki and Mitcham (ed.) 2002). Majo 2016 also implied some influence of Polanyi on Illich (One section was named as 'The Great Transformation of the Commons and Its Socio-environmental consequences'). But he only discussed the influence of Marx there.

2.1. Theory-historical context of substantive economy

Polanyi's ideas on economy in a wider sense of ecology, different from the dis-embedded market economy, stemmed from his research on economic theories of German-speaking countries during the interwar period, where fundamental problems for economy were lively discussed: He studied the Austrian School of Economics and the German Historical School as well as Austro-Marxism, while reading Marx, and committed himself to the Socialist Calculation Debate in his own perspective. In due course, he also grappled with the thoughts of Guild Socialism in England.

These research led him to devise some unique concept of social cost already in the 1920s, different from the cost minimized in the profit maximizing economic activities⁶. In a nutshell, the concept of social cost by Polanyi was founded on his conviction that development, improvement (progress) and the economizing principle⁷ which framed the scientific world view could solve only part of complex problems of human beings (Polanyi 1920-22/ 2005, pp. 179-181). Certainly, human beings are within physical constraints as living creatures, but Polanyi attempted to find some room for 'the social', independent of natural world and thus of natural sciences.

Polanyi also explored the distinction of two meanings of economy in this connection⁸: The distinction stems from Carl Menger, the founder of the Austrian School of Economics who wrote *Principle of Economics* in German⁹. As Tamanoi explained that 'Only Polanyi seems to have inherited a valuable lesson from Menger's relentless pursuit of truth' (Tamanoi 1983, p. 125), Polanyi discovered the history about the revision of this work: Menger had tried to improve the first edition until the end of his life to widen the concept of economy and his son Karl, made great effort to edit the voluminous manuscript, the outcome of which was published as the second edition in 1923¹⁰. But this second edition was not well accepted as the established masterpiece

⁶ There were similar critics of standardized concept of economy, indicating the problem of externality or the problem outside the market, also in English speaking countries. Marshall utilized the concept of external economies as a tool to analyze industrial development (Kurasaka 1998a), and then Pigou, Coase, and Kapp made further contributions to the concept of externality, market failure and social cost, which promoted the development of welfare economics as well as environmental economics. I once analyzed Polanyi's writings in the 1920s and discussed the influence of Polanyi on Kapp (Nakayama 2010, p43, p. 48).

⁷ *Entwicklung, Fortschritt, Ökonomieprinzip* in German.

⁸ Polanyi 1977. Chapter two, The two meanings of economic, especially pp. 21-24. Cangiani investigated this issue in detail (Cangiani 2006).

⁹ It was published originally as *Grundsätze der Volkswirtschaftslehre* (Vienna: W. Braumüller, 1871), and the second edition was edited and published by Karl Menger (Vienna, 1923).

¹⁰ Tamanoi paid attention to the memo made by Carl Menger himself on his own copy of *Principle*, the first edition. Interestingly enough, Menger deleted *Volks* in

of the School¹¹: It would have been because the wider concept of economy or the ‘techno-economic’ direction, different from ‘economizing’ (Tamanoi *Ibid.*), and derived from the physical requirements of production regardless of scarcity of goods, was beyond the scope of standardized economics.

Polanyi, on the other hand, took highly of this wider notion and developed as his idea of the ‘substantive economy’ (Polanyi 1977. p. 31). He claimed that ‘the economy as an instituted process of interaction serving the satisfaction of material wants, a vital part of every human community’ (*Ibid.*), had to be understood on two levels which were inseparable in actuality. The first level was the process of interactions between man and his surroundings, followed by the second level of institutionalization of it. In this way, Polanyi came close to the idea of ecology.

This view had certainly been fostered by his study of anthropological literatures and his comparative observation of many market and non-market societies in different places at different times, but he did not grasp this type of economy as primitive and pre-capitalistic. In this sense, he distinguished his view from that of Karl Bücher who stood methodologically on the side of the Austrian School but followed the stage theory of German Historical School. While Bücher saw ‘a closed household economy, the oikos’ (Polanyi 1968, p. 163), ‘only a phenomenon of a particular stage of economic development’ (*Ibid.*, p. 164)¹², Polanyi found such substantive element as ‘the essence of the economy’ (*Ibid.*).

When we examine Polanyi’s argument in GT with the research interest above, we notice that he described the dis-embedding process, laying the decisive importance on the contrast of ‘habitation versus improvement’, adopted for the title of Chapter Three of GT. He took this formula from an official document of England in 1607, concerning the process of enclosure since the fifteenth century with the conversion of arable land to pasture for sheep farming: ‘The poor man shall be satisfied in his end: Habitation; and the gentleman not hindered in his desire: Improvement’ (Polanyi 1944/ 1957/ 2001, p. 36). The formula appeared ‘to take for granted the essence of purely economic progress, which is to achieve improvement at the price of social dislocation’ (*Ibid.*).

Polanyi saw that such enclosure and sheep farming enabled woolen industry and

Volkswirtschaftslehre and inserted *allgemeine* (general) and *theoretische* (theoretical) instead’ (Tamanoi 1983, p. 131).

¹¹ The editor of posthumous *Collected Works*, F. A. Hayek, and the writer of introduction of the English translation of it, F. H. Knight found the revised draft incomplete and fragmental, so that they did not take the second version as the decisive one. Cf. Menger, C. “*Principles of Economics*”, translated and edited by James Dingwall and Bert F. Hoselitz (Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press, 1950).

¹² Bücher posited three stages of (a) household economy, (b) town economy, and (c) national economy, which had a wide impact within Germany and beyond (Hoselitz 1960, p. 211).

foreign trades of England, the development of which ‘was an asset to the country, leading ... to the establishment of the cotton industry —that vehicle of the Industrial Revolution’ (*Ibid.*, p. 39). It was true that his analysis of the market society in GT focused mainly on the formation of fictitious commodities to serve for industrialization in the 19th Century, but he saw the century-long prehistory at the cost of the poor becoming still poorer, as the indispensable prerequisite for the development. He clarified the ‘fact that poverty seemed to go with plenty’ (*Ibid.*, p. 89), with the view that ‘pauperism, political economy, and discovery of society were closely interwoven’ (*Ibid.*). He thus made an analysis of Poor Laws and the Speenhamland Law in a considerable detail, criticizing that almost all political economists of the classical school kept silence to this issue.

Polanyi described the history around Poor Laws as an example of contact of two types of economy, or the process and outcome of the institutionalization of market economy. He explained that, through the process, the share in the common was robbed, the houses supposed to be owned by people were torn down, and ‘the fabric of society was being disrupted: desolate villages and the ruins of human dwellings ...endangering the defences [*sic*] of the country, wasting its towns, decimating its population, turning its overburdened soil into dust, harassing its people and turning them ... into a mob of beggars and thieves’ (*Ibid.*, p. 37). In this way, he described the desperate destruction of human life with subsistence economy there. Reading such descriptions, a later study of GT summarized: ‘In a world of change, settled folk are converted by the market into shiftless migrants. People ... are not exploited in the sense that they become less well off economically; rather they are damaged by the disintegration of their environment’ (Kindleberger 1974, p. 50).

2.2. The conception of shadow economy and shadow work

Illich paid attention to the whole process above as the dis-embedding of a market economy, and Tamanoi indicated that Polanyi’s analysis of the Speenhamland Law related to the crucial contribution of Illich in *Shadow Work*. (Tamanoi 1982, p. 55). Further, Tamanoi emphasized that the Speenhamland Law was implicative, even though some historical inaccuracy had been criticized¹³: ‘This law, by stipulating the

¹³ Tamanoi mentioned that ‘Several objections have been raised against Polanyi’s interpretation of British economic history and the Speenhamland Law. Kindleberger (1974), for example, complains that “it is never clear in Polanyi’s discussion whether the social distress which he blames on the market occurred only in the 1830s after the Poor Law [of 1834] was enacted” ’ (Tamanoi 1983, p. 130). Similar critics were given also later (Dale 2016, p. 119 or Block and Somers 2014, p. 87). But Kindleberger himself, for example, took highly of Polanyi and GT in that article, concluding that ‘I propose to continue to quote Polanyi, though not necessarily to believe everything he

“right to live,” delayed the formation of the competitive labor market and consequently also the conversion of labour into a fictitious commodity. This is Polanyi’s evaluation. ... Polanyi appears to think that the spirit of the law that embodies the “right to live” was in itself quite revolutionary’ (Tamanoi 1983, p.130). And certainly, Polanyi’s descriptions of this act as a kind of basic income and family assistance were examined whether to be applied for real economic policy in some case in the 1970s (Block and Somers 2014, p. 114-115).

Illich mentioned Polanyi in connection to the contrast between the right to live and the evaluation of labor in the market, or the change and destruction of value by the rise of market-oriented society.

‘(This) gradual replacement and degradation of the vernacular by its costly counterfeit heralds the coming of the market-incentive society in which we now live. ... *Vernacular* comes from an Indo-Germanic root that implies “rootedness” and “abode”. *Vernaculum* as a Latin word was used for whatever was homebred, homespun, homegrown, homemade as opposed to what was obtained in formal exchange. ... If Karl Polanyi had adverted to this fact, he might have used the term... ’(Illich 1981/ 2009, pp. 56-57. Italics in original).

The concept of vernacular was one of the most important ones for Illich and here we see that it corresponded to what Polanyi argued under the concept of habitation, i. e. home, contrasted from progress and improvement. But Illich added some theoretical scrutiny, indicating that market economy, or the formal exchange economy in his term, required the complement by shadow economy which ‘feeds the formal economy, not social subsistence’ (Illich 1981/ 2009, p. 100). This shadow economy, according to Illich, was similar to subsistence in some sense, but the misconception of it as social subsistence would be fatal. ‘Unless we clarify the distinction... the “informal” sector will become the main colony which sustains a last flurry of growth’ (*Ibid.*, p. 2). This was Illich’s problem consciousness in *Shadow Work*.

The book *Shadow Work* has been discussed mainly from the viewpoint of gender and feminism, because many examples of unpaid work of women was utilized for explanation. But at the same time, this analysis went beyond the limit of gender studies. Shadow work was defined as the ‘form of unpaid work which an industrial society demands as a necessary complement to the production of goods and services’ (*Ibid.*, p. 100). It included not only most of housework, activities connected with shopping and with family life, but also ‘the toil expended commuting to and from the job, ... the stress of forced consumption, the tedious and regimented surrender to

says’ (Kindleberger 1974, p. 51).

therapists, compliance with bureaucrats, the preparation for work to which one is compelled...’ (*Ibid.*).

Illich emphasized that such stress, toil, time, all possible mental burden, and loss of dignity were included in the routine and were often counted as satisfaction of needs rather than as work, like the case of forced consumption, even though people were ‘coerced for the sake of the economy’ (*Ibid.*). As to the commuting to and from the job, Illich explained it as the activity of workers offering their labor forces to their bosses in a better way, adding their value by such commuting (Illich and Tamanoi 1981/ 1982, p. 242).

The increase of shadow economy operated negatively on people’s way of lives in general, but Illich’s special focus was laid on such labor itself. In order to explain its character and problems around it, Illich explored and overviewed the terminology and history of wage labor in comparison to the concept of job, toil and work. He criticized that almost all economic theories from the Classical School of Smith, Ricardo including Marx, to the Neoclassical, post Keynesian etc., were like alchemy to present work as ‘the magic elixir which transforms what it touches into gold’ (Illich 1981/ 2009, p. 105). As we have seen, it corresponded to Polanyi’s critic of political economy, though Illich’s trenchant irony might be unacceptable for most economists. Illich wanted to warn the harm to lead people to unconscious belief in the necessity of wage labor, with increasing shadow work, for their living.

2.3. The ‘imprisoned’ mentality

Hence it became necessary for him to destruct such unconscious belief in wage labor. It deserves attention that Illich told to Tamanoi that Polanyi was very critical to any attempt to write economic history utilizing contemporary concept of economy, to which Tamanoi responded and both discussed the production and subsistence economy in the middle age (Illich and Tamanoi 1981/ 1982, pp. 230- 232). In this sense, Illich took over the basic stance from Polanyi to analyze the past economy not with his contemporary perspective and with contemporary assumptions, but rather with the reserve that the meaning of economy would have been different in different times and places.

In *Shadow Work*, Illich contrasted the meaning of wage labor in the Middle Ages which ‘stood in clear opposition to ... three other types of toil’ (Illich 1981/ 2009, p. 102), and to that of our age. The three types were activities of household for subsistence, the trades for shoes, haircut, cutting stones etc., and various forms of beggary. All of these types were constituents of ‘berth’ (*Ibid.*) that protected all the members in the society from unemployment and destitution. Even beggary was not taken negatively, while wage labor meant misery. Only those who exceptionally

needed public assistance, like a widow or an orphan, engaged themselves in wage labor. Illich picked up an example in the fourteenth century that the destitute, ‘crowd of cripples, exiles, pilgrims, madmen, friars, ambulants, homeless that made up the world of the poor’ (*Ibid.*, pp. 102- 103) were selected and locked into the available churches to get some beneficiaries by their wage labors. Wage labor was combined with such imprisonment, but only as an exceptional case.

Then between the seventeenth and nineteenth century, ‘instead of being a proof of destitution, wages came to be perceived as a proof of usefulness ... [and] viewed as the natural source of livelihood for a population. These populations had been excluded from the means of subsistence by progressive forms of enclosures’ (*Ibid.*, p. 104). This change was paradoxically promoted by the special institutions of workhouse. ‘Set up to receive beggars caught by the police, these institutions softened them up for treatment by a few days of no food and a carefully planned ration of daily lashes... People resistant to work were thrown into a constantly flooding pit, where they could survive only by frantically pumping all day long’ (*Ibid.*, p. 106). This was the institutional devise ‘to transform useless beggars into useful workers’ (*Ibid.*, p. 105). But Illich did not forget to add that the destitute or the so-called ‘poor’ by this date resisted violently to such treatment. Labor in the workhouse had gradually become a type of punishment, while it had also become to be seen a source of profit.

Illich’s description could easily be connected to Polanyi’s analysis of liberal creed, especially of Jeremy Bentham who ‘formed a plan of using paupers on a large scale to run machinery ... for the working of wood and metal’ (Polanyi 1944/ 1957/ 2001, pp. 111-112), the plan for industry-houses on the Panopticon plan¹⁴. Bentham thought more rationally than the planners of workhouse: ‘If hunger would do the job, no other penalty was needed. ... All that was needed was the “scientific and economical” treatment of the poor’. (Polanyi, *Ibid.*, p. 122). Polanyi analyzed that Bentham’s idea was typical for the turning-point toward the domination of liberalism to treat human beings biologically in political economy. It was based on the assumption of self-regulating market mechanism that hunger and profit were the driving force with which people find their motivation to earn the living by themselves (Polanyi 1947, p. 111).

Illich’s conception of shadow work was to show that the metaphorical ‘imprisonment’ of human beings within the realm of shadow work had continued even after real imprisonments became limited to the punishment for those who had committed crimes.

¹⁴ And it also reminds us of a French philosopher, Michel Foucault, who had analyzed the demarcation of sane/ insane, health/ illness, etc., and wrote the history of imprisonment in the 1970s referring to Bentham. Illich mentioned Foucault in a footnote in relation to the concept of policing, not his work of imprisonment (Illich 1981/ 2009, p. 147).

According to Illich, 'industrial society cannot forgo its victims. ... Our society forces its victims to become cooperative objects of oppression ...' (Illich 1981/ 2009, p. 115).

2. 4. Implications of shadow work: farewell to the proletariat?

Illich emphasized that shadow work was different and more important than underpaid wage labor. It was remarkable that he, at the early stage of the 1980s, stressed that the people who engage in shadow work must be investigated more than proletariat or underpaid wage laborers. He defined them as post-proletariat, which represented the third stage after the first of pre-proletariat, the second of proletariat in the history. In this way, he distinguished his idea from that of Marx. In the dialogue with Tamanoi, Illich replied positively to Tamanoi's question whether Illich's attempt was in sympathy with Andre Gorz's "Farewell to the working class". (Illich & Tamanoi 1981/ 1982, p. 235).

With the keyword of post-proletariat, Illich wanted to clarify a new phase of inequality and poverty defined as the 'modernization of poverty' (Illich 1981/ 2009, p. 4) in our understanding. He had explored this problem since the 1970s, as was deployed in his work in 1973. 'Unchecked industrialization modernized poverty. Poverty levels rise and the gap between rich and poor widens. These two aspects must be seen together or the nature of destructive polarization will be missed' (Illich 1973, p. 74). It was new type of poverty in the middle of affluence and not only former subsistent farmers who became laborers, but also 'U. S. citizen with ten times his income is also desperately poor. Both get increasingly less at greater cost' (*Ibid.*).

In the analysis of shadow work, Illich characterized this new poverty in relation to the concept of counter-productivity (Illich 1981/ 2009, pp. 9-10). It was defined as a new kind of disappointment and frustration 'which arises "within" the very use of the good purchased' (*Ibid.*). Even though the negative externality of markets had been gradually seen problematic for its negative effects on environment since the 1960s, Illich saw this counter-productivity still more problematic.

For example, the mass production of cheap plastic buckets in response to the demand caused air pollutions, which was an example of negative externality. But even though this fact of negative effect became known in the society, those who were not very rich were obliged to buy this kind of buckets and might feel frustrated, while the richer could avoid consuming it. Illich explained that 'Defense against the damages inflicted by development, rather than giving access to some new "satisfaction", has become the most sought after privilege' (*Ibid.*, p. 10). As to the problems around the concept of development, we discuss in the next section. Anyway, a new kind of inequality began to prevail in the world, which could not be simply explained by the Marxian concept

of proletariat, around that time.

In fact, the area of shadow economy expanded intensely during the seventies with the ‘indiscriminate propagation of self-help’ (Illich 1981/ 2009, p. 2), which Illich found morally unacceptable. He mentioned the names of main companies of automobile industry, Ford, Fiat and Volkswagen, and criticized their emphasis on self-help, while they had given financial assistance to the Rome Club to clarify the limit to growth (*Ibid.*). He saw that such propagation of self-help was ‘the opposite of autonomous or vernacular life’ (*Ibid.*) and decayed people’s own work that served for subsistence¹⁵. As he explained to Tamanoi, such euphemistic expressions as self-help and self-management which sounded pleasant, ‘would be used to replace wage for the social control of laborers in the post-proletariat society. ... An example is the self-diagnosis of measuring blood pressure and so on’ (Illich and Tamanoi 1981/ 1982, pp. 244-245). Illich indicated that such self-help, self-management and self-care of laborers would ease the employers and the business at the cost of laborers’ time and energy, or eventually money. He warned that it led the people to the so-called self-imprisonment within the realm of industrial society just to serve for the requirement of the society through shadow work.

His critic was all the more conspicuous, because it was the time when the idea of humanistic management was increasingly adopted in big companies as above, which had much been promoted by Peter Drucker’s book on management in the seventies. It differentiated itself from the old type of scientific, rational management of Taylorism for each individual (Drucker 1974, p. 201). But Illich contrastingly expressed deep concern for the increase of shadow work and for the industrial society, mentioning a sentence at the entrance of concentration camp in Auschwitz, ‘Arbeit macht frei (labor makes free)’, explaining that ‘the unpaid work of the Jew in the camp is exacted from him as his due contribution to his own extinction’ (Illich 1981/ 2009, p. 115). The point was that people in the industrial society were engaged in shadow work without becoming conscious that their work was increasing their own frustration and poverty, which was similar to the mechanism of concentration camp. This was the horrible conclusion of shadow work.

3. The consideration of peace and post-development

Here we further investigate the meaning of shadow economy in connection to economic development. Polanyi seemed rather to have avoided using this concept, because he did not want to place the subsistence economy as the primitive stage of

¹⁵ Illich explained this distinction in some lecture given in Germany, so that he utilized the German adjective, *eigen* (one’s own) to distinguish from self-help (Illich 1980/ 1981).

economic development, as we have seen concerning his article on Bücher. It was his stance in the comparative analysis of market and non-market societies. For Illich, in contrast, a particular development mattered that was promoted by the USA in the post-war period under the name of *pax oeconomica*. It was the point of high resonance between Tamanoi and Illich in their collaboration at the beginning of the eighties.

3.1. The critic of *pax oeconomica*

First we begin with a fact: the Japanese translation of *Shadow Work* contained one more article of Illich as the first chapter, ‘peace is a way of life’ (Illich 1980/ 1992, under a different title though). It was originally his text of the opening address for the first meeting of the Asian Peace Research Association held in Yokohama in December 1980, for which Illich came to Japan for the first time¹⁶. And Tamanoi, the translator of *Shadow Work* into Japanese, explained that this addition was done by Illich’s request (Tamanoi 1981/ 2006, p. 303-304).

In this chapter, Illich attempted to reveal the meaning of the mixture of economic development with peace, which was closely connected to the military interest of the USA and hence to some violence in reality, as was shown in the belligerent terminology like ‘*war on poverty ... [or] strategies (literally, war plans) for peace*’ (Illich 1980/ 1992, p. 15). Though peace for people were of vernacular nature, ‘in European civilization since the Middle Ages ... under the expanding assumption of scarcity, peace acquired a new meaning, one without precedent anywhere but in Europe. Peace came to mean *pax oeconomica*. *Pax oeconomica* is a balance between formally “economic” power’ (*Ibid.*, p. 19).

Though Illich did not mention explicitly, it reminds us of Polanyi’s description in *GT* of hundred years of peace as a by-product of the Concert of Europe. ‘... the same result was attained: peace was preserved. This almost miraculous performance was due to the working of the balance of power’ (Polanyi 1944/ 1957/2001, p. 6). But the more serious problem for Illich was the continuation of this kind of peace even after the Second World War in a wider scale of worldwide, in spite of Polanyi’s hope that the market mentality of the industrial civilization would become obsolete (Polanyi 1947) after this postwar period.

Illich saw the starting point of the usage of the word development in today’s sense in the announcement of the so-called Point Four Program by Truman given in his inaugural address of January 1949. ‘Until then we had used “development” to refer to species, to real estate and to moves in chess. But since then it can refer to people, to

¹⁶ Illich came for two invited lectures, one of which was this and the other was for the Peace Research Conference (Heiwa Kenkyu Kaigi) held by the United Nations University and Hiroshima University, both in December 1980, and stayed about one month (Tamanoi 1981, p. 177).

countries and to economic strategies' (Illich *Ibid.*, p. 20). And people gradually became to believe in growth 'rising production and ... dependence on consumption' (*Ibid.*), while such *pax oeconomica* 'ensures aggression against popular culture, the commons and women' (*Ibid.*, p. 23). We see the reason why this lecture was placed as the beginning chapter of *Shadow Work*.

A later study analyzed the strategy of the Point Four Program to be designed 'as an antidote to misery, hunger, and disease, but its larger goal was to spark stagnant economies and the economic growth of underdeveloped areas, and was realized in the enforcement of the Marshal Plan devoted to investment and then for the "development" outside Europe. ...[It was] a logical outcome of Roosevelt's commercial ambitions in erstwhile colonies and at the same time unprecedented' and America's industrial and technological know-how, combined with international capital investment and democracy, was seen to be the solution to underdevelopment'¹⁷. For Illich who had taught in Puerto Rico and then lived in Mexico, the negative impact of such a strategy on Latin America could well be understood. We know that the financial aid program of the USA for young people in the post-war period to offer opportunities to study abroad, was not necessarily helpful for people's living, as was the case of Chicago Boys in Chile, for example¹⁸.

Illich mentioned the Point Four Program also in another lecture of some conference held in 1983¹⁹, where he discussed education and development (E & D) seen as 'two cared cows that since 1949 have been harnessed as the draft animals of so called progress' (Illich 1984, p. 4). He mentioned two ways of warning of its danger, the yellow and red signals, corresponding roughly to the concepts of externality and counter-productivity, what he called as 'the non-economic costs of progress' (*Ibid.* p. 5): 'In the yellow light educational institutions are one source of inequality, or privilege, of negative taxation and of the disruption of urban space. In the red light education directly threatens non-formal learning by legitimating the removal of learning opportunities from the environment... '(*Ibid.*, p. 7). In this way, Illich suggested that the red signal was urgent, even though both were necessary, and contrasted the E & D to the commons. As the title of this lecture shows, he extended his research area with the theoretical axis of development to the commons as its counter-part.

¹⁷ Smith 2003, pp. 445-446.

¹⁸ I once analyzed the fatal influence of the neoliberal economic policies of the Chicago Boys following the doctrine of Milton Friedman, accused by Frank, A. G. as economic genocide (Nakayama 2013).

¹⁹ It was an international conference on the theme of development, organized by some center for education at the University of Bristol (Garrett 1983, Introduction).

3.2. The deterioration of commons

The negative influence of increasing shadow economy was not limited within the area of labor and work but also lay on the quality of life of human beings in general. Illich thought the main stage of argument was moving into the area of commons around the beginning of the eighties (Illich 1981/ 2009, p. 3)²⁰.

Tamanoi explained Illich's original concept of commons in relation to his keyword of vernacular. 'According to Illich, it (vernacular) meant ... [for example] the provisions you get from the commons, not commodities bought in the market' (Tamanoi 1982, p. 151). The commons were hence most typically the environment, the land and nature, on which human beings live on, that is, for the subsistence.

Tamanoi gave some further clue in thinking of Polanyi's idea about land and nature which could not become commodities in full scale, 'labor is but a name for the purposive activity of man ... and land is nothing other than the natural environment in which human societies survive' (Tamanoi 1983, p. 119): There he picked up Polanyi's statement that 'Limited, since land and labor for a long time to come remained part of the social tissue and could not be arbitrarily mobilized without destroying it' (Polanyi 1957b, p. 75). And Tamanoi continued the quotation, 'This ([Neither land nor freeman could be sold outright] transfer was conditional and temporary' (Ibid.). The point was that 'Property, both in land and persons, belonged ... to collectivities ... Use alone was transferred. ... In modern terms: interest, which is the price of use over time, may be said to have been one of the earliest economic quantities to be instituted.' (Polanyi Ibid, pp. 75-76).

Certainly, Illich re-examined the meaning of this transfer of 'use alone' and the meaning of interest or rent. He explained that the commons he paid attention were not necessarily the spatial ones of meadows, woods and pastures, but rather all what related to 'values which are destroyed by economic expansion, *whatever* form it takes' (Illich 1981/ 2009, p. 3. Italics in original). He emphasized that, just to transfer the right of 'use alone' and to put some price on it had destroyed the 'utilization values', which he meant the value for everyone who utilized it informally without being educated and instructed. Illich showed much interest in this mechanism in his dialogue with Tamanoi in 1981 (Illich and Tamanoi pp. 245- 251) and explored this concept on many occasions (Illich 1982/ 1992, 1984/ 1992, 1984/ 2011), the titles of which show that commons could be found in silence, in dwelling, and also in the ways of education. We notice that Polanyi's interest in home or *oikos* as the essence of economy was taken over and further elaborated in Illich's conception of commons, as was indicated in the article on dwelling.

²⁰ It was the third stage in his category, in which the first stage was the focus on goods, and the second on care (Illich 1981/ 2009, p. 6).

According to Illich, dwelling, being home, was 'an activity that lies beyond the reach of the architect' (Illich 1984/ 1992, p. 56) and much more complex than the mere living. It consists of 'the art of living in its entirety – that is, the art of loving and dreaming, of suffering and dying- makes each lifestyle unique. And therefore this art is much too complex to be taught ... by a schoolmaster or by TV' (*Ibid.*). Hence people at home was not the same as the cars in the garage and it could not be fully grasped by the Cartesian, three-dimensional, homogeneous space. And commons was of the same character. 'Inhabited land lies on both sides of the threshold; the threshold is like the pivot of the space that dwelling creates. On this side lies home, and on the other lies the commons: the space that households inhabit is common. It shelters the community as the house shelters its members' (*Ibid.*, p. 59).

In this way, Illich defined commons much more fundamentally than the theories of commons by Hardin, G. etc.²¹. In most literatures, commons had been defined as some shared space, but not entirely open of free access, and some source of profit, but Illich found the very utilization of commons as some resources decay the meaning of commons at all. 'The commons are not community resources; the commons become a resource only when the lord or the community encloses them. Enclosure transmogrifies the commons into a resource for the extraction, production or circulation of commodities. ... I am not suggesting that it is possible to re-create the old commons. But lacking any better analogy I speak of the recovery of the commons, to indicate how, at least conceptually, we could move beyond our sacred cows. Truly subsistence-oriented action transcends economic space, it reconstitutes the commons' (Illich 1984/ 2011, pp. 12-13). And this was the very point which Tamanoi reacted sharply in their dialogue, as we see below.

3.3. The implications for practice: from Hiroshima to Okinawa

In the case of Tamanoi or of Japan in general, people became conscious of the limit or harm of growth and development relatively early since the late 1950s, through the problem of Minamata Disease owing to the mercury contamination. There were several other cases of pollution problems which raised local movements of the residents, so that not only natural scientist but also several social scientists, including Tamanoi, established Japanese schools of post-development as well as their commitment to such movement (Nakano 2011, p. 124)²². Getting to know this

²¹ Hardin 1968. Hardin argued that commons or a pasture open to all would get into tragedy because 'each herdsman will try to keep as many cattle as possible on the commons' (Hardin 1968, p.1244). But later Ostrom counter-argued that it would not necessarily be the cases if there were rules and institutions for common pool resources (Ostrom 1990).

²² Nakano picked up the names of Tamanoi for regionalism, Kazuko Tsurumi for the

situation, maybe through Tamanoi's instruction²³, Illich visited Minamata as well as Hiroshima, Kyoto, Okinawa, during his stay in Japan at the beginning of the eighties (Tamanoi 1981, pp.178-179), when Tamanoi lived in Okinawa.

Tamanoi explained that in Okinawa Illich gave an invited lecture at a meeting held by the committee of hundred members for peace in Okinawa²⁴, in which Tamanoi was one of the leading members. Then he went to old battlefield in the southern part of the main island, visited the Okinawa Prefectural Peace Memorial Museum, and then discussed with many different people in Okinawa who were active for the protection movement of environment. For Tamanoi, Okinawa was the place to combine his theoretical consideration with daily practices with these people and museums (Okamoto, Arasaki, Nakachi 1990, p. 55) almost until the end of his life.

Especially, the concept of commons seemed to be the most important also for Tamanoi. The last article of him was about the sea in Okinawa as a commons (Tamanoi 1985/ 1987), in which he argued that people in Okinawa had utilized a particular parts of the sea as a commons, which was quite a different tradition from other parts of Japan.

But as we know, it was the time when neo-liberalism was growing its power not only throughout Japan but also all over the world and the thoughts, conceptions, and warnings of Illich and Tamanoi could not be taken over for years until recently. Only recently, we have been re-discovering them, which enabled us the rediscovery of Polanyi's potentiality as well.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, we have investigated the potentiality of Polanyi's thought for ecology through a conceptual development made by Illich, the shadow work and shadow economy. Illich's idea was much promoted by his acquaintance with Tamanoi, who got much influence from Polanyi's work. In examining Illich's conception of shadow work and shadow economy, the influence of Polanyi turned out to be essential. Illich went beyond the narrow limit of economic assumption of scarcity, through his elaboration of the commons as the symbol of vernacular, Tamanoi, who went also beyond the narrow limit of economic theories, gave much hints and implications to

theory of culturally endogenous development, Takeshi Murota for the critique of nuclear energy policy, and Hisashi Nakamura and Takeshi Murota for the study of local commons and evaluated Minamata as the platform for these.

²³ Illich also made a dialogue with Hirofumi Uzawa, who was also an economic theorist who had sought for an alternative way at that time (Illich and Uzawa 1981). Uzawa should have also given some advices to Illich for the places to visit.

²⁴ Heiwa wo Tsukuru Okinawa Hyakunin Inkaï (平和をつくる沖縄百人委員会) in Japanese.

Illich, especially as an economic theorist with the deep knowledge of history of economics..

References

- Block, F. and Somers, M. R. 2014, *The Power of Market fundamentalism: Karl Polanyi's Critique*, Cambridge/ London: Harvard University Press.
- Cangiani, M. 2006. From Menger to Polanyi: Towards a Substantive Economic Theory, *Keizai Gakushi Kenkyu (The History of Economic Thoughts)*, June, 2006. pp. 1- 15.
- Dale, G. 2016, *Reconstructing Karl Polanyi: Excavation and Critique*, London: Pluto Press.
- Drucker, P. F. 1974, *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*, New York: Harper Business.
- Dupuy, J-P. 2002, Detour and Sacrifice: Ivan Illich and René Girard, Hoinacki and Mitcham (ed.), *The Challenges of Ivan Illich: A Collective Reflection*, pp. 189- 204.
- Falbel, A. 2002, The Mess We're IN: How Ivan Illich Revealed to Me That the American Dream Is Actually a Nightmare, Hoinacki and Mitcham (ed.), *The Challenges of Ivan Illich: A Collective Reflection*, pp. 129-139.
- Garrett, R. M. (ed.). 1984/ 2011, *Education and Development*, Oxon/ New York: Routledge.
- Hardin, G. 1968, The Tragedy of the Commons, *Science*, new series, vol. 162, No. 3859 (Dec. 13), pp. 1243-1248.
- Hoinacki, L. and Mitcham, C. (ed.) 2002. *The Challenges of Ivan Illich: A Collective Reflection*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hoselitz, B. F. 1960, Theories of Stages of Economic Growth, Hoselitz, B. F. et al. (ed.), *Theories of Economic Growth*, New York: The Free Press.
- Illich, I.
- 1973. *Tools for conviviality*, New York/Hagerstown/ San Francisco/ London: Perennial Library.
 - 1980/ 1981, One's own work (Japanese translation from German), *Sekai*, No. 425, Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, pp. 158-163.
 - 1980/1992, The De-linking of Peace and Development, *In the Mirror of the Past: Lectures and Addresses 1978- 1990*, New York/ London: Marion Boyars, pp. 15- 26
 - 1981/ 2009, *Shadow Work*, London/ New York: Marion Boyars.
 - 1982/ 1992, Silence is a Commons, *In the Mirror of the Past: Lectures and Addresses 1978- 1990*, New York/ London: Marion Boyars, pp. 47- 54.
 - 1984/ 1992, Dwelling, *In the Mirror of the Past: Lectures and Addresses 1978- 1990*, New York/ London: Marion Boyars, pp. 55- 64.
 - 1984/ 2011, Eco-Paedagogy and the Commons, Garrett, R. M. (ed.), *Education*

- and Development*, Oxon/ New York: Routledge, pp. 4- 13.
- 1992, *In the Mirror of the Past: Lectures and Addresses 1978- 1990*, New York/ London: Marion Boyars.
- Illich, I. D. and Uzawa, H. 1981, Prague wo Nuku: Keizaigaku no Ronri wo Koete (Unplugging: Beyond the Logic of Economics), *Sekai*, No. 425, Tokyo: Iwanami-Shoten, pp. 145- 157.
- Illich, I. D. & Tamanoi Y. 1981/ 1982. Gendai Sangyo Bunmei he no Keikoku (A warning of modern industrial civilization, a dialog), in Tamanoi 1982. pp. 224- 251.
- Kindleberger, C. P. 1974, The Great Transformation by Karl Polanyi, *Daedalus* 103 (1), pp. 45- 52.
- Kugelman, R. 2002, Economy, Subsistence, and Psychological Inquirey, Hoinacki, L. and Mitcham, C. (ed.), *The Challenges of Ivan Illich: A Collective Reflection*, pp. 73- 87.
- Kurasaka, H.
- 1998a. 'Kankyo ni Kakaru Gaibusei no tokucho to Gaibusei Process no Kangaekata (The process and characteristics of externality concerning environment), the 1st part, written in Japanese, *Keizai Kenkyu (Economic Research) of Chiba university*, Vol 13-2, 1998. Sep. pp. 291- 324.
- 1998b. 'Kankyo ni Kakaru Gaibusei no tokucho to Gaibusei Process no Kangaekata (The process and characteristics of externality concerning environment), the 2nd part, written in Japanese, *Keizai Kenkyu (Economic Research) of Chiba university*, Vol 13-3, 1998. Dec. pp. 597- 634.
- Majo, C., de, 2016, Ivan Illich's Radical Thought and the Convivial Solution to the Ecological Crisis, *The International Journal of Illich Studies*, 5 (1), pp. 113- 139.
- Nakano, Y. 2011, De-growth, or Questions of Subjectivity in Reconstructing Local Autonomy: The Case of Minamata's Environmental Politics, *The Journal of Social Sciences* 72, pp. 119- 143.
- Nakayama, C.
- 2010, Hi-Shijougata-Shakai no Kousou: K. Polanyi no Futatsu-no Sengo, ([The Vision of Non-Market Societies: Two Post-War Periods for K. Polanyi] written in Japanese), *Shakai- Shisoushi Kenkyu (Annals of the Society for the History of Social Thought)* 34, pp. 37- 51.
- 2013, *Economic Genocide: Friedman and the Half-Century of Global Economy* (in Japanese), Tokyo: Heibonsha.
- Okamoto, K., Arasaki, M. and Nakachi, H. 1990, Okinawa no 'jichi-jiritsu' wo Kangaeru (Thinking of Okinawa's 'self-governance and subsistence' in Japanese), *Shin-Okinawa Bungaku* 86, pp. 55-71.
- Ostrom, E. 1990, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for*

Collective Action, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Polanyi, K.

-1920- 22/ 2005, *Wissenschaft und Sittlichkeit, Sein und Denken, Die Wissenschaft von der Zukunft (Behemoth)*, Cangiani, M. Polanyi-Levitt, K., and Thomasberger, C. (ed.), *Chronik der grossen Transformation: Artikel und Aufsätze 1920- 1947*, Band 3, Marburg: Metropolis-Verlag, pp. 172- 214.

-1944/ 1957/ 2001, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origin of Our Time*, Boston: Beacon Press.

-1947, *Our Obsolete Market Mentality: Civilization Must Find a New Thought Pattern*, *Commentary* 3(2), pp. 109- 117.

-1957a, *Aristotle Discovers the Economy*, Polanyi, K., C. M. Arensberg, Pearson, H. W. (ed.), *Trade and Market in the Early Empires: Economies in History and Theory*, pp. 64-94.

-1957b, *Economy as an instituted process*, Polanyi, K., C. M. Arensberg, Pearson, H. W. (ed.), *Trade and Market in the Early Empires: Economies in History and Theory*, pp. 243-270.

-1968a, *Karl Bücher*, Sills, D. (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, pp. 163-164.

-1968b, *The Semantics of Money-Uses, Primitive, Archaic and Modern Economies: Essays of Karl Polanyi*, Dalton, G. (ed.), Boston: Beacon Press.

-1971. *Carl Menger's Two Meanings of 'Economic'*, in *Studies in Economic Anthropology*, Dalton, G. (ed.), American Anthropological Association, pp. 16-24.

-1977. *The Livelihood of Man*, Pearson, H. W. (ed.), New York/ San Francisco/ London: Academic Press.

Smith, N. 2003. *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization*, Berkeley/ Los Angeles/ London: University of California Press.

Tamanai, Y.

-1978/ 2002. *Kaidai to Hon-yaku (Commentary and Translation of Polanyi's 'Carl Menger's Two Meanings of 'Economic'')*, in *Economy and Ecology*, Misuzu Shobo, (written in Japanese).

- 1979/ 1982, *Marx, Polanyi and Illich: In the Crisis of Non-autonomous Society, Seimei Kei no Economy*, pp. 255- 269. (Originally a series of articles (1-4) in the *Nihon Keizai Shinbun*).

-1981, *Illich no Mondai Teiki (Illich's Problem Raising in Japanese)*, *Sekai*, No. 425, Tokyo: Iwanami- Shoten, pp. 177- 181.

-1982. *Seimei Kei no Economy (Economy of Life)*, written in Japanese), *Sinhyoron*.

-1982/ 2006. *A Translator's Commentary on the Shadow Work*, (Illich, I. *Shadow Work*, Japanese translation, Iwanami Shoten.

- 1983, Liberating Oneself from the Market Mentality: Reflections on Marx and Polanyi, *York Studies in Political Economy*, Winter 1983, Second Issue, pp. 109-133.
- 1985/ 1987, Commons to shite no umi (Sea as a commons), *Economy and Ecology* (written in Japanese), Misuzu Shoten.