



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

'I Learned to Make a Lot More Space in Myself for Other People'

Examining the Negotiation of Hegemonic and Alternative Values in the Urban Commons

Griffith, Emma Jo; Uitermark, Justus

DOI

[10.1111/1468-2427.13332](https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.13332)

Publication date

2025

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

International Journal of Urban and Regional Research

License

CC BY

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Griffith, E. J., & Uitermark, J. (2025). 'I Learned to Make a Lot More Space in Myself for Other People': Examining the Negotiation of Hegemonic and Alternative Values in the Urban Commons. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 49(4), 912-928. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.13332>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

– ‘I LEARNED TO MAKE A LOT MORE SPACE IN MYSELF FOR OTHER PEOPLE’: Examining the Negotiation of Hegemonic and Alternative Values in the Urban Commons

EMMA JO GRIFFITH AND JUSTUS UITERMARK

Abstract

In this article, we examine the urban commons through the concept of subjectivity. We attend to the ways in which alternative and hegemonic values are negotiated among different commoners and within individual commoners. Which challenges do commoners face as they pursue alternative values within the context of capitalist urbanization? What sorts of subjectivities do people develop by participating in the commons? How do different commoner subjectivities form, align or collide? Drawing on a study of three housing projects in the Netherlands, we show how commoners struggle to redefine hegemonic notions of work, responsibility and sharing. Our findings suggest that realizing the commons is not just about finding the right institutional configuration, but hinges on the development of alternative dispositions, affects and relations.

Introduction

Critical scholarship celebrates the commons as a work of creative and collaborative production that prefigures forms of social life that stand as alternatives to capitalism (Caffentzis and Federici, 2014; Rossi and Enright, 2016). Although commons come in many forms, critical scholars focus on those types of commons that are based on practices of cooperation, solidarity and mutual aid (Rossi and Enright, 2016). Such prefigurative commons exist in tension with the advanced capitalist societies in which they are situated, resulting in tensions and contractions (De Angelis, 2017). Much of the critical research in this area analyzes the interaction between commons and capital from a macro-perspective, highlighting how capital relies on the commons for reproduction (*ibid.*), and examining processes of enclosure, privatization and cooption (Vidal, 2019; Martínez, 2020).

In this article, we look instead at the micro-level, examining tensions between hegemonic and alternative logics *within* the commons. Our starting point in exploring such tensions and negotiations is the concept of subjectivity. Key literature on the commons tends to presume that commoner subjects are constituted in particular ways rather than studying how subjectivities are construed. For instance, the institutionalist approach advanced by Elinor Ostrom rests on an ontology that sees humans as autonomous agents who strive to maximize utility. Ostrom's work amends neoclassical economics and mainstream game theory while still adhering to the maxim of rational choice that 'individuals compare expected benefits and costs of actions prior to adopting strategies for action' (Ostrom *et al.*, quoted in Forsyth and Johnson, 2014: 1100). Marxist approaches are based on a different ontology yet also tend to presume commoner subjectivities. They view commoners not as individuals maximizing

We thank the members of the housing collectives for their willingness to participate in this research and for kindly opening their homes and sharing their experiences. We are grateful for the work and constructive comments of the IJURR editor and anonymous reviewers, which significantly enhanced the paper. We would also like to acknowledge the valuable input of Federico Savini (University of Amsterdam) during different stages of the research and writing process. Finally, we thank Simon Ferdinand for his thorough editing work.

utility, but insurgents attempting to create an alternative to the state and the market (Pasquinelli and Dieter, 2008; Velicu and García-López, 2018). The observation that Marxist theorists and other critical scholars project their revolutionary hopes onto the commons has led to calls for theorizations that go ‘beyond wishful thinking’ (Tummers and MacGregor, 2019) and acknowledge the messy, paradoxical and uneven nature of commoning in practice (Noterman, 2016).

Instead of assuming a utility-maximizing or revolutionary subject, we are interested in the contradictory process of subject formation. We begin from the premise that hegemonic and alternative values coexist tensely in the commons as well as within individual commoners. Crucially, the concept of subjectivity is processual and relational (Fiorito, 2019). As such, it allows us to grasp the complexities and ambivalences at the heart of the formation of the commoner subject who is positioned at the intersection of conflicting value systems. Though the concept of subjectivity has rarely been used in research on urban commons, recent scholarship has begun to examine how the commons and commoners evolve together. Drawing on Indigenous and feminist theories, this body of work helps rethink the commons by emphasizing that they are not just systems for managing resources, but also involve affects, imaginaries and social relations (Singh, 2017; Nightingale, 2019; García-López *et al.*, 2021; Johnson, 2021). Commoning not only requires a transformation in modes of (re)production, it also implies an alternative understanding of commoners’ senses of self in relation to the world. In short, commoning implies alternative subjectivities and ways of being. This challenge of cultivating alternative subjectivities takes on particular significance in the urban commons where commoners cannot rely on preserving traditional practices and beliefs, but must craft new ways of being in response to the pressures of capitalist urbanization.

Building on this emergent literature and drawing on qualitative research on three housing commons in the Netherlands, this article makes two contributions to the literature. First, by analyzing the formation of subjectivities we highlight contradictory values, positions and emotions that pervade the commons and commoners. Commoning entails specific forms of care and work involving complex feelings and geared towards the cultivation of affects, sensibilities and relations that sustain alternative ways of life (Fernández Arrigoitia *et al.*, 2023). The engagement with Indigenous scholarship helps us appreciate how commoners deploy principles of interdependence, practices of intersubjective communication and rituals. Second, by examining three different housing commons, we explore a variety of ‘actually existing commons’ (Eizenberg, 2012) and examine how different types of commons create different commoner subjectivities, and vice versa. We highlight instances of ‘differential commoning’ (Noterman, 2016) by demonstrating variations among and within the commons. Studying different kinds of commons enables us to avoid assuming that the commons are either inherently revolutionary or merely pragmatic ways of solving problems of collective action. Instead, it reveals how commoners develop different ways of negotiating hegemonic and alternative values, advancing scholarly efforts that acknowledge the messiness of commoning (*ibid.*).

The article is structured as follows. The first section elaborates on how the concept of subjectivity helps us better understand the commons. We then present our methods, before analyzing how commoners negotiate values and form subjectivities in the domains of work, sharing and responsibility. Finally, we outline the implications of our discussion for developing a better understanding of the commons.

The urban commons and subjectivity

Studying the political potential of the commons requires a move away from neoclassical assumptions about commoners’ motivations and practices. Critical scholarship faults institutionalist approaches for their overreliance on rational

choice theory and conceptualization of the commons as resources, not as constitutive social practice (Caffentzis and Federici, 2014) and something that is actively made through labor (Gidwani and Baviskar, 2011). Commoning involves ‘collective work, cooperation, and participation with rights and obligations’ (Martínez, 2020: 1400). The critical literature views commoning as exploring a way of life outside capitalism (De Angelis, 2017; Nightingale, 2019). Critical scholars have focused on the overarching forces that threaten the commons through enclosure and cooption (Caffentzis and Federici, 2014; De Angelis, 2017), paying less attention to how these forces play out in the ‘actually existing commons’ (Eizenberg, 2012). Indeed, it is one thing to investigate how the commons and capitalism interact as systems, but another to set out to understand how capitalist logics influence relations and ways of being *within* the commons and commoners (Velicu and García-López, 2018; Savini, 2023). Such is the task we take on here.

– Indigenous ontologies and the commons

An emerging strand of literature explicitly connects subjectivation and commoning. By drawing on Indigenous ontologies and feminist political ecology, scholars contributing to this literature understand subjectivities as always in becoming in relation to others and their environments (Singh, 2017; García-López *et al.*, 2021). Many Indigenous worldviews reflect a relational ontology that views all beings—human and non-human—as ‘entangled becomings, creative and vital and always in the process of becoming through their connections’ in specific times and places (Suchet-Pearson *et al.*, 2013: 187; Tynan, 2021). Instead of assuming that humans simply manage resources—thereby instituting a separation between the object (resource) and subject (humans) (Mattei, 2012)—these approaches grasp the commons as emerging from the mutually constitutive formation of subjectivities, social relations and socio-natural environments (García-López *et al.*, 2021). The commons, then, are a potential site for the creation of relations among people and their socio-natural environments that go beyond the dominant logics of capitalism and colonialism.

Importantly, in Indigenous cosmologies, relationality is a practice that involves enacting an ethics of care and responsibility (Watts, 2013). Different ways of relating are fostered through affective intersubjective interactions (Singh, 2017). For example, Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe peoples ascribe intentionality to land and place and feel obliged to maintain communication with them through ceremonies and agreements (Watts, 2013). Similarly, Suchet-Pearson *et al.* (2013) reformulate the concept ‘caring for Country’ as ‘caring *as* Country’, reflecting the idea in Yolŋu ontologies that humans are part of Country and that the two are intertwined in a state of co-becoming.¹ This view suggests that the affinity between commons and commoners is underpinned by relationships of responsibility and care that are strengthened through practices and rituals (Johnson, 2021; Tynan, 2021). Moreover, such rituals and practices contribute to the formation of commoner subjectivities and intersubjectivities: caring for the commons means caring for oneself *as* commons. This scholarship may not be transferred directly to cases in the global North or to cities; however, Indigenous urbanism (Dorries, 2023) and relational approaches do help us appreciate the mutual constitution of commoners’ subjectivities and the commons within specific places.

– Subjectivity and the commons

Subjectivity is loosely defined as one’s sense of self. It refers to the subject’s interior life and affective state (Fiorito, 2019) as well as one’s ‘ways of perceiving, understanding and relating to the world’ (Read, 2011: 114). Furthermore, the concept

1 The capitalized ‘Country’, here, ‘is a term used by many Aboriginal groups in Australia to delineate understandings from the English word “land”’ (Tynan, 2021: 602).

‘emphasizes that power structures are internalized and embodied in our sense of self and our thoughts, feelings and sensibilities’ (Fiorito, 2019: 347). It is the ambivalence of power that makes subjectivities the terrain of both domination and subversion (Butler, 1997; Nightingale, 2019). On the one hand, subjectivation involves the internalization of dominance, with subjects fashioning themselves according to prevailing values and views (Karaliotas, 2017). On the other hand, subjectivation entails the ability to reflect and question (Butler, 1997; Velicu and García-López, 2018; Nightingale, 2019). The ambivalence of power means that subjectivities are dynamic, and that people can inhabit contradictory subjectivities (Nightingale, 2019). Commoners do not simply maximize their utility or enact ideologies but *embody* contradictory values. Given that subjectivities are embodied, they involve intersubjective emotion and affect. Creating the commons, it follows, is a matter of coordination and ideology, as well as emotional labor. If affect ‘denotes a relational force that flows between bodies and which enhances or diminishes their power of acting’ (Singh, 2017: 759), then investigating the commons’ political potential means understanding how people *feel* about dominant or alternative practices.

To account for power’s ambivalent role in the formation of subjectivity, we draw on Gramsci’s concept of hegemony. Peet (2002: 56) defines hegemony as ‘a prevailing common sense formed in culture, diffused by civic institutions, that informs values, customs, and spiritual ideals and induces “spontaneous” consent to the status quo’. Subjectivity and hegemony are closely related as the latter situates subjects in specific societal positions (Hall, 1986). Subjects embody both hegemony and alternatives. Indeed, Gramsci suggests that counter-hegemonic common senses arise not in splendid isolation from hegemony but by ‘renovating and making “critical” an already existing activity’ (Gramsci, quoted in García-López *et al.*, 2017: 90). This is an inherently relational process that occurs *within* and *between* commoners—commoners question, affirm and renegotiate alternative and hegemonic values through everyday practice, discussion and reflection.

– The urban commons

Arguably, appreciating how hegemony and its alternatives are negotiated in everyday life is especially important for understanding the urban commons, that is, commons located within cities in advanced capitalist economies. Scholars drawing on Indigenous ontologies have mostly studied natural commons (such as forests, fisheries or lands) that have been communally managed for generations (Singh, 2017). Whereas such commons have developed in relative seclusion from capitalism and are often threatened with violent expropriation, the type of housing projects we study here embody the contradiction of being beyond and within advanced capitalism at the same time. If urbanization involves the remaking of space for capitalism (e.g. Brenner and Schmid, 2015), then the urban commons are not a precapitalist residue, but construed in dialectical relation with capitalism. The term ‘urban commons’, in our understanding, does not refer primarily to sites at which strangers meet, nor to commons that are located within a city’s boundaries (Feinberg *et al.*, 2021). Rather, we use it to denote commons that are created as capitalist urbanization unfolds. While members of traditional commons rely on preserving values and practices in the face of commodification and colonialism, urban commoners must carve out a niche and confront the challenge of establishing alternative subjectivities within and against the hegemonic logic of capitalist urbanization.

The commons’ transformative ambitions and the concomitant performance of counter-hegemonic subjectivities thus emerge in response to capitalist urbanization. The prefigurative ambitions of these commons are intimately connected to the struggles felt by urban dwellers, such as the lack of affordable housing and non-commercial spaces for subcultures. Moreover, each commons brings forward particular discourses within

the realm of alternative values. While some are intended to promote communal living as a remedy against individualism, others emphasize ecological, queer, anarchist or intersectional politics. Consequently, the process of identifying hegemonic domination and articulating alternatives is an important step in the formation of subjectivities.

Commodification and state power are pervasive in the urban commons, not just as institutional logics but also as ways of thinking and habitual practice (Qian and An, 2021). Creating and maintaining the commons in highly saturated urban spaces, targeted by capitalist investment, puts pressure on the work of commoning (Huron, 2015). Commoning in the urban context involves extensive emotional labor, with commoners having to reconcile alternative ways of thinking and being amidst pervasive commodification and individualization. Where wage labor and property relations are omnipresent, for instance, it becomes difficult to view and enact 'work' as something that is done for a community rather than in pursuit of an individual career or monetary compensation. Urban commoners are constantly pushed and tempted to view themselves as workers or entrepreneurs in the economy, members of a household, or individuals with unique trajectories and lifestyles. All these self-conceptions sit uneasily with a commitment to the commons, which requires that individuals become dependent on each other and act in concert for the common good. In short, the urban commons become a site for investigating the tensions between, and mutual constitution of, hegemony and its alternatives in everyday life (Kip *et al.*, 2015; Huron, 2017; Qian and An, 2021). Examining how subjectivities are formed through constant negotiations among hegemonic and alternative values is critical in understanding the dynamics and potential of the urban commons.

Methods

Having discussed the theoretical dynamics of subjectivation and hegemony in urban commons, we now examine how commoners negotiate alternative and hegemonic values in everyday life. We draw upon 18 interviews as well as participant observations carried out by the first author between September 2021 and July 2022. She participated in two maintenance days in the eco-community, and various communal meals and events open to the public in all three communities. The interviews with commoners focused on how they negotiated hegemonic and alternative values in their everyday lives. How did they try to do things differently from the surrounding society? How was commoning changing their attitudes, dispositions and relations? What sort of obstacles, challenges or opportunities arose as they tried out alternative ways of organizing collectively? Interviews are a suitable method for studying the process of subject formation as they allow subjects to reflect on changes in their personalities, practices, values and aspirations. Interviewees who had experiences in other communities were able to reflect on their biographies of collective living and identify how predispositions and values had evolved, while people who had only recently become part of a commons project talked about the culture shock they experienced.

To define counter-hegemonic practices we rely on commoners' own understanding of what counts as 'alternative' or 'mainstream'. Practically, interviewees expressed how their ways of living and being were different from the 'mainstream' by directly comparing their lives to those of people living outside of the commons. They also communicated how their housing project was transformative by recounting how difficult it was to convince state actors or building companies to operate in ways that are not standard in the Netherlands. Relying on members' own understanding of 'alternative' allowed us to consider the variety of values that had informed the three housing projects and helped interviewees to reflect on how they personally expressed and practiced communal values. We should note that this method comes with limitations. The notion of hegemony presumes that people tend to embody relations of domination and therefore accept and naturalize rather than critique them (Gramsci, 1971; Spivak, 1988). While this

approach means that we do not comprehensively examine the workings of hegemony, we are able to see how commoners themselves view their efforts and struggles. We learn what they see as hegemonic and how they attempt to develop alternatives to the status quo.

By studying three different housing projects, we examine how different types of commons shape the formation of commoner subjectivities, and vice versa. The first case is the *legalized squat*. From the 1970s until the squatting ban of 2010, squatting was widespread in the Netherlands, creating many communal living spaces (Kadir, 2016). The squat in question has been legalized and is now managed by an association. It still endorses values associated with the squatting movement such as a strong do-it-yourself mentality, a commitment to affordable housing, and an openness to experimentation and alternative subcultures. The legalized squat is a single building, with inhabitants sharing all spaces except for their rooms. There is a strong sense of community and members are expected to participate in communal work and activities. The majority of the thirty inhabitants are young, male and without children. When our research was conducted, the community was trying to diversify by accepting only female members and becoming more family friendly.

The second case is an *eco-community*. Members of this eco-community value communal and ecological living. Most people live in private apartments of different sizes (to accommodate different types of households) but share many spaces and resources. The architectural structure and decision-making procedures are designed around the core value of affordable ecological living, though inhabitants may have different interpretations of what this entails. Around sixty people live in the eco-community, and despite variations in terms of age, gender, familial status and occupation, the community is ethnically and culturally homogeneous in the sense that it predominantly consists of ethnically Dutch inhabitants with progressive and ecological values.

The third case is a *communal condominium*. Whereas in the legalized squat and eco-community residents live in a private accommodation that is owned by the collective, in the communal condominium individual households own their self-contained apartments as private property. Still, the communal condominium has been established as a commons to the extent that inhabitants collectively manage spaces (including an inner garden and a multifunctional room) and engage in activities that foster a sense of community. They promote a broad set of values such as ecological sustainability, community involvement, and the combination of collective and individual living. Most inhabitants were in their forties with kids, white, Dutch, and worked in artistic and intellectual professions.

Although all three housing projects are prefigurative commons in the sense that they have been founded with the express purpose of experimenting with alternative ways of providing housing and creating living environments, the practice of commoning differs in nature and extent. Given its high degree of communal sharing, origin in political action and collective decision-making, the legalized squat is arguably the most intense type of housing commons among the cases studied. The communal condominium is at the opposite end of the spectrum. Its members embrace a cooperative ethos and manage shared spaces yet are first and foremost owners of individual properties. The eco-community stands between these two types. Its households inhabit but do not own their housing units, and members of the community jointly manage resources ranging from cars to laundry facilities. Taken together, these three projects represent a variety of alternative housing (Hodkinson, 2012).

In all three housing projects, we conducted extensive conversations with members before commencing our research. During those conversations, we explained the purpose of the research and explained how we would use the data. Generally, residents were initially reluctant to participate; they were wary of the time it would take and concerned about Covid-19. Over time, however, they came to perceive the research

as an occasion to reflect on their living environments and relations. We agreed not to include any sensitive information and guaranteed all interviewees that they would not be named. Therefore pseudonyms are used throughout this article.

Domains of negotiation: between alternative and hegemonic values

We identify three domains—work, responsibility and sharing—in which commoners negotiate hegemonic and alternative values. These domains figure prominently in the commoning literature and frequently emerged during interviews, as well as observations of informal conversations between commoners, which indicates their relevance to everyday living in the commons. Focusing on these three practices as domains of negotiation helps identify the values that commoners promote, how they do so, and the difficulties they encounter in the process.

– Work

Many of our interviewees indicated that the affordability of living in a housing commons enabled them to redefine their relation to work. In the eco-community and legalized squat, members have the financial freedom to limit their engagement in paid labor and invest more time in other activities. For instance, one inhabitant of the eco-community stated:

Yeah, we have our own energy and our own water. All these costs are also very low, especially now you see the energy costs rising and our energy costs are still very, very low. This doesn't hurt our family budget. That also makes it possible for me to work less than a lot of people. So, I don't have to work 40 hours just to pay the bills. I can choose to work less, to spend more time with my family, and also spend more time to put into volunteer projects, like cultural projects or nature projects. And this is the same for a lot of people, it's very unusual for people to live here and work full-time. This is not something which is an ambition of the people living here. It's more important to put your time towards more fulfilling work (Lodewijk, eco-community).

For the inhabitants of the eco-community and legalized squat, working less is not an automatic consequence of affordable living, but something rooted in the values of these commons. According to one of the eco-community's founders, the possibility of working fewer hours per week in a regular job was already on the minds of those who conceived the project and represented one of the commons' main transformative goals.

We also thought, ok, if we can make affordable houses then we can have the lifestyle that not everybody has to be working all the time to have enough income and to have, you know, so that they can live more relaxed, so that they also have time to do things for society or for their ideals, and to do things around their own house, so that's actually, that's transformative I think (Annalisa, eco-community).

Reducing paid employment is transformative in that it creates an alter-hegemonic way of working whereby commoners can lessen the burden of capitalist relations on their lives. Instead, they prioritize personal development, creativity and work toward social justice by volunteering in various organizations. Whereas hegemonic conceptions of work cast paid labor as the only route to achieving a fulfilling life, in these communities, care and social labor are appreciated and define how commoners see themselves. Importantly, the fact that commoners decide to reduce their participation in paid labor does not mean they work less. As Suzanne (an inhabitant of the eco-community)

states: ‘when you live here it’s difficult to combine it with a full-time job’. Indeed, there is always some collective work to do, from cleaning and maintenance to attending meetings, cooking and looking after children. It is expected that members participate in these tasks. Indeed, if commoners did not have time or drive to care for the commons, the commons would not exist.

Comparing practices in the eco-community and legalized squat with those in the communal condominium shows how upholding hegemonic conceptions of work risks undermining the commons. Most of the people living in the communal condominium work full-time, take care of their children, and do other things on the side such as studying or hobbies. On top of all that, they participate in the community. Unlike the other two communities, here expectations about active participation are quite low. Given that working and parenting are considered priorities, there is limited time left for communal work. For instance, when we asked a resident of the communal condominium why they hire a cleaning company to clean the common areas instead of dividing the work, she was quick to answer that she wanted to spend time with her children. The example of the communal condominium illustrates how material conditions (affordability), and subjectivities (internalized conceptions of work and community) evolve together; the communal condominium cultivated a way of thinking in which something as valuable as time cannot be spent on activities such as the cleaning of the common spaces.

Through the perspective outlined above, we see commoning as a process of co-becoming: creating and maintaining the commons crafts commoner subjectivities. The embodied value of reduced work and the related practice of spending time on fulfilling work is what sustains these housing commons. To achieve their transformative ambitions, commoners must embody and internalize the values on which these ambitions are built. In the case of work, this process involves substituting the hegemonic idea that you must do paid work to achieve a fulfilling life by the alter-hegemonic values associated with performing care work and social labor in a community. In the hegemonic logic, time should be *spent* and *invested* in accordance with the maxim *time is money*. In this logic, unpaid care work is at best secondary. Tensions between hegemonic and alternative conceptions of work and time emerge when new members are selected. As a resident of the eco-community explained:

We have to see the new people who are coming who didn’t help with building and everything, so didn’t feel this like ok we are doing this ourselves with the resources that we have, so then people could just see this as a way of living cheap or something, so we have to be careful about that, that we keep having people who actually take responsibility to keep the community going (Annalisa, eco-community).

At the same time, she stated that participating in the community ‘shouldn’t be forced or something’ as then it would be ‘no fun anymore of course’. Annalisa worried that newer members would not understand what living affordably really means to commoners; she is interested in selecting people with a certain mindset and set of commitments. To ascertain whether someone is reliable and will show up when needed, members of the eco-community ask if they have been involved in voluntary work or have experience working in a collective. These worries reflect a tension between expectations about active participation to maintain the commons and the uneasiness in enforcing others’ work as it should be ‘fun’ and voluntary. Here we see how work for the commons is necessary but cannot be imposed—the success of the commons hinges on ingraining the value of work in subjectivity so that it becomes second nature.

Even though these communities mostly attract people with similar values, participation is often uneven. For instance, we observed that on a rainy Sunday only

seven people showed up for the monthly maintenance day in the eco-community, resulting in disappointment and frustration among the people who did show up (nevertheless, they did get to work and concluded the day cheerfully). While commoners may feel frustrated about doing more than their fair share, they may also experience guilt about not doing enough. As Lisa (eco-community) explains:

It's just always the feeling that I'm having, that I should do more and that's actually the constant voice that I have 'you should do more for the community because other people are doing so much' and that's sometimes a bit difficult to be at home and just be at home and do my own stuff, read a book, or have a nap, or whatever. Without feeling guilty about doing nothing.

This sense of guilt is present across the three commons and manifests in different ways. Some people explained how they avoid the common areas when they cannot attend a communal activity to prevent having to embarrassedly justify their absence. It is challenging to align predispositions and internalized values with the requirements of participating in the commons.

This tension is not just about the volume but also the kind of work. On the one hand, the three commons share the principle that everyone should contribute according to their abilities, preferences and capacity; meaning that while some people are good at fixing, others may focus on cooking shared meals or looking after children. On the other hand, some kinds of work are celebrated more than others. As these communities are founded on a do-it-yourself philosophy, being handy, solution-oriented, and able to fix things is highly valued. However, some members stressed that work and practices that create a loving and safe environment, such as organizing a party or putting a flower in front of someone's door, are equally important for the well-being of the community and yet are easily overlooked. These preconceptions about work in the commons can implicitly influence members' decisions when selecting new members. In fact, according to Amalia (legalized squat), men tend to present themselves as handier and more practical than women, which favors them during selection. If not discussed, tensions between practical work *vis-à-vis* care work risk reproducing the hegemonic and gendered invisibility of reproductive work (Fernández Arrigoitia *et al.*, 2023).

Uneven and different modes of participation, which are often linked to hegemonic and gendered conceptions of work, can result in negative feelings that obstruct the realization of an alternative vision of work as communal. Some people may become frustrated when other members do not show up at communal activities such as maintenance day, or because their neighbors always ask them to repair things, while others feel guilty and ashamed when they cannot participate. Martha from the eco-community explains this well:

We as a community do everything to make sure that people don't feel like this, but then still you have one or two persons who are a bit like 'contribution!' 'is everybody contributing enough?' and then it's enough to make sure that ten people feel guilty.

Even if these feelings are often unfounded and rooted 'in people's heads', they may eventually hinder a sense of belonging in the community. Recognizing that implicit sentiments about uneven contributions are potentially toxic, the eco-community organizes periodical conversations where commoners share their thoughts around the topic. These are important moments because in small groups commoners share and hear what others think about the topic, and according to Martha the conclusion is the same every year: 'everybody does what they can'.

Sharing the weight of taking care of the commons does not mean that everyone does the same tasks and works the same number of hours, it means people support each other along fluctuations in their time, energy and interests. There will never be an exact balance in participation. When people make calculations—such as how much time to ‘invest’ or how to ‘spend’ time—and attempt to maximize utility, they skirt or devalue alternative conceptions of communal labor. Reducing capitalist labor relations is not just meant to change one’s calculus but to alter subjectivity so as to redefine one’s relationship to work and the commons. However, the deeply internalized ideals of productivity and the valuing of some over other work stand in the way of fully embracing an alter-hegemonic subjectivity. As these tensions may never be resolved, rituals of listening and talking become important for preventing or channeling negative emotions such as guilt, shame and anger.

– Responsibility

The next domain of negotiation of commoner subjectivities that emerged from the fieldwork is that of shared responsibility. If commoning is a social practice that involves collective management, then responsibility for creating and maintaining the commons is shared among members. Illustrative in this regard is the account of Michail, who has lived in such housing all his life and acquired a deep sense of internalized responsibility:

An example of a shared facility is our wood workshop; it’s a workspace with tools and materials that everyone can use ... I’ve lived in other communities where a workshop would be managed by designated people, but our workshop isn’t locked and the responsibility for the space is not delegated to specific people. This implies that we trust that people use the space and materials responsibly, and that we don’t need designated people to manage the place, nor for the spaces to be locked with only designated people holding the key. This requires a non-hierarchical mindset and a well-developed internalization of personal responsibility (Michail, legalized squat, email exchange).

Annalisa (eco-community), who had also lived communally for many years, connected the sharing of responsibility to the possibility of building the housing commons. She stated that:

Often people ask ‘so what exactly is the social connection between everybody?’ but it’s also already very special that we have houses that we are responsible for, and that we can choose who is coming to live there, and that we all know each other ... and that we have affordable houses, and ecological houses and that we do this ourselves, nobody is a boss or something.

In this light, sharing responsibility allows for collective agency and empowerment. Moreover, given that the creation and maintenance of members’ houses depends on their own work and that of their neighbors, sharing responsibility highlights the interdependence among commoners. The sharing of responsibility foregrounds the commons’ cooperative and collective aspects. Indeed, cooperation relies on a deep sense of internalized responsibility and mutual interdependence, which contrasts with hegemonic values of individualism, self-sufficiency and rational decision-making. Responsibility in these commons therefore emerges from a state of relationality. This state resonates with the ethics of responsibility described by Indigenous scholars and contrasts with the ‘ethics of rights-based entitlement that is present in many Western logics’ (Tynan, 2021: 604).

To illustrate the relationship between personal responsibility, interdependency and collective agency, we turn to the practice of decision-making. As part of a collective, one is often called upon to make decisions that directly affect other people's lives. Such decisions might involve determining whether someone's partner can come to live in the building, what to do when someone is not paying rent, or whom to accept as a new member. These decisions are difficult and complex because they involve talking about people and will inevitably affect someone. Lisa fully grasped the implications of making decisions together only after two years of living in the eco-community:

I think sometimes it also gives a feeling of community that we are deciding together, and yeah that maybe is also what it would be in a family, right? That you are also making choices and that also affects each other which kind of choices you are making. Ehm yeah and I think for myself I wouldn't make choices very easily which affect others so much ... but now I also think ok that's apparently how community living works and made those choices, which is maybe also important because in this way it probably feels safer for people if their choice is really worth it ... That they can say that they don't feel good about something and then this feeling is really seen because they can say that they don't feel good about it, and then it's not gonna be done if they really have a strong feeling about that.

These observations indicate how collective deliberation makes members aware of the interdependence that binds them together. Contrary to the conception of people as rational agents in pursuit of individual gain, collective decision-making entails acknowledging that your decisions are not made in a vacuum—that they are influenced by previous experiences and interpersonal relations. The realization that one's decisions and actions directly affect others—i.e. that members are vulnerable to each other—is often uncomfortable. This feeling stems from the fact that in contemporary society vulnerability is hidden and pathologized, instead of being seen as an inescapable part of the human condition (Petherbridge, 2016). Accepting mutual interdependence and vulnerability may be challenging, but they are the source of collective agency. As Lisa's testimony suggested, being able to decide what happens in the commons is empowering because it means that decisions taken collectively are respected and directly influence how the commons are managed. Moreover, by considering the eco-community to be a family, Lisa exposes the affective relations among commoners. This, in turn, reveals how the value of personal responsibility has become embodied in her sense of self and the collective. She considers the eco-community to be a collective subject tied by affective relations: a family.

The internalized sense of personal responsibility, which is characteristic of commoner subjectivities across the three housing commons, relies on the recognition of a state of interdependence. Michail reflected on the connection between an internalized sense of responsibility and taking action:

Living in a community like this also gives you the opportunity to have a lot of influence on your surroundings and the people you live with. Without the government having anything to do with it. When you live just in a house, in a street and there is something wrong in your neighborhood or whatever, the normal thing is to say, 'yeah well the municipality is responsible for that', instead of saying 'hey neighbors let's do something about this' and doing it ourselves. And this DIY mentality, you see it much more in a collective like this than in a regular street (Michail, legalized squat).

Responsibility is pivotal because if no one does anything, nothing gets done. Cooperation relies on mutual interdependence and personal responsibility, which are opposed to

the hegemonic values of individual sufficiency and reliance on higher institutions. Yet housing commoners have been socialized in Western societies and might struggle to fully embody personal responsibility. For instance, Martha (a member of the eco-community's internal communication workgroup, referred to as 'intern') reflected on the risk that the commons might become too institutionalized:

But you see that there is some kind of hierarchy. People expect us [the internal communication workgroup] to do it. They will not do it themselves, which is kind of logical somehow, but we have to be aware that we don't get too institutionalized. That people don't forget that we are all neighbors together and you can also just talk to each other without asking people from intern to join. You know? We are also still grownups who can just do our own shit, right? ... Sometimes we have to be aware of that. That we don't try to solve all the things that are going on. So, like for example there was some issue with the parking lots ... and people were emailing and then someone emailed us as a group and said like 'yes, you noticed there has been some emails back and forth and some people are not happy with blah blah blah, could you maybe organize a meeting?' and I think I replied you are free to organize a meeting, and organize a group concerning the parking lots, and then you can talk to everyone and make sure that everyone who wants to can join, and then you can talk about the issues that are concerning you. I just like said we are not gonna do anything, but you are free, you are a free person, you can organize your own group and talk about this.

Formally, the intern workgroup does not have any hierarchical position within the eco-community. Yet the amount of knowledge its members possess about internal relations created an informal hierarchy whereby people tended to rely on them to solve issues. According to Martha, members must realize that they are not part of a hierarchical institution that people can simply call to solve their problems, and that people participating in the intern workgroup are just their neighbors.

By making members aware of how hegemonic conceptions of individualism were shaping their actions, Martha's efforts to spur her neighbors' sense of personal responsibility were an attempt to foster the internalization and formation of a commoner subjectivity. That members perceived and approached the intern group as a hierarchical institution appears antithetical to the idea of a commoner who can deal with their frustrations with the community. Importantly, Martha was inciting her neighbors to acknowledge their interdependency with others and take responsibility for solving the problem in common, instead of outsourcing this responsibility or solving the problem alone. This example suggests that personal responsibility ought not to be individualized but shared and collectivized in the commons.

These accounts emphasize how taking responsibility is not the result of a conscious decision based on the calculation of costs and benefits, as rational choice approaches to the commons would argue. Instead, it is a disposition fostered by repeated interactions and guided by alternative values. Furthermore, the examples represented by Lisa and Martha indicate that commoners are not naturally oriented toward this disposition. Rather, shared responsibility is continuously negotiated through affective interactions and people gradually come to embody it.

– Sharing

In the literature on the commons, sharing is often identified as a way to efficiently manage resources (Vestbro, 2012). The eco-community inhabitants also emphasize that sharing helps to save resources:

The main ecological value that we have is sharing, so we share space and tools and equipment, and we share the work. We also share a lot of time just socially, so it's also a lot of fun. Especially the biggest impact we make is that we share this building [that contains members' apartments]. So, you don't need a lot of room, and you don't need a lot of materials to live together in a quite a small spot within the city, so that saves a lot of material and energy ... But sharing is the thing that is the most impactful on our daily lives. So, whenever there's a choice to be made, we will always look to see if it can be made in a way in which resources and stuff are shared (Lodewijk, eco-community).

Although Lodewijk stresses that sharing is efficient, this quote also indicates another dimension: sharing creates alternative relations and subjectivities. This point is easily neglected if commoning is merely seen as the management of resources. In the eco-community, collective sharing overspilled into the private sphere, with neighbors starting to share cooking appliances and library cards. In other words, sharing became a recurrent practice that contrasts with the hegemonic values of individualism and private property.

There is a high level of sharing in the legalized squat, where individuals and families share essential facilities (such as bathrooms, showers and kitchens) and non-essential spaces (such as a woodwork space, attic, darkroom, archive and small concert venue). This intensity of sharing is closely connected with alternative ways of relating. During our interview, Carmen emphasized how living in this intimate community has changed her:

Like the second I step out of the door here, people will see me, and it can also be very fucking confrontational, you know, sometimes you don't want to see people. You don't have that luxury; when you walk to the kitchen, people will see you, and they will see how you are doing. So, it also forces you to deal with things and deal with things in yourself but also deal with other people. It has made me a lot more social, a lot more patient. Yeah, *I have learned to make a lot more space in myself for other people* (our emphasis).

According to Carmen, the legalized squat is 'a pressure cooker for all your social skills'. Other members also acknowledge that they have developed skills including listening, patience and empathy. Living near each other has a strong intersubjective and collective dimension:

Yeah, because you are [living] so together with each other, when things are not right mentally with one person in the house, the whole house can feel that. And we all suffer because of that. So, in a way we always try to help each other as much as possible, you know (Carmen, legalized squat).

Those living in the legalized squat cannot escape from the affective relations among the inhabitants; so much so that caring for each other becomes synonymous with caring for oneself and the commons—it becomes caring *as* commons. This quote shows that Carmen was deeply aware that living collectively—commoning—involves creating a collective relational subject that is interdependent and vulnerable to other beings. In this case, commoning goes beyond collectively managing resources. It generates new relations and expands into subjectivity.

However, not everyone has the same feeling of belonging to the commons. Some people may physically inhabit the commons but not participate socially or emotionally. Sometimes these people were referred to as 'ghosts', on occasion even as 'parasites'.

They do not show up at the rituals that sustain the commons, but do not move out either, leading to feelings of guilt, frustration and sometimes anger. There are different routes to this role: sometimes people withdrew after conflicts, at other times they gradually found that they were more drawn to a career and social life outside of the commons, or they got bored or exhausted from participating. Whatever the route, a divergence grows between their predispositions and behaviors versus the need of the commons for continued participation and involvement, resulting in their severing from the collective subject. Inhabitants whose subjectivity neatly aligns with the commons are those who have developed an intimate relation to their environment through building, caring, maintaining and repairing. Such practices serve as rituals that cultivate an intimate connection with the building and its transformative ambitions, to the point that it becomes an integral part of their being. Accordingly, as Lisa from the eco-community shares, one of the strategies commoners employ to increase their sense of belonging is to participate in communal activities, such as maintenance day:

Yeah, I feel that every time with the *klusdagen* [maintenance day] I then say, ok I'm gonna build this box or so, and when I have built this, every time that I'm passing I think oh yeah that's something I gave to this place, and that then also feels connecting that I did something for this place. So, the *klusdagen* definitely helped to get connected. Yeah the *klusdagen* are super nice, also to connect with the people because then you are having this whole, yeah what they just had in the building process that you are building together, then you have that in a small form in the *klusdagen* because then you care together of the building and you are also together in this way.

Through maintenance days, members who joined at later stages can participate in the moments of building the commons. By building kitchens, making furniture or introducing a new method of decision-making, they feel like they have tangibly contributed to the commons. This example shows how belonging to the commons and performing a commoner subjectivity is not an automatic process, but something cultivated through practices of care and rituals with other beings, environments and objects (Watts, 2013; Tynan, 2021). Sharing is vital to the reproduction of the commons, however, sharing is not easy. It presupposes a relaxation or breaking of hegemonic norms of property, propriety and privacy; it only works when it is sustained through rituals and is encoded into everyday life. Sharing requires an extended and ongoing process of learning, negotiating and adapting to develop emotional skills and intersubjectivity.

Conclusion

In response to critiques according to which literature about the commons suffers from 'wishful thinking' (Tummers and MacGregor, 2019) and does not sufficiently acknowledge contradictions within 'actually existing commons' (Eizenberg, 2012; Noterman, 2016), this article unpacks how commoners negotiate alternative and hegemonic values in everyday life. Comparing three types of housing commons—a legalized squat, an eco-community and communal condominiums—we discuss three domains in which such negotiations take place: work, responsibility and sharing. Our findings suggest that commoners struggle to develop viable alternatives to hegemonic notions and practices of work, sharing and responsibility. For instance, although the commons are based on the equal sharing of responsibilities, in practice commoners often feel that this is highly demanding and occasionally they opt out. Internalized ideas about economic productivity and individual responsibility get in the way of realizing the potential of the commons. To highlight the role of internalized values, we draw upon the notion of subjectivity. The commons do not only require alternative mechanisms of management, but they also presuppose alternative affects, dispositions and relations.

Our findings show how commoners push back against hegemonic notions by self-consciously cultivating alternative values. Through rituals such as holding maintenance days, sharing meals and organizing film screenings, they craft subjectivities and develop shared practices. Their implicit and sometimes explicit understanding is that the commons cannot survive if commoners act as utility maximizers. Instead, they should appreciate housing affordability as an opportunity to undertake work for the community, not as a way of saving money; they should feel responsible for joining and organizing collective events, even if no one asks them to; they should be open to sharing and other people's concerns, even when they sometimes are overburdened. The commons here appear as more than an institutional configuration, it is an affect and disposition. As Carmen remarked in the quote presented above, she 'learned to make a lot more space in [her]self for other people'. Commoning, in short, had become engrained into her subjectivity.

Considering that the fate of the commons is inextricably tied to that of the commoners, we should put more emphasis on the emotional labor needed to sustain alternative commoner subjectivities. Seen in this light, the commons do not result from negotiations among rational utility maximizers but grow out of a sense of interdependence and intersubjectivity, both among the commoners and with their broader socio-natural environment. This research suggests that by engaging in rituals and collective communication commoners try to develop modes of 'differential commoning' (Noterman, 2016) that acknowledge multiple subjectivities and different modes of engagement. Yet, this process appears difficult in practice and still presupposes some performance of the collective subject by members through social rituals and practical work. The negative references to 'ghosts' indicate that complete inactivity is not appreciated and deemed incompatible with commoning.

These findings contribute in several ways to a growing body of research that tries to go beyond understandings of the commons as a configuration of property relations or resource management (Mattei, 2012; Williams, 2018; Fernández Arrigoitia *et al.*, 2023). Starting from the notion that commoners and the commons constantly co-produce each other, this body of work sees the commons as always in becoming (Singh, 2017; García-López *et al.*, 2021). Here we suggest that the commoners, too, are always in becoming in that their subjectivities—their affects, dispositions and senses of self—are shaped through constant negotiations between hegemonic and alternative values. Being a commoner is an affective and embodied process, not a natural predisposition, nor an effect of calculation, nor an automatic consequence of group membership.

In this regard, we can learn from Indigenous scholarship that emphasizes co-becoming through practices of relationality between people and place (Tynan, 2021). The idea that the self emerges in relation to other beings and places allows us to grasp that belonging to the commons and embodying a commoner subjectivity is an intersubjective process that develops with other beings and objects, defining commoner subjectivities bounded to place. Moreover, discussions on Indigeneity stress how counter-hegemonic practices must be embodied and lived and continuously reinforced through rituals. We should not only think of commoners as acting *on* but also *with* their environment and to consider what it means to care *as* commons (Singh, 2017).

This idea entails a radically different perspective on the commons than the one suggested by neoclassical economics. Whereas neoclassical economics views a lack of involvement in the commons as a form of 'free riding', we view it in terms of the incomplete or fraught process of co-becoming. Our findings suggest that one does not become a commoner due to a straightforward cost-benefit calculation or by following formal rules. It involves sustained emotional labor and struggles with internalized and omnipresent hegemonic norms.

Finally, by comparing three different types of housing projects, we have begun to understand how commons differ and what this means in terms of the subjectivities

and alternatives they create. By showing which dominant values are being contested and how, the notion of hegemony helps in specifying the commons' generative potential. Altogether, this approach helps us imagine the conditions necessary for commoning to bring forward a qualitatively distinct set of values. This approach is especially useful for the urban commons, because it acknowledges contradictions among and within commoners. It helps scholars understand how places and imaginaries are constituted through struggles over hegemony (Savini, 2023) and provides insight into how people negotiate the contradictions of capitalism during everyday commoning (Vidal, 2019). Observing negotiations and alternatives within the commons highlights the realm of possibilities that lie beyond hegemony. Realizing the commons' potential ultimately hinges on the formation of commoner subjectivities.

Emma Jo Griffith, Department of Human Geography, Planning and International Development, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, University of Amsterdam, Nieuwe Achtergracht 166, 1018, Amsterdam, WV, Netherlands, e.j.griffith@uva.nl

Justus Uitermark, Department of Human Geography, Planning and International Development, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, University of Amsterdam, Nieuwe Achtergracht 166, 1018, Amsterdam, WV, Netherlands, J.L.Uitermark@uva.nl

References

- Brenner, N. and C. Schmid (2015) Towards a new epistemology of the urban? *City* 19.2/3, 151–82
- Butler, J. (1997) *The psychic life of power: theories in subjection*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
- Caffentzis, G. and S. Federici (2014) Commons against and beyond capitalism. *Community Development Journal*, 49 Issue suppl_1, i92–i105.
- De Angelis, D. M. (2017) *Omnia sunt communia: on the commons and the transformation to postcapitalism*. Zed Books Ltd, London.
- Dorries, H. (2023) Indigenous urbanism as an analytic: towards Indigenous urban theory. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 47.1, 110–18.
- Eizenberg, E. (2012) Actually existing commons: three moments of space of community gardens in New York City. *Antipode* 44.3, 764–82.
- Feinberg, A., A. Ghorbani and P. Herder (2021) Diversity and challenges of the urban commons. *International Journal of the Commons* 15.1, 1–20.
- Fernández Arrigoitia, M., M. Ferreri, J. Hudson, K. Scanlon and K. West (2023) Toward a feminist housing commons? Conceptualising care-(as)-work in collaborative housing. *Housing, Theory and Society* 40.5, 660–78.
- Fiorito, T. R. (2019) Beyond the dreamers: collective identity and subjectivity in the undocumented youth movement. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 24.3, 345–63.
- Forsyth, T. and C. Johnson (2014) Elinor Ostrom's legacy: governing the commons, and the rational choice controversy. *Development and Change* 45.5, 1093–110.
- García-López, G. A., I. Velicu and G. D'Alisa (2017) Performing counter-hegemonic common(s) senses: rearticulating democracy, community and forests in Puerto Rico. *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 28.3, 88–107.
- García-López, G. A., U. Lang and N. Singh (2021) Commons, commoning and co-becoming: nurturing life-in-common and post-capitalist futures. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 4.4, 1199–216.
- Gidwani, V. and A. Baviskar (2011) Urban commons. *Economic and Political Weekly* 46.50, 42–43.
- Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the prison notebooks*. Edited and Translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, Lawrence and Wishart, London.
- Hall, S. (1986) The problem of ideology—Marxism without guarantees. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10.2., 28–44.
- Hodkinson, S. N. (2012) The return of the housing question. *Ephemera: theory & politics in organization* 12.4, 423–44.
- Huron, A. (2015) Working with strangers in saturated space: reclaiming and maintaining the urban commons. *Antipode* 47.4, 963–79.
- Huron, A. (2017) Theorising the urban commons: new thoughts, tensions and paths forward. *Urban Studies* 54.4, 1062–69.
- Johnson, M. (2021) Creole becoming and the commons: Black freedom in Belize. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 4.4, 1217–31.
- Kadir, N. (2016) *The autonomous life? Paradoxes of hierarchy and authority in the squatters movement in Amsterdam*. Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Karaliotas, L. (2017) Staging equality in Greek squares: hybrid spaces of political subjectification. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 41.1, 54–69.
- Kip, M., M. Bieniok, M. Dellenbaugh, A. K. Müller and M. Schwegmann (2015) *Urban commons: moving beyond state and market*. Volume 154 in the series Bauwelt Fundamente. Birkhäuser, Switzerland.
- Martínez, M. A. (2020) Urban commons from an anti-capitalist approach. *Partecipazione e Conflitto* 13.3, 1390–410.
- Mattei, U. (2012) First thoughts for a phenomenology of the commons. In D. Bollier and S. Helfrich (eds.), *The wealth of the commons: a world beyond market and state*, Levellers Press, Amherst, MA.
- Nightingale, A. (2019) Commoning for inclusion? Commons, exclusion, property and socio-natural becomings. *International Journal of the Commons* 13.1, 16–35.
- Noterman, E. (2016) Beyond tragedy: differential commoning in a manufactured housing cooperative. *Antipode* 48.2, 433–52.
- Pasquinelli, M. and M. J. Dieter (2008) *Animal spirits: a bestiary of the commons*. NAi Publishers, Rotterdam.
- Peet, R. (2002) Ideology, discourse, and the geography of hegemony: from socialist to neoliberal development in postapartheid South Africa. *Antipode* 34.1, 54–84.
- Petherbridge, D. (2016) What's critical about vulnerability? Rethinking interdependence, recognition, and power. *Hypatia* 31.3, 589–604.
- Qian, J. and N. An (2021) Urban theory between political economy and everyday urbanism: desiring machine and power in a saga of urbanization. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 45.4, 679–95.

- Read, J. (2011) The production of subjectivity: from transindividuality to the commons. *New Formations* 70.70, 113–31.
- Rossi, U. and T. Enright (2016) Ambivalenza dei commons [Ambivalences of the commons]. In Aa. Vv. (eds.), *Commons/Comune, Memorie Geografiche*, Società di studi geografici, NS.14.
- Savini, F. (2023) Maintaining autonomy: urban degrowth and the commoning of housing. *Urban Studies* 60.7, 1231–48.
- Spivak, G.C. (1988) Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture*, MacMillan, London.
- Suchet-Pearson, S., S. Wright, K. Lloyd and L. Burarrwanga, on behalf of Bawaka Country (2013) Caring as country: towards an ontology of co-becoming in natural resource management. *Asia pacific viewpoint* 54.2, 185–97.
- Singh, N. (2017) Becoming a commoner: the commons as sites for affective socio-nature encounters and co-becomings. *Ephemeris: theory & politics in organization* 17.4, 751–76.
- Tummers, L. and S. MacGregor (2019) Beyond wishful thinking: a FPE perspective on commoning, care, and the promise of co-housing. *International Journal of the Commons* 13.1, 62–83.
- Tynan, L. (2021) What is relationality? Indigenous knowledges, practices and responsibilities with kin. *Cultural geographies* 28.4, 597–610.
- Velicu, I. and G. García-López (2018) Thinking the commons through Ostrom and Butler: boundedness and vulnerability. *Theory, Culture & Society* 35.6, 55–73.
- Vestbro, D. U. (2012) Saving by sharing—collective housing for sustainable lifestyles in the Swedish context. Presented at the 3rd International Conference on Degrowth for Ecological Sustainability and Social Equity, 19–23 September 2012, Venice.
- Vidal, L. (2019) Cooperative islands in capitalist waters: limited-equity housing cooperatives, urban renewal and gentrification. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 43.1, 157–78.
- Watts, V. (2013) Indigenous place—thought and agency amongst humans and non-humans (First woman and sky woman go on a European world tour!). *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 2.1, 20–34.
- Williams, M. J. (2018) Urban commons are more-than-property. *Geographical Research* 56.1, 16–25.