The (In)justice of the Urban Common(s)

Melissa Harrison

National Technical University of Athens, School of Architecture, Athens, Greece

Email address: melissa.harrison32@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper explores the (in)justice of community-based initiatives through the lens of contemporary spatial commoning in urban contexts, namely Berlin and Athens. I will first survey recent proliferations of scholarship on the urban common(s)—exploring the ambiguity manifest across varying mobilisations of thoughts and practices—in search of ethicopolitical analyses, praxes and trajectories. Then, following Amanda Huron's (2015) analysis according to which urban commons emerge and endure in saturated spaces, the paper will problematise how such practices can and do wrest space from the capitalist city; and subsequently, beyond temporary enclaves of urban emancipation, how they resist enclosure or co-option. Finally, there will be an exploration regarding if, when, and how such initiatives emerge in, against and beyond austerity urbanism and neoliberal forms of individual "responsibilization" (Butler, 2015, p. 15) to pose transformative political and socio-spatial praxes; a becoming in common that can de-centre and counter-hegemonic urban politics and socialities while reconstituting intra-active agencies (Barad, 2012) and in(ter)dependent care beyond temporal, locational or identitarian demarcation. The theorisations will be developed through my participatory action-based research with Prinzessinnengarten in Berlin, and exchanges in mutual learning conducted with commons-based initiatives in Athens, and with the Social and Cultural Centre of Vironas in particular.

Keywords: urban common, community, spatial justice, neoliberal urbanism, response-ability

Résumé

Cet article explore la justice/l'injustice des initiatives communautaires dans l'optique d'un faire commun spatial contemporain, dans les contextes urbains de Berlin et

d'Athènes. J'examinerai, tout d'abord, le foisonnement de travaux récents sur les communs urbains – en étudiant l'ambiguïté qui se manifeste à travers des mobilisations variées de pensées et de pratiques – en quête d'analyses, de praxis et de trajectoires éthico-politiques. En accord avec l'analyse d'Amanda Huron (2015) selon laquelle les communs urbains apparaissent et perdurent dans des espaces saturés, nous problématiserons ensuite la manière dont ces pratiques s'approprient l'espace de la ville capitaliste et, ultérieurement, au-delà des enclaves temporaires d'émancipation urbaine, la façon dont elles résistent à l'enclosure ou à la cooptation. Une exploration finalisera l'article pour savoir si, quand et comment de telles initiatives semblent dans, contre et au-delà de l'urbanisme d'austérité, et au-delà des formes néolibérales de « responsabilisation » individuelle, pour établir des praxis politiques et sociospatiales transformatives ; un « devenir en commun » qui peut décentrer et contrer les politiques urbaines et les socialités hégémoniques, tout en reconstituant des agentivités intra-actives (Barad, 2012) et un soin mutuel in(ter)dépendant, au-delà d'une démarcation temporelle, géographique ou identitaire. Les théorisations seront développées à travers ma recherche participative fondée sur l'action, dans le cadre du jardin Prinzessinnengarten à Berlin et des échanges d'apprentissage mutuel au sein d'initiatives basées sur les communs à Athènes, et en particulier celle du centre social et culturel de Vironas.

Mots-clés : commun urbain, communauté, justice spatiale, urbanisme néolibéral, réactivité-capacité

Introduction: The Urban Common(s) and Community

As Juliane Spitta highlights, "community is one of the essential terms used to describe the identity of political collectives today", which is variously mobilised as a "basic sociological concept, political battle cry, or utopian ideal" (Spitta, 2018, p. 21). This mobilisation of community is central in claims to the commons and enactments of commoning: as an embodiment of a different sociality. This praxis involves an ongoing process of sharing and negotiation, dependent on (a) community/ies of *commoners*; the material/immaterial wealth—and responsibility—to be shared, the *common(s)*; and the relational practice of being and doing in common, *commoning* (de Angelis, 2017; Linebaugh, 2008). However, the term community', much like the one of commons', travels through our current conjuncture—inseparable from contemporary political processes, ideologies, socialities, and subjectivities—with an increasingly vague ubiquity: an idea(l)' that Max Haiven (2016, p. 271) argues is increasingly "co-opted and made to serve the reproduction of neoliberalism(s)". While Haiven (2016, p. 281) upholds the valence of the commons as a potential antidote to

neoliberal capitalism, he also warns of a naive and all-encompassing enthusiasm. In the face of an imperiously decimated welfare state concurrent with the failure of capitalism to meet the needs of an ever-increasing proportion of the planet's inhabitants, he foregrounds the risk of the commons being enlisted, rhetorically and systemically, to revitalise the decomposing corpse of neoliberal globalization by mobilising "grassroots participatory forms to 'externalize' the costs of its reckless, endless expansion" (Haiven, 2016, p. 277). Following this, the paper will set out by surveying recent proliferations of scholarship on the urban common(s)—exploring the ambiguity manifest across varying mobilisations of thought and practice—in search of ethicopolitical analyses, praxes and trajectories that problematise the (in)justice of such initiatives.

Furthermore, as Amanda Huron (2015) argues, the qualifier "urban", as attributed to commons, is not simply an empty locational marker but, rather, it signifies distinct qualitative and quantitative characteristics that render specific opportunities and challenges. Central to this is the fact that the urban commons are prefigured and actualised in saturated space:

> "Cities are already-commodified spaces, where property lines have been drawn and ownership declared at a fine-grained scale [...] thick with financial investment, and competition for commodified space [...] a major point of pressure lies in the fact that urban commons must be wrenched from the capitalist landscape of cities." (Huron, 2015, p. 969)

It may be significant to note that the urban itself is genealogically connected to what Haiven (2016, p. 273) terms "Enclosure 1.0" designating—*à la* Marx's concept of primitive accumulation—the usurpation of common land germane to the genesis of capitalism whereby people were effectively dispossessed of their modes of social reproduction, compelled into waged labour dependency and, over the course of centuries, forced into proletarianized city life. On the other hand, this process, and the attached characteristics of urbanisation, mean that the urban common(s) are often "constituted by the coming together of strangers" (Huron, 2015, p. 963): a quality that for many, as opposed to merely being an obstacle, proffers the possibility of dynamic and intersectional ways of being and belonging that escape essentialised embodiments of community.

Navigating, and departing from, the terrain of common(s) scholarship to situate ethico-political lines of thought, I will draw on empirical research to further ground and problematise the (in)justice of such initiatives along the aforementioned axes. How can and do such initiatives emerge in, against, and beyond the financialised city and austerity urbanism to wrest the space and time of the city from the capitalist

landscape? And, how can and do they—as strangers come together in and across difference—transcend neoliberal forms of individual "responsibilization" (Butler, 2015, p. 15) to pose a transformative political and sociospatial praxis: a "becoming in common" (Gibson-Graham, Erdem and Özselçuk, 2013, p. 11) that eschews atomisation inasmuch as it does homogenisation? Commoning as an in(ter)dependent and beyond-capitalist social praxis may promise, following Haiven, "a form of decentralized political and economic collectivity beyond the welfare state based on—and generative of—autonomy and solidarity" (Haiven, 2016, p. 276).

In order to grapple with these questions, this research follows what can be generally characterised as an immanent approach. Meaning, borrowing the words of Guido Ruivenkamp and Andy Hilton, that "theories and practices of commoning are explored from within and through the struggles and social relations of the present epoch" (Ruivenkamp and Hilton, 2017, p. 6). According to the authors, immanent research is usually characterised by a perspectivist rather than a primarily objectivist approach to knowledge-making: it implies searching beyond the given to explore the possible in order to strive for effective truths, or, in more everyday language, "insights into actual concrete practices for societal transformations" (Ruivenkamp and Hilton, 2017, p. 6). In each of the cases I refer to, my standpoint or positionality as a researcher is contingent. First, my ongoing involvement with the Commons Evening School attached to Prinzessinnengarten, an urban garden and social space in Berlin-Kreuzberg, is best described as Participatory Action Research (PAR). This process values lived experience as a way of democratizing inquiry (Gray and Malins, 2004, p. 75), as a way of doing-thinking together with others.[1] With a similar impetus, but a different standpoint, I approach my research in Athens not as isolated and discrete case studies but rather as an ongoing engagement in mutual learning across different social, cultural, and geopolitical contexts. In this instance, I refer primarily to The Social and Cultural Centre of Vironas, which was conceived following a series of general assemblies whereby a decision was made by a diverse group of residents to occupy an abandoned municipal coffee shop (Lampidona) and develop solidarity-based activities related to social reproduction, cultural events, informal learning, and environmental issues. Here, I will draw primarily on the insights provided by a member of the general assembly, Alex Patramanis, during a recent interview.[2] Elevating the "situated knowledges" emanating from within this context, and placing them in dialogue with my own "situated knowledges", the hope is that these "partial, locatable, critical

---

1. While acknowledging, with gratitude, the vast collective experience and insight assembled through this process, some of these reflections are oriented from my personal standpoint and will not manage to capture the diversity of thoughts of all involved.

2. Similarly, these insights reflect Alex Patramanis' personal experience and views garnered throughout his involvement with the initiative and are not intended to speak on behalf of or homogenize the diverse subjective experiences of others.

knowledges" may sustain "the possibility of webs of connections called solidarity in politics and shared conversations in epistemology" (Haraway, 1988, p. 584). And, as Stavrides states: "sharing thought-images may be the nearest practice to thinking-in-common, if by this we don't, of course mean thinking in the same way or thinking about the same things, but thinking through shared experiences and shared questions" (Stavrides, 2016, p. 215).

A Conceptual Survey

During the past decades, theoretical contributions on the commons have seen an upsurge; however, it is crucial to survey the conceptual ambiguity emerging across a diverse and sometimes contested terrain pertaining to contemporary urban politics and socialities. This contemporary moment and the concurrent proliferation of commons thought and practice, Haiven argues, "cannot be separated from the simultaneous rise of neoliberalism as a material process, an ideological orientation and a political-economic period" (Haiven, 2016, p. 272). And, further, as Theresa Enright and Ugo Rossi delineate, the commons can be embodied "as a site of experimentation with post-capitalist cooperative relations; as a site of an anti-capitalist practice of resistance; and/or as a site of capitalist re-appropriation" (Enright et Rossi, 2018, p. 35). The latter, in its most neoliberal incarnation, demonstrates what Oli Mould has called "individualization-masked-as-collectivism" (Mould, 2018, p. 29): evidenced, amongst other things, in the learning commons of privatised universities; in forms of the sharing economy, such as Airbnb, that promotes the entrepreneurialisation of livelihoods and the commodification of social relations; and in coworking premises such as WeWork that adopts the notion of the commons whilst critique is levelled against exploitative workplace practices and speculative financial models. Further, Enright and Rossi (2018, p. 35) identify two prominent strands in scholarship: a neo-institutional framework inspired by, and pursuing, the influential work of Elinor Ostrom (1990); and, a neo-Marxist framework that advocates for the defence of the commons *vis-à-vis* qualitatively evolving processes of, what David Harvey has denominated, "accumulation by dispossession" (Harvey, 2004; 2012); alongside the simultaneous re-appropriation the commons, from below, through collective praxis (Enright and Rossi, 2018, p. 35).[3] It may be worth noting that in this paper, Enright and Rossi appear to use

---

3. According to Harvey, accumulation by dispossession operates according to the practices of privatisation, financialization, management and manipulation of crises, and state redistributions.

neo-Marxist as broad terms incorporating what may otherwise be situated across neo-Marxist and post-Marxist schools of thought.[4]

Both strands of scholarship share a crucial aspect: a refutation of the exclusive alternative between private and public. However, as Haiven notes, the more reformist neo-institutional strand—not disregarding crucial efforts to retrieve the concept of the commons—posits the commons as "an equal partner with the state and market in the reproduction of modern economic life" (Haiven, 2016, p. 277).[5] Whereas the neo- and post-Marxist strands, considered to be explicitly anti-capitalist, may be more radically situated against and beyond the "capitalist instrumentalization of all aspects of life" (Haiven, 2016, p. 271-272). Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt (2009) describe a long history of enclosures dividing up public (regulated by state and government authorities) and private (governed by specific individuals or economic entities), whilst excluding and destroying the commons. Further problematising this dipole of market and state, Harvey emphasises that public space and public goods do not inherently "a commons make" (Harvey, 2012, p. 72). In fact, Harvey (2012, p. 67-88) traces the state tutelage of public goods, historically and to this day, as employed for the continued production of labour power as commodity and, therefore, of capital. Along similar lines, Silvia Federici (2019, p. 96) argues that the public—owned and governed by, and in the interests of, the state—in fact, could be considered to constitute a unique private domain. And, in chorus with Harvey and others, she compels us to not lose sight of the distinction while acknowledging that we cannot simply abandon the state as "it is the site of the accumulation of wealth produced by our past and present labour" while most of us are still dependent on capital for our survival (Federici, 2019, p. 96). These crucial arguments, put forward by Harvey and Federici, certainly resonate with Iris Marion Young's (1990, p. 10; p. 39) enabling conception of justice *vis-à-vis* a critique of the distributive paradigm whereby, she argues, welfare capitalist policies can tend to depoliticise public life through a failure to address power, oppression (economic,

---

4. In an earlier paper, Rossi suggested that while the neo-marxist conceptualisation of enclosure/accumulation via dispossession, *à la* Harvey, posits a sovereignty-based ontology associated with capitalism "which allows this mode of production to act as a sovereign and colonizing force within the existing political-economic order at multiple geographic scales"; a post-marxist ontology, *à la* Negri and Hardt, mobilizes the *dispositif* of subsumption, reigniting Foucault's notion of biopolitics to understand how capitalism engages in the real subsumption of the immaterial commons—language, ideas, information, culture, affects—and of "life itself" (Rossi, 2012, p. 351). Simon Springer astutely introduces the understanding of neoliberalism as discourse to posit a reconciliation of neo- and post-marxist ontologies of capital and power; "the Marxian political economy perspective of hegemonic ideology with poststructuralist conceptualizations of governmentality" (Springer, 2012, p. 137). He suggests a dialectical relationship between the operation of power in "both a Gramscian sense of hegemony and a Foucauldian sense of governmentality" (Springer, 2012, p. 143) which could provide a common ground between "top-down" Marxist political economy and "bottom-up" poststructuralism, navigating a shared "attempt to decode and destabilise the power relations of capitalist axiomatics" in a manner that is not necessarily incompatible (Springer, 2012, p. 140).
5. This is certainly not to rule out possible alliances with what could prove to be important reformist forces but, as George Caffentzis (2011, p. 27) suggests, drawing on Bertolt Brecht's famous advice: "it might be necessary to mix wine with water, but you should know what is the wine and what is the water!".

racialised, gendered), decision-making processes, the division of labour, and culture. Here, a dual demand for the urban commons emerges: against the expropriation of public spaces and public goods—necessary for our social reproduction—by private entities; but, also for their appropriation from below, not simply as distributions, often remaining entangled with the reproduction of power and capital, but as real common spaces and common goods shaped through collective agency and decision-making processes.

These strands—neo-institutional and neo-/post-Marxist or, from here on referred to as, beyond capitalist—diverge, respectively, towards an emphasis on two differing aspects: firstly, the technical management of the commons as resources and, secondly, the commons as a verb—commoning—and the "struggle to perform common livable relations" (Velicu and Garcia-Lopez, 2018, p. 57). The former focuses primarily on material commons, natural or cultural, and the opportunities and challenges posed in their collective management by and for the benefit of bounded communities (Ostrom, 1990; Harrison and Katrini, 2019). Ostrom contested previous postulates that collective use and management was resigned to the depletion of the commons and her seminal work charted principles for the collective self-governance of common pool resources (Hardin, 1968; Ostrom, 1990). The latter departs from a resource-centred and bounded paradigm to emphasise a less techno-rational model and a more ethico-political process of commoning which acknowledges that "the communal sharing of our fragile commons (resources) cannot be separated from the sharing of our messy sociopolitical relations (commoning)" (Velicu and Garcia-Lopez, 2018, p. 67). This is a variable sociality premised on practices of sharing and negotiation, beyond the community management of existing resources and towards the co-production of new ways of being, doing, thinking, and imagining "that act against the contemporary capitalist forms of producing and consuming (variously enclosing) the common wealth" (Ruivenkamp and Hilton, 2017, p. 7). Or, as Harvey expresses: "The common is not to be constructed, therefore, as a particular kind of thing, asset or even social process, but as an unstable and malleable social relation [...] there is, in effect, a social practice of *commoning*." (Harvey, 2012, p. 73)

Critically woven through this latter strand is the notion of primitive accumulation not as a historically and spatially circumscribed moment at the origins and peripheries of capitalism but as the qualitatively evolving mode of capital itself (Haiven, 2016; Federici, 2019; Holloway, 2010). Haiven helps us chart the genealogy of this ongoing process through the designation of enclosure 1.0, enclosure 2.0, and enclosure 3.0. Enclosure 1.0 is the name he gives to "the original spatial process" whereby an ascending capitalist class expropriated the resources of commoners through land eviction thus "laying waste to community and self-sufficiency" (Haiven,

2016, p. 278) and creating the foundations for social and economic life to be disciplined, and coerced to obey the logic of value and accumulation, under capital; a process that continues today at the frontiers of extractive global capitalism and at the core through processes of urban displacement (Haiven, 2016, p. 278). Enclosure 2.0 designates the multifarious ways that capitalism creates value through the capture of our "common, cooperative labour and life", from intellectual property regimes to the privatisation of essential socially reproductive functions that were, as a result of common struggles, once the domain of the welfare state (Haiven, 2016, p. 279). Enclosure 3.0 is an expansion and escalation of previous modes, exploiting globalised technological capitalism and fostering entrepreneurialisation as we are encouraged to "monetize the not-yet monetized aspects of our lives": manifest in the sharing economy as well as in neoliberal governmental campaigns such as the big society which "pry open the field of daily life and the final frontiers of non-capitalist co-operation and collaboration and transform these into either (a) means to generate profit or (b) means to maintain bare human life amid relentless market failure" (Haiven, 2016, p. 279). These qualitatively evolving and perilously encroaching processes of capitalist enclosure and accumulation reconstitute the fabric of the city, producing sociospatial injustices as vital goods become variously and unequally accessible and lives—human and more-than-human[6]—are displaced, degraded, and subordinated for/to profit.

Subsequently, I will attempt to navigate—*vis-à-vis* the neo-institutional paradigm—a transversal terrain of beyond-capitalist urban common(s) praxis that contests the varying ontologies of capitalist enclosure and subsumption; allowing space for the different interpretations and manifestations to imbricate, hopefully without homogenizing or universalising nor without eclipsing "[t]he 'ambiguity' between commons-within-and-for-capital and commoning-beyond-capital" (de Angelis and Harvie, 2013, p. 291). Beyond-capitalist theory and practice has demonstrated a differentiated but promising shared struggle amongst Marxists, autonomists, anarchists, feminists, ecologists, and indigenous groups alike; perhaps articulating the common(s) along the claim of the Zapatistas, "one no, many yeses".[7]

---

6. A phrase coined by David Abram in 1996 which aimed, in contrast to the term nature, to not position humankind and culture as discrete from the more-than-human world; but, rather, to acknowledge mutuality and interconnectedness.

7. Feminist scholarship has been fundamental in radically inflecting the discourse on the commons: Federici (2019) has highlighted an overlooking of social reproduction in orthodox Marxist theory in order to illuminate subaltern and everyday practices of commoning or what Peter Linebaugh has termed "the suppressed praxis of the commons in its manifold particularities" (Linebaugh, 2008, p. 19). J. K. Gibson-Graham's diverse economies research has re-positioned already existing post-capitalist economic performativity as an important site for fostering the commons and disrupting the apparent coherence of capitalist space (Gibson-Graham, 2006a; 2006b; 2013); and, Butler has presented a shift from Ostrom's rational subjects towards performative subjects expressing mutual vulnerability (Butler, 2015; Velicu and Garcia-Lopez, 2018). Concurrently, a myriad of indigenous struggles around the world have

As such, we might ground this expansive terrain of beyond-capitalist commons scholarship within, and across, the diverse spaces and practices of commoning: embodying an (ant)agonistic politics—*vis-à-vis* qualitatively different and interrelated processes of capitalist enclosure of both the commons and of ourselves as atomised subjectivities—and a prefigurative, performative, and relational praxis of what Jean-Luc Nancy calls "being-in-common, or being-with" (Nancy, 1991, p. 2), or what others have repositioned as "becoming in common" (Gibson-Graham, Erdem and Özselçuk, 2013, p. 11) beyond homogenized identities and parochial collectivities. In an urban context, these community-based practices of commoning are confronted with the political and social forces shaping the city. The struggle to disentangle or dis-entrench from the mutually exclusive domains of market individualism and state proprietary as to prefigure a post-capitalist politics and sociality is precarious and rife with challenges and contradictions. Therefore, it is difficult to propose a model or rules for such struggles and practices that emerge and endure across different geo-political, social and cultural contexts; however, we might be able to analyse characteristics, tactics, and strategies that move in search of, and prefigure, just sociospatial practices of the city.

To better understand and situate the relationships that spatial practices of commoning embody within the city, it may be useful to identify some of the ways in which they are engendered. Urban commoning practices often emerge and aggregate around three key spatial typologies: symbolic space, trigger or catalytic space, and infrastructural space (Harrison and Katrini, 2019). In symbolic spaces—prominent in contemporary urban struggles—commoning practices arise in relation to, and contest, the meaning of abstract capitalist space. Take, for example, the occupation of Syntagma Square in Athens, Gezi Park in Istanbul, or the various other Occupy movements around the world. Trigger or catalytic spaces—often vacant lots/buildings or public spaces—prompt a collective response from local inhabitants to transform specific sites into common spaces; shaping the city through their shared needs and desires (Harrison and Katrini, 2019). Prinzessinnengarten exemplifies this spatial response: it is one of many communal gardens in Berlin catalyzed from the bottom-up to create space for biodiversity and experiments in self-organization in what were once considered urban wastelands. Similarly, Navarinou Park in Exarchia, Athens, came into existence through the collective efforts of residents who occupied and transformed an abandoned parking lot: tearing up the asphalt to free the soil for planting trees, cultivating a garden, building a playground, and creating a space for self-organised political and cultural events. Infrastructural spaces, on the other hand, are often sought to host commoning practices that have been envisioned or emerged before

---

posed a powerful defence of, and decolonial reclamation of, traditional commons alongside resistance to new enclosures.

developing a situated spatiality: these practices may address everyday needs through alternative provisioning mechanisms, such as cooperatives dealing with food production and distribution, care practices, or shelter; or, they may respond to collective desires through the co-creation of social and cultural activities (Harrison and Katrini, 2019). Take, for example, the solidarity school of Mesopotamia in Moschato, Athens: Mesopotamia is a social movement originating in 2003 that sought to address issues related to ecological awareness, human rights, immigrants' and workers' rights. In 2006, they sought an infrastructural base to hold their activities and entered into an informal agreement with the municipality to occupy an unused building in the neighbourhood; later the solidarity school and a corresponding time bank were initiated (Koliaraki, 2020). Certainly, these spatial typologies are not discrete: The Social and Cultural Centre of Vironas traverses the catalytic and infrastructural typologies, with the decision to occupy a disused municipal building emerging from an already formed assembly interested in pursuing practices of solidarity.

The above spatial schema designating symbolic space, trigger or catalytic space, and infrastructural space (Harrison and Katrini, 2019) resonates with John Holloway's (2010, p. 27-37) characterisation of communities of practice that tend to form around three, although not discrete, dimensions: temporal, spatial, and activity- or resource-centred. Symbolic spatial occupations manifest temporal cracks in which "the world that does not yet exist displays itself as a world that exists not-yet" (Holloway, 2010, p. 31); catalytic spaces engender local and material prefigurations in self-organisation and emancipatory spatial transformations; and, infrastructural spaces provision a location for preconceived activity- or resource-centred practices of sharing, de-commodified (re)productive activities and socialities (Holloway, 2010, p. 27-37; Harrison and Katrini, 2019).

Between the Urban Commons and the City as Common: Wresting Space, Resisting Enclosure

Returning to Huron's articulation that the urban commons emerge and endure in saturated space and are often characterised by the coming together of strangers, we might highlight Stefan Gruber's claim that commoning, when considered from a long-term perspective, is faced with the challenge—amid threat of enclosure—of remaining open to newcomers and adaption and resistant to hierarchies and discrimination. Moreover, placed within a broader conception of transformation towards a more just horizon, he questions:

"How can practices of commoning grow beyond local initiatives, from islands of exception to triggering systemic change? And, at a temporal scale, how can commoning, beyond the struggle for survival and as a mode of resistance, become a desirable condition to be sustained?" (Grubert, 2016, p. 89)

This ushers in—following the above survey of theoretical trajectories—a pivotal question pertaining to the (in)justice of urban commoning initiatives: how might such practices—*vis-à-vis* neoliberal urbanisation—evolve as more than enclaves of temporary urban emancipation to wrest space from the capitalist landscape and to contend with co-option, processes of displacement, and the broader dynamics of urban spatial (re)production? As previously alluded to, spatial commoning practices often emerge in the gaps and the margins and are therefore highly contingent and precarious; (re)produced in, against, and beyond the space and time of the capitalist city and confronted with the opportunities, constraints, and contradictions posed by urban socialites and politics (Harrison, 2019, p. 86). Therefore, the practice and process of disentanglement from "capitalist forms of producing and consuming (variously enclosing) the common wealth"—the reappropriation of common wealth and disaccumulation of capital—is a complex, contested, and fraught spatial pursuit (Ruivenkamp and Hilton, 2017, p. 7).

Situating the urban commons within a broader conception of both the urban as common may help us to posit the micropolitical articulations of reappropriating, defending and struggling for localised urban commons within a broader struggle for spatial justice in, against, and beyond capitalist production, and instrumentalization, of space. Prinzessinnengarten provides an illustrative example that situates a dialectical relationship between manifestations of the urban commons and a broader conceptualisation of the common across space and time. The social-ecological space, alongside many urban gardens and social-cultural spaces in Berlin, was designated as an interim-use project: in a city characterised by decades of nebulous and ceaseless privatisations coupled with ever-intensifying urban speculation, such spaces face precarious futures. The allure of prominent initiatives is often encapsulated in creative city-branding exercises to attract start-ups and investors; an effort which effectively co-opts the everyday use value and transforms it into profit-seeking exchange value. Meanwhile, Berlin planning and policy authorities are not alone in a continued advocacy for interim use as an innovative and successful bottom-up urban regeneration strategy. However, in a city facing unprecedented rent increases and the resulting displacements of residents, social spaces, and local businesses, one may question the benevolent nature of such strategies when situated within the broader dynamics of the financialised city (Harrison, 2019).

The land that Prinzessinnengarten has called home, since a collective of residents obtained a lease agreement with the borough in 2009, was at the time owned by the municipality. However, it was administered by a city-owned real estate company that is astute in selling public land to the highest bidder: without either borough or city-level intentions for the future security the site, the garden faced the threat of expulsion in 2012 when an investor expressed interest in purchasing the land which now proffered lucrative returns. In response, people involved in the garden launched a petition, "Let it grow!" The petition endeavoured to problematise the vulnerable situation of the garden as well as the other alternative spaces of Berlin that have for decades eschewed the mandate of monetary profit to (re)produce free and open space for various social, cultural, political and ecological activities. Through this mobilisation, they were able to resist the privatisation of the site, with the support of 30,000 people, and deepened political aspirations lead to the formation of the Common Grounds association in 2013 (Harrison, 2019). This reflects the claim that urban space is "continually [being] shaped and reshaped through a relentless clash of opposing social forces oriented, respectively, towards the exchange value (profit-oriented) and use value (everyday life) dimensions of urban sociospatial configurations" (Brenner, Marcuse and Mayer, 2012, p. 3).

In 2017, the security of the garden was once again threatened: the renewed interim-use rental contract approached expiry at the end of 2019 and *Nomadisch Grün*, the not-for-profit enterprise that oversaw numerous undertakings in the garden, announced that they would relocate to a different site in Neukölln. This marked a divergence in the garden between those moving and those organising to defend and secure the site as a protected common space for socioecological praxis beyond the instrumentalization of interim-use and speculative urbanism. Under the umbrella of the Common Grounds association, the Commons Evening School was conceived, and the Prinzessinnengarten-Kreuzberg Initiative began campaigning for a 99-year security that would protect the site from privatisation or development and exceed the temporal imaginary of one generation (Harrison, 2019). If Ostrom notes that a significant feature of a commons durability and vitality is based on that fact that their members "share a past, and expect to share a future" (Ostrom, 1990, p. 88), what does this mean in an urban context? Not only do such commons need to be defended and reproduced in, against, and beyond the pressures of the financialised city, but "just as importantly, long-term maintenance of the commons requires members to care about the ability of future, as-yet-unknown members—strangers—to access this vital resource" (Huron, 2015, p. 974).

Along this deepened temporal trajectory, we might be able to situate our actions here-and-now within a broader understanding of—and responsibility to—past,

current, and possible future (in)justices pertaining to our human and more-than-human others; and within an understanding of how our actions here-and-now are connected to the lifeworlds of others there-and-then. Interestingly, Moritzplatz, where the garden is adjacent, is marked by trans-historic struggle: during the 1960s, a major highway that was to dissect one of Europe's densest neighbourhoods, creating forms of displacement via urban renewal, was prevented by neighbourhood resistance. With a similar impulse, there was a desire to situate the struggle not as the defence of a singular and circumscribed locale but as a node within a broader struggle for urban justice: connecting to other movements for the right to the city, housing security, and ecological regeneration. This was carried through as two members of the Common Grounds association collaborated with other urban gardening initiatives to draft a "Tenure Treaty for Berlin Gardens" which summoned the historical memory and precedent of the "Tenure Treaty to Protect the Berlin Forests" (Clausen and Meyer, 2018). Within this frame of historical continuity, we might situate justice as something that is never arrived at but is always in movement: it is birthed by the (in)justices of the past and it is contained in the radical futures that perpetually haunt the time of the present, propelling ethico-political action here-and-now.

While this struggle did not culminate in a 99-year lease, a transitional 6-year lease was obtained. The aim, during this time, is to develop a durable structure and process of community self-management that could see the space returned to, and protected by, the borough while remaining governed and organised by the community. Critically, it may prove important to note that dissensus is not only manifest as relation between the inside and outside of spatial practices of commoning but as a quality of being in common itself. Here, as Jacques Rancière writes, "dissensus cannot thus be equated to some difference of opinion [...] it consists in challenging the very logic of counting that marks out some bodies as political beings in possession of speech and consigns others to the mere emitting of noise" (Rancière, 2010, p. 5). Moreover, "it is a demonstration of the gap in the sensible itself" and it "sets stages for implementing a collective power of intelligence" (Rancière, 2010, p. 88). During a Deep Dialogues workshop[8] in the garden during the summer of 2019, we sought to register the resonant and dissonant voices to find common ground, across our differences, as we struggled for the long-term security of the garden and prefigured commoning practices. We collectively found resonance around six central aims or principals: *99 years*, a long-term lease for trans-generational security; *the common good*, an open

---

8. This was a self-organised workshop which took inspiration from an earlier deep mapping workshop, hosted in the garden, facilitated by artists and activists Bonnie Fortune and Brett Bloom. They employ the deep mapping methodology to explore space, time, and relationships in a way that no one person, discourse, or narrative holds power over an understanding of the things being investigated.

and not-for-profit social-ecological space for encounter and transformative praxis; "*Boden*" (the German word designating both "the soil" and "the land"), positing regeneration of the soil against speculative land practices; *grassroots democracy*, a democratic structure for self-determined and active engagement; *a new narrative*, advocating social, ecological, and economic justice here and elsewhere; and, *political gardening,* a positive and emanating example for collective survival.

However, even with these shared resonances, translation into practical and concrete terms for the future use of the garden was marked by differing, and sometimes conflicting, opinions. There were likely many reasons for this, including the personal subjectivities, means of life, and differential relationships to the garden of those involved as well as varied alignments to different, but not mutually exclusive, conceptions of justice: ecological, social, and economic. While an anchoring in ecological justice advocated for a reduction in both fixed and programmatic uses that draw large numbers of people to the garden in favour of protecting and cultivating the soil, a gravitation towards social engagement argued for non-commercialised formats that provide an open invitation for people to come together in the garden. A discussion on economic-justice revealed differing opinions on whether livelihood sustaining economic activity in the garden could help to address the precarity of those involved or whether it would detract from a broader sense of economic justice by creating disparities between those obtaining a livelihood and those contributing through unpaid time. One hypothesis put forward was the possibility, or need, to develop broader solidarity structures that acknowledge differential precarity without subordinating the sociopolitical aims to economic factors. Here, the fact that the project traverses self-managed sociopolitical engagement and contractual agreement with the borough complexifies the modes of operation. In eschewing hierarchical structures in favour of direct-democratic processes, while facing the requirement of fulfilling duties and obligations, we face the challenge of organising in an effective and egalitarian manner which recognises that each person comes in and out of this space and time with different backgrounds, capabilities, capacities, and means of life. The critical and ongoing task ahead is to establish common, but not homogenizing, grounds in and through differences to articulate a collective project, prefigure and actualise a collective practice of commoning, and institute a continually calibrated structure and process that can foster the sharing of power, decision-making, response-ability (Barad, 2007; Haraway, 2008), intra-active agency (Barad, 2012), and joy towards beyond-capitalist ways of being and doing together in the city. And, to draw on the learnings shared by Alex Patramanis through his involvement in The Social and Cultural Centre of Vironas—which I will refer in more detail in the following section— "to cut a long story short, this ordeal has taught me that what is critical 'is not agreement in

opinions but in form[s] of life' as Wittgenstein put it [Wittgenstein, 1958, p. 88]" (Patramanis, 2020).

Becoming-in-common: Porous Communities of Dissensus

The above discussion on the appropriation and defence of common spaces alongside the prefiguration of structures and instituting practices of commoning provides us with a bridge—via Federici's claim that commoning, far from a substitute to broader resistance against capital's incursion on our everyday space and life, can be an essential realisation of communal relations and collective government—to a critical aspect pertaining to the (in)justice of urban commoning practices (Federici, 2019, p. 110). How can, or how do, these practices emerge in, against, and beyond the assaults of austerity urbanism and neoliberal forms of individual "responsibilization" (Butler, 2015, p. 15) to pose a transformative political and social praxis: a becoming-in-common that can de-centre and counter-hegemonic urban politics and socialities while reconstituting intra-active agencies (Barad, 2012) and in(ter)dependent care? Returning to Huron, the coming together of strangers through urban commoning, as persons move in and out of varying constellations across the metropolis, echoes Young's articulation of "city life" where individuals and groups interact amongst various spaces and institutional structures and where "city dwelling situates one's own identity and activity in relation to a horizon of a vast variety of other activity, and the awareness that this unknown, unfamiliar activity affects the conditions of one's own" (Young, 1990, p. 238). This comes in contrast to neo-institutional commons principals that gravitate around a model of boundedness and consensus. While these may be advantageous for commons conservation, they also risk the reproduction of existing power relations and exclusions, "creating enclaves of (homogenous) 'community', which become new sites of enclosure" (Velicu and Garcia-Lopez, 2018, p. 59; Caffentzis and Federici, 2014; Stavrides, 2016). Further, as Velicu and Garcia-Lopez argue, the Ostromian institutional framework falls short of challenging the "tragedy of the commons" at the core, proposing "end-of-pipe" solutions (Velicu and Garcia-Lopez, 2018, p. 64) instead of challenging the structural conditions that produce enclosure and vulnerability. They turn to Butler for a performative reading of structuration and agency:

> "While Ostrom's politics is populated by autonomous rational citizens who can freely engage in the cooperative design of collective norms, for Butler, such autonomy and norms have to be continuously problematized in performing the political stage with the 'response-ability' of all as equal political agents." (Velicu and Garcia-Lopez, 2018, p. 66)

For Barad, relational "response-ability" is not based on similarity or proximity alone but is an "ongoing responsiveness to the self and other, here and there, now and then" (Barad, 2007, p. 394). Here, we may transcend a conception of essentialised and closed communities—certainly eschewing a tendency towards reactionary traditions or identitarian belonging—to place an emphasis on commoning as a verb and situate forms of community in praxis, as continually happening, traversing and imbricating across the metropolis, rather than in abstract or hypostatized constructs of individual or group identity and enclosure. Following Giorgio Agamben (1993, p. 86-87), Alexandros Kioupkiolis suggests that such relationalities compose differences and "inessential commonalities" (Kioupkiolis, 2017, p. 284) through solidarity without enclosing a totality. Stavrides, in turn, argues that these communities which form around the collective practice of sharing and negotiating common space are "communities in movement" (Stavrides, 2016, p. 164). Further, interrogating spaces of commoning as threshold spaces, spaces of becoming, he posits a condition of porosity (Stavrides, 2016) that enables these communities in movement to not only face the challenge of contesting enclosure, but also of remaining open, ensuring hierarchies do not form and ossify, dismantling discriminations, and developing a desirable culture of mutual care to be sustained. This in an ongoing process of translating intention into the micropolitics of everyday practice: enabling the sharing of "power-to" against the accumulation of "power-over" (Holloway, 2002; 2010), fostering care-full attention to the (in)visibility of bodies and the (in)audibility of voices, and composing differences while mediating conflicts (Harrison and Katrini, 2019).

Let us turn to The Social and Cultural Centre of Vironas in Athens. As Alex Patramanis explains, the occupation of the abandoned municipal coffee shop (Lampidona) by "a group of citizens from all walks of life (wage labourers and pensioners, self-employed and unemployed, intellectual and manual workers)" (Patramanis, interview of 3 April 2020)—and the subsequent engagement with solidarity-based activities related to social reproduction, cultural events, non-formal learning, and environmental issues—was influenced by two broader social and political moments. First, the police assassination of 15-year-old Alexandros Grigoropoulos, in December 2008, "triggered a kind of embryonic, nebulous and instinctual politicization that sought an institutional channel of expression" (Patramanis, 2020); and, secondly:

> "For the older ones, the occupation was more a reaction to the overall economic and sociopolitical situation of the time (austerity, authoritarianism, unemployment, the collapse of an underdeveloped welfare state, the curtailment of parliamentary democracy and/or national sovereignty), that, on the one hand, took inspiration from the Syntagma occupation and related mobilisations, but, on the other, also emerged from a broader, preexisting, albeit, nebulous need to experiment with alternative forms of social organization and different modalities of doing politics." (Patramanis, 2020)

Having from the very outset, assumed a distance to both state and market as well as partisan ideologies—foregrounding the centre as an open space for all free of racism, sexism, and oppression—they pursued paths to negate both the subordination of our everyday lives to the logics of private property/ownership as well as a normative understanding and practice of politics (Patramanis, 2020).

> "This process is transformative in a dual sense: it transforms social relations by proving in practice that money and power are not necessarily the most effective and efficient means of social mediation and it transforms the subjectivities of those engaged in similar experiments." (Patramanis, 2020)

However, as Patramanis explained, what was initially "a spasmodic and politically underdetermined reaction to the collapse of the world as [they] knew it" (Patramanis, 2020) became more rigorously articulated following Syriza's ascendance to office in 2015, the subsequent adoption of a TINA (there is no alternative) discourse, and the "statification" of a number of similar initiatives. They began to problematize their critiques, concepts, modes of action, as well as their organizational and decision-making structures. These included questions pertaining to "collective solidarity" vs. "philanthropy"; how to translate a counter-hegemonic discourse into practice; and how to foster mutual agency beyond a dynamic of "good-doers" and "passive recipients" (Patramanis, 2020). Moreover, they were faced with how to balance "the two logics of collective action": openness or "massification" and "internal cohesion" (Patramanis, 2020; Offe and Wiesenthal, 1979). This presented the need for sensitivity towards people with different backgrounds and subjectivities, particularly when many involved may not have had previous experience in "politics broadly defined as a transformative engagement with our everyday life"; and the need to develop modes of engagement and translation amongst those with differing relationships to, and experiences with, the "political", allowing space and time for people to speak and act through means that would not impose a prescribed, and potentially alienating, framework (Patramanis, 2020). As such, it suggested the need for a certain malleability in both behaviors and identities.

The challenges that Patramanis reflects on certainly resonate with those faced in the prefiguration of direct-democratic structures for commoning in Prinzessinnengarten; moreover, they bring again to the fore, and into dialogue, Rancière's conception of dissensus and Barad's notion of response-ability. Such a relational practice of commoning is a thinking, being, and doing together that doesn't seek to expunge differences; in fact, it is a coming and acting together not despite our differences but because of our differences. Further, in contradistinction to the neoliberal narrative of individual "responsibilization" (Butler, 2015, p. 15) which has colonised the imaginary and which attempts to deflect "obligations formerly (and

formally) assigned to the state" onto "independent, self-managing, and self-reliant subjects", Patramanis (2020) articulates—against the grain of a social-democratic compromise or the creation of a paternalistic "workers state"—a reappropriation of the concept of responsibility along two trajectories:

> "Firstly, 'an understanding of responsibility not in terms of self-reliance (as it is usually understood in the West) but in terms of the need to stand up for oneself in order to make (collective) political demands on the state that would transform self-responsibility into political responsibility' and, secondly, 'in terms of an ethics of care that point to a relational commitment to the welfare of the Self and the Other'." (Patramanis, 2020)

This not only departs from the neo-institutional framework where the commons could be seen as a third-sector alternative to state and market or, at worst, an aid in the reproduction of the economic status quo; it also eschews the "responsibilization" (Butler, 2015, p. 15) imbued in the neoliberal rational and self-managed individual, legitimised by cartesian dualism, in whom an intrinsic discipline is cultivated that no longer relies on external coercion to reproduce the socioeconomic system (Federici, 2014, p. 150-152). Drawing on Nancy's conceptualisation of being-singular-plural, Kioupkiolis suggests that the common—against this grain—offers a conception of community that both breaks "with the nostalgia of a lost community (in Rousseau, Hegel and other modern philosophers) and with a figure of 'society' whose emergence supposedly dissolved communitarian intimacy into an aggregation of separate atoms" (Kioupkiolis, 2017, p. 286).

Conclusion

As Peter Kropotkin wrote, "under any circumstances sociability is the greatest advantage in the struggle for life" (Kropotkin, 1902). In a globalised, fractured, and unjust world, in cities ravaged by financialization, decimated welfare state functions, and inequalities, the common(s) point to a different sociality that, through and beyond modes of collective survival, embody transformative and counter-hegemonic ways of being and belonging together. The intent here was not to provide a roadmap for sociospatial justice in the city; however, a deepened understanding of, and engagement with, the relational space and time of commoning could provide a useful imaginary to situate such initiatives within a broader framework of (in)justice in the city. By revealing and connecting micropolitical counter-spatialities and socialities in, against, and beyond the systemic injustices created by the capitalist (re)production of space and time, we may problematise how transformative claims to, and enactments of, the urban common(s) can reckon with institutional and market forces to wrest the

space of the city from the capitalist landscape and prefigure in(ter)dependent practices of care in and across difference. Both of the examples provided demonstrate in different ways, and in different contexts, how common space was reclaimed from the capitalist city. The case of The Social and Cultural Centre of Vironas embarked on this through occupation (seemingly tolerated by the authorities). In the case of Prinzessinnengarten, this took the form of a lease agreement to cultivate an urban wasteland; the subsequent defence of the land against privatisation; and continued struggle for the long-term security of the site beyond temporary-use and urban speculation. In each of these examples, beyond a reappropriation and defence of common space, crucially, an ongoing process of commoning is foregrounded, prefigured, and actualised.

Through this contingent, precarious, messy, collective, and deliberative disentanglement from dominant structures towards the (re)production of our common spaces, ecological world, and selves, we might begin to reveal and contest the often-suppressed experience and articulation of our everyday lives as inter-constitutive; delving into questions regarding our differential alienation from the space of the city, the land, each other, and our own livelihoods under capitalist relations. Following this, we might conceive of common spaces not as harmonious islands off the peninsula, nor as strongholds of alterity outside of the capitalist city, but rather as Mathis Van de Sande articulates—drawing on Negri and Hardt's (2019) notion of potentia or constituent power—as "an active potential that creates an 'outside', but 'inside' the capitalist relations and structures it seeks to confront" (Van de Sande, 2017, p. 26). This is a dissensual praxis that challenges the consensual horizon of the market-state; it is a process of democratisation (Critchley, 2012, p. 119) embodied in micropolitical practices and in movements that weave a sequence of trans-local articulations. And, as Brian Massumi articulates, these forms of resistance and transformation that occur at the "micropolitical" level do not so much refer to the scale, but rather the mode, by which action takes place: micropolitical and macropolitical are "processual reciprocals" by which potentialities emerging at the micropolitical level can "proliferate a singularity" as they ascend the slope that macropolitics descend, inducing systemic tipping points, they make "the unimaginable practicable" (Massumi, 2008).

Acknowledgements

To quote this article

Harrison Melissa, "The (In)justice of the Urban Common(s)" [« Commun(s) urbain(s) et (in)justice »], *Justice spatiale | Spatial Justice*, nᵒ 16, 2021 (http://www.jssj.org/article/commun_s-urbain_s-et-in_justice/).

References

Abram David, *The Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More-than-Human World*, New York, Pantheon Books, 1996.

Agamben Giorgio, *The Coming Community*, translated by Michael Hardt, Minneapolis-London, University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Barad Karen, *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*, Durham, Duke University Press, 2007.

Barad Karen, interviewed by Adam Kleinmann, "Intra-actions", Mousse 34, 2012 (http://moussemagazine.it/product/mousse-34/, accessed on April 29, 2020).

Brenner Neil, **Marcuse** Peter, **Mayer** Margit, *Cities for People, Not for Profit: Critical urban theory and the Right to the City*, London, Routledge, 2012.

Butler Judith, *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2015.Ò

Clausen Marco, **Meyer** Kerstin, *Ein Dauergartenvertrag für Berlin: Ein Untersuchungsbericht*, Berlin, ZK/U Press, 2018.

Caffentzis George, "A Tale of Two Conferences: Globalization, The Crisis of Neoliberalism and Questions of the Commons", a talk prepared for the Alter-Globalization Conference, 2011.

Caffentzis George, **Federici** Silvia, "Commons Against and Beyond Capitalism", *Community Development Journal*, vol. 49, nᵒ 1, 2014, p. 92-105 (https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsu006).

Critchley Simon, *Infinitely Demanding: Ethics of Commitment, Politics of Resistance*, London, Verso, 2012.

De Angelis Massimo, *Omnia Sunt Communia, On the Commons and the Transformation to Postcapitalism,* London, Zedbooks, 2017.

De Angelis Massimo, **Harvie** David, "The Commons", in **Parker** *et al.* (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Alternative Organization*, London, Routledge, 2013, p. 280-294.

Enright Theresa, **Rossi** Ugo, "Ambivalence of the Urban Commons", in **Ward** Kevin, *The Routledge Handbook on Spaces of Urban Politics*, Abingdon, Routledge, 2018, p. 35-46.

Federici Silvia, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*, New York, Autonomedia, 2014.

Federici Silvia, *Re-enchanting the World: Feminism and the Politics of the Commons*, Oakland, PM Press, 2019.

Gibson-Graham J.K., *A Postcapitalist Politics*, Minneapolis, MN, University of Minnesota Press, 2006a.

Gibson-Graham J.K., *The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It)*, Minneapolis, MN, University of Minnesota Press, 2006b.

Gibson-Graham J.K., **Erdem** Esra, **Özselçuk** Ceren, "Thinking with Marx For a Feminist Postcapitalist Politics", in **Loick** Daniel, **Jaeggi** Rahel (eds.), *Karl Marx: Perspektiven der Gesellschaftskritik*, Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 2013.

Gray Carole, **Malins** Julian, *Visualizing Research: A Guide to the Research Process in Art and Design*, Hampshire, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004.

Gruber Stefan, "Designing Commoning Institutions: The Dilemma of the Vienna Settlers, the Commoner, and the Architect", in **Baldauf** Anette *et al.* (eds.), *Spaces of Commoning. Artistic Research and the Utopia of the Everyday*, Berlin, Sternberg Press, 2016, p. 86-101.

Haiven Max, "The Commons Against Neoliberalism, The Commons of Neoliberalism, The Commons Beyond Neoliberalism", in **Springer** Simon *et al.* (eds.), *Handbook of Neoliberalism*, Abingdon, Routledge, 2016, p. 271-283.

Haraway Donna, "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective", *Feminist Studies*, vol. 14, n° 3, 1988, p. 575-599.

Haraway Donna, *When Species Meet*, Minneapolis, MN, University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Hardin Garrett, "The Tragedy of the Commons", *Science 162*, vol. 3, nᵒ 859, 1968, p. 1243–1248 (https://doi.org/10.1126/science.162.3859.1243).

Hardt Michael, **Negri** Antonio, *Commonwealth*, London, Harvard University Press, 2009.

Harrison Melissa, "Commoning In, Against, and Beyond Urban Accumulation", *Upping the Anti*, nᵒ 21, 2019, p. 83-99.

Harrison Melissa, **Katrini** Eleni, "Commoning and Transition", in **Tsafoulia** Loukia, **Wines** Suzan, **Ong** Samantha (eds.), *Transient Spaces*, NY, The Bernard and Anne Spitzer School of Architecture, The City College of New York, 2019.

Harvey David, "The 'New Imperialism': Accumulation by Dispossession", *Actuel Marx*, vol. 35, nᵒ 1, 2004, p. 71-90.

Harvey David, *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*, New York, Verso, 2012.

Holloway John, *Change the World without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today*, London, Pluto Press, 2002.

Holloway John, *Crack Capitalism*, London, Pluto Press, 2010.

Huron Amanda, "Working with Strangers in Saturated Space: Reclaiming and Maintaining the Urban Commons", *Antipode*, vol. 47, nᵒ 4, 2015, p. 963-979 (https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12141).

Kioupkiolis Alexandros, "Commoning the Political, Politicizing the Common: Community and the Political in Jean-Luc Nancy, Roberto Esposito and Giorgio Agamben", *Contemporary Political Theory*, vol. 17, nᵒ 3, 2017, p. 283-305 (https://doi.org/10.1057/s41296-017-0156-5).

Koliaraki Mariniki, interviewed by Melissa Harrison, 15th April 2020.

Kropotkin Peter, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution,* New York, McClure Phillips & Co., 1902.

Linebaugh Peter, *The Magna Carta Manifesto: Liberties and Commons for All,* Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, 2008.

Massumi Brian, "Of Micropolitics and Microperception", *Inflexions: A Journal for Research Creation*, vol. 3, 2009, p. 183-275 (http://www.inflexions.org/n3_massumihtml.html, accessed on July 21, 2021).

Mould Oli, *Against creativity*, London, UK, Verso, 2018.

Nancy Jean-Luc, "Of Being-in-Common" (translated by James Creech), in **Miami Theory Collective** (eds.), *Community at Loose Ends*, Minneapolis, MN, University of Minnesota Press, 1991, p. 1-12.

Offe Claus, **Wiesenthal** Helmut, "Two Logics of Collective Action: Theoretical Notes on Social Class and Organizational Form", *Political Power and Social Theory,* vol. 1, 1979, p. 67-113.

Ostrom Elinor, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*, Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Patramanis Alex, interviewed by Melissa Harrison, 3rd April 2020.

Rancière Jacques, *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*, London-New York, Continuum, 2010.

Rossi Ugo, "On the Varying Ontologies of Capitalism: Embeddedness, Dispossession, Subsumption", *Progress in Human Geography,* vol. 37, n° 3, 2012, p. 348-365 (https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132512463300).

Ruivencamp Guido, **Hilton** Andy (eds.), *Perspectives on Commoning. Autonomist Principles and Practices*, London, Zed Books, 2017.

Spitta Juliane, "The Fiction of Community: A Political Model Between Identitarian and Emancipatory Appropriation", *ARCH+*, *An Atlas of Commoning*, 2018, p. 20-25.

Springer Simon, "Neoliberalism as Discourse: Between Foucauldian Political Economy and Marxian Poststructuralism", Critical Discourse Studies, vol. 9, n° 2, 2012, p.133-147 (http://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2012.656375).

Stavrides Stavros, *Common Space: The City as Commons*, London, Zed Books, 2016.

Van de Sande Mathis, "The Prefigurative Power of the Common(s)", in **Ruivencamp** Guido, **Hilton** Andy (eds.), *Perspectives on Commoning. Autonomist Principles and Practices*, London, Zed Books, 2017, p. 25-63.

Velicu Irina, **Garcia-Lopez** Gustavo, "Thinking the Commons through Ostrom and Butler: Boundedness and Vulnerability", *Theory, Culture & Society,* vol. 36, nº 6, 2018, p. 55-73 (https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276418757315).

Wittgenstein Ludwig, *Philosophical Investigations*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell Ltd, 1958 (1986).

Young Iris Marion, *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1990.