

Community

MIRKO NIKOLIĆ AND SAM SKINNER

ABSTRACT: This essay discusses notions of community, commoning, and assemblage, in conjunction with new materialist and posthumanist onto-epistemologies and ethico-politics. The analysis is situated within, and applied to, current debates in ecological and community-oriented art, curating, and activism. The essay concludes with an articulation of what a “community of material-discursive commoning” may be constituted by, through, and with.

KEY WORDS: ecological art/curating, (the) common(s), more-than-human community

How might the notion of community be rethought in a more-than-human world?¹ After all, the concept of community has continually evolved, traversing place, ethnicity, morality, symbolism, and communication, so can we expand it further, otherwise, beyond the human, from weather systems to the molecular—reassembling it into a more open, distributed, or nomadic form? In a moment when individual agency is both intensified and dispersed by digital media, and new forms of inclusion and exclusion emerge, enwrapped within increasingly volatile climatic phenomena, the question of collective agency becomes all the more crucial and radically transformed.

In modern terms, community is tied to social presence, gathering, talking, negotiation, and finding ways to get along, in other words, to logocentric discursivity. Feminist new materialism and posthumanism raise an injunction that what is usually considered as humanities—and here we include the arts—should actively take up the problem of how to account for those beings that are not usually considered part of the social. This is one of the crucial imports of a new materialist alternative to representationalism, understood as a set of practices that operate in dualistic terms, splitting culture from nature, mind from body, discourse from matter. Concurrently, a reworked understanding of agency is loosened from the

humanist realm into a field of “material agency.”² Thinking in terms of hybrids, “nature-cultures,” and multispecies entanglements affords an opportunity to creatively rework the boundaries and co-constituted character of community-oriented practices. In this essay we explore a more-than-human sense of community in relation to recent theories of commoning, ecological methodologies, and socially-engaged art and curation (our particular field of practice), amongst others modes of “doing community.” We cannot though assume that human and extra-human bodies are already gathered in biotic communities, assemblages, or ecosystems from the outset. Instead a materialist notion of community offers a means to attend to the very effects of gathering or not gathering, to account for the “marks on bodies” left in the process,³ and in turn how a more-than-human community may become or unfold. Additionally, we need to ask: whose marks, whose bodies, and whose arts?⁴

However, being a “mass noun”—something which cannot be counted—community resists easy measurement of its inscriptions and marks, and remains in a continual process of becoming. Similarly, “the commons,” which we discuss later, is a general term for shared resources where stakeholders possess a joint interest, but commoning is itself a verb that foregrounds aspects of participation and care-taking. These declinations, between substantive and verb, are not merely binaries between object and process, but rather point at dynamic tensions in these terms, which disclose their productive in/determinacy that may help situate them in a nature-culture/quantum dynamic. In this context, community needs to be figured performatively, as an action, or in new materialist terms, an “intra-activity” that works through and between different materialities and spatio-temporalities.

Historically the use, re-use, and abuse even, of the word “community” has been at times fraught and problematic. As Eric Hobsbawm wrote: “Never was the word ‘community’ used more indiscriminately and emptily than in the decades when communities in the sociological sense became hard to find in real life.”⁵ Thus, at the outset, it is important to question how unifying and useful community as a praxis or term really is or might be and what else could it mean or enact.

The singular (*unus*) togetherness (*com*) of community has historically been used in academic discourse in a variety of ways, as Gerard Delanty writes:

For sociologists community has traditionally designated a particular form of social organisation based on small groups, such as neighbourhoods, the small town or a spatially-bounded locality. Anthropologists have applied it to culturally-defined groups, such as minorities. In other usages, community refers to political community, where the emphasis is on citizenship, self-government, civil society and collective identity. Philosophical and historical studies have focused more on the idea of community as an ideology or utopia.⁶

More recently, works including Anthony Cohen’s *The Symbolic Structure of Community* and Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* interpret community

as a symbolic structure, defined by a concern for meaning and identity.⁷ Whilst Roberto Esposito's term *communitas* emphasises community as an action (albeit an anthropocentric one), rather than a noun, and an incomplete and impossible one at that—defined by difference and continual becoming, as opposed to equivalency: “This is the very object of the law of community: this nothing-in-common cannot be destroyed, reduced to a simple nothing as Hobbes wanted, since nothing-in-common precedes and encompasses every attempt at its own destruction. . . . [T]he limit cannot be erased nor can one cross it.”⁸

Foregrounding matter's entanglement with community challenges binary or dualistic notions of community that emphasise a conception of community as self versus other. This conception also seeks to extend the work of posthuman/ist and new materialist ethico-politics of difference to notions of community.⁹ And in relation to our own practice, as artists and curators, fruitful lines of thought emerge when diffracting new materialism with notions of community.

* * *

Art practice in a new materialist key finds a kindred spirit in the fields of community and so-called “useful” art, and we see contained therein a seed and ability to expand the sense of what constitutes a community. Useful and community arts both seek to empower an expanded sense of belonging or engagement. Like feminism's emphasis on processes of marginalisation, exclusion, and minorities, traditional community art's prioritisation and development of participatory practice contains the potential to evolve and connect strongly to new materialism's thickened sense of the entangled agencies of the world. Affinities can be found for example with “Arte Útil” as developed by the artist Tania Bruguera, which “aims to transform some aspects of society through the implementation of art, transcending symbolic representation or metaphor and proposing with their activity some solutions for deficits in reality.”¹⁰ Additionally, Stephen Wright's concept of useful art working at 1:1 scale is relevant, where “art and art-related practices that are oriented toward user-ship rather than spectatorship are characterised more than anything else by their scale of operations: they operate on the 1:1 scale.”¹¹ We might add that community art, of a “more-than-human sociality” as proposed by Anna Tsing,¹² by necessity operates at a 1:1 performative scale because representationalism is a dualist epistemology at odds with a multi- or interspecies methodology. Curation too, understood as an action of a subject organising objects and processes, can become reimaged when rethought of as an “intra-action” with lively materialities,¹³ or what we might term *material communities*.

In a discussion of the politics of contemporary art practice, Claire Bishop suggests that “artists have internalised a huge amount of pressure to bear the burden of devising new models of social and political organisation—a task that they are

not always best equipped to undertake,¹⁴ but can this tension be affirmative in an expanded field of more-than-human sociality? We propose that a meaningful response lies in a transversal dialogue between certain agonistic practices promoted by Bishop (indebted to Chantal Mouffe) that resist easy instrumentalisation, alongside an unapologetic advocacy of art as a viable and critical tool of social amelioration, albeit averse to processes of “value extraction,”¹⁵ as chronicled in the writing of Grant Kester for example,¹⁶ in combination with the Spinozist spirit of affirmation in Rosi Braidotti’s feminist philosophy of difference.¹⁷ Furthermore, this affirmative approach can couple with a decentred and expanded understanding of place and material agency, responding to the ethical imperatives that a new materialist epistemology and ontology engenders, and find kinship with Braidotti’s articulation of posthumanist subjectivity which is immersed in:

An eco-philosophy of multiple belongings, as a relational subject constituted in and by multiplicity, that is to say a subject that works across differences and is also internally differentiated, but still grounded and accountable. Posthuman subjectivity expresses an embodied and embedded and hence partial form of accountability, based on a strong sense of collectivity, relationality and hence community building.¹⁸

In terms of post-anthropocentric ideas, a number of recent art productions and curatorial projects draw upon Object-Oriented Ontology.¹⁹ However, in the context of art, where objects have always garnered special attention, there is a risk of re-commodifying and reifying artworks, performing an ontological flattening that does not reconfigure dualistic models of thought, or build new communities, but merely reshuffles the power relation from the subject to the object side, and with somewhat less traction. On the other hand, recent new materialist elaborations challenge the modernist core of artistic and curatorial methodologies and seek to move beyond binaries.²⁰ It is however worth noting that almost all work discussed in the new materialism and arts reader *Carnal Knowledge* was produced primarily in the studio,²¹ ignoring many transdisciplinary and community-engaged practices, which clearly indicates a need to transgress the limitations of simply a new materialist interpretation or rebranding of old forms.²² Materiality in art has historically played a crucial role, and we should create dialogue with this tradition, while asking, how can art practice and curating in a new materialist key enact a less object-oriented, and more hospitable sociality? How then might curating act within a broader nexus of the material community, and how may this be constituted and imagined?

Let us now turn to the notion of “(the) common(s),” which together with its verb “commoning,” may bring us closer to thinking community in a more-than-human manifold. This ancient word has often been translated into contemporary parlance as referring to a “public good,” influenced by among others, one of the founders of the English group the True Levellers, later the Diggers, Gerrard Winstanley, and

his claim that Earth is a “common treasury for all.”²³ This specific meaning has in more recent times waned, as exemplified by Garrett Hardin’s Neomalthusian notion of the “tragedy of the commons”²⁴ forging links between human population growth and the use of the earth’s natural resources. Over the last decade, however, and especially in the wake of the 2008 financial meltdown, and subsequent Occupy movements, a consistent stream of thinkers and political activists has placed commoning at the centre of a post-capitalist political agenda.²⁵ This surge in attention has intensified in response to a wave of appropriations and exclusions operated over recent decades under the guise of globalisation and consequential rising inequality.

Of particular relevance to our discussion is how the common(s) has brought to the fore the material substratum of community, the material environment, without which there can be no relations in the first place. In Michael Hardt’s and Antonio Negri’s post-Autonomist formulation:

Whereas the traditional notion poses the common as a natural world outside of society, the biopolitical conception of the common permeates equally all spheres of life, referring not only to the earth, the air, the elements, or even plant and animal life but also to the constitutive elements of human society, such as common languages, habits, gestures, affects, codes, and so forth.²⁶

Hardt and Negri’s reading of “the common” opens it up towards a politics of natural-cultural problematics and affordances. However, it should be noted that their analysis focuses almost exclusively on (human) agentiality, rather than on multispecies collaboration. In a critical response to Hardt and Negri’s commons, Miriam Tola proposed a productive conjunction of post-autonomist commons with ecological feminism and feminist posthumanism to envisage “commoning with/in the earth.”²⁷ We may add to that how Ash Amin and Philip Howell emphasise “[m]oving beyond . . . an anthropocentric understanding of the common . . . is surely a priority if we are to do any justice to the demands of our ‘common’ environmental crisis.”²⁸ Gibson-Graham, Cameron, and Healy propose the notion of “commoning-community,” thus conjoining different traditions and envisioning a material-discursive entanglement of practices that involves extra-human agencies.²⁹ These recent reconfigurations also decisively break away from the modern tradition of thinking of the commons as resource.

With these developments in mind, and contrary to a political economic understanding which sees the two terms as separate (commoners/community as subject and common as object), in a flattened onto-epistemology they are bound in the same movement and cannot be thought of separately. In this sense, biopolitical analyses of community are given new light. For example, Jean-Luc Nancy’s analysis of community in terms of “being-with” (*cum*)³⁰ and Roberto Esposito’s emphasis on *munus* (“law” or “gift”),³¹ are brought forwards; being-with as a more bodily, and law/gift as a more discursive topological manifold of what we describe as: a *community of material-*

discursive commoning, to transpose Karen Barad's notion of "material-discursive entanglement."³² From this position we can tackle also one of the thorny aspects of community that sits uneasily with an ethics of difference—community's traditional grounding in some form of identity. Through a conceptualisation of a more-than-human "commoning-community," following Silvia Federici, community ceases to be

[a] gated reality, a grouping of people joined by exclusive interests separating them from others, as with communities formed on the basis of religion or ethnicity, but rather as a quality of relations, a principle of cooperation and of responsibility to each other and to the earth, the forests, the seas, the animals.³³

Without circumscribing community and commons to definite subjects or objects, it is important to see them as immediately transversal processes of collective becoming. Here, the shared fragility, even debility, of the commons is crucial: "commons is invisible until it is lost"³⁴ either through privatisation or destruction (e.g., forest-cutting). This emphasis on seeing is not only a metaphor here, but refers to (re)learning "noticing the worlds [earth others] make"³⁵ and is, we would argue, one of the prerequisites of a more-than-human commoning-community, that is, connecting with world-making projects that already act in a specific place and bring forth new worlds in common. Here we can point at the potential significance of curatorial and art practices within this milieu. One is "always already" in a material community; thus the art and curation of commoning-communities concern themselves with performances of maintenance and reproduction before and beyond the paradigm of production.

To notice is to account for and become responsible to what is here, to a "commoning-community" in action, and how "we" are differentially emplaced within and against these agencies. Reproduction, as feminist critiques of political economy have articulated, is the ground of accumulation³⁶ and from an affirmative standpoint it also becomes the primary stratum of a feminist politics of commons. Commoning is about beginning from elsewhere, from a location that is not, however, determined once and for all. As Adrienne Rich in "Notes toward a Politics of Location" writes, "[b]egin, though, not with a continent or a country or a house, but with the geography closest in—the body."³⁷ In a similar way, and from a related tradition, Stefano Harney and Fred Moten envisage "undercommons" as the "surround" of the politics of the "fort": "the common beyond and beneath—before and before—enclosure. The surround antagonises the laager in its midst."³⁸ It is what Gilles Deleuze might have had in mind when, in commentary on Michel Foucault, he stated: "resistance comes first."³⁹ Commons then is before, and beyond, disciplinary and controlling power over the enclosure, and is constantly negotiated—it is the fence as well as the field. Rich reveals this process of collective and individual becoming, as an iterative entanglement of "[the] difficulty of saying I"⁴⁰ and the necessity to ask, "[o]nce again: Who is we?"⁴¹

* * *

In an attempt to address this question and to continue our feminist new materialist elaboration of community, we now turn to the ecological sciences' use of the terms community and assemblage. According to one of the more established definitions in eco-science, community is "an assemblage of populations of plants, animals, bacteria and fungi that live in an environment and interact with one another."⁴² Thus it stands for a number of *different species* living in a given area. Importantly, it is deemed impossible to make a full census of all the species that shape a community; rather communities are discussed in terms of "species richness," which is barely an estimate, rather a cut determined by the scientific apparatus and acknowledging an irreducible complexity. Much of the relational, co-constituted, and what we might call *excessive* character of any subject, or community, under observation must necessarily be ignored to enable a useable measurement to be produced. Furthermore, ecological community involves numerous different relations, including predation, parasitism, herbivory, and competition for example. In this sense, community is not a harmonious unity, but an immeasurable and complex relational field of many bodies sharing a given territory, whereby competition and predation are only some of the relations, while others, equally if not even more important ones, are relations of what Lynn Margulis calls "endosymbiosis," and Donna Haraway's multispecies "sympoiesis."⁴³ In the mid-1900s the environmentalist Aldo Leopold grounded his vision of a "land ethic" precisely in "biotic community"—an ethical community which involves both humans *and* other species.⁴⁴

Closely related to community is assemblage, a term used in both eco-science and new materialism. Eco-science defines assemblage as "[p]hylogenetically related groups within a community,"⁴⁵ designating a taxonomical subset of a given community. Assemblage in new materialist register is affiliated to its theorisation by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, who, in turn, borrowed it from Spinoza. Anna Tsing, drawing on both traditions, provides a fully performative understanding of the term: "Assemblages are open-ended gatherings. They allow us to ask about communal effects without assuming them. They show us potential histories in the making."⁴⁶ "Open-endedness" and "in the making" highlight the malleability of the boundaries of assemblage and multiple orientations that are either enacted or rendered possible, and link to Esposito's sense of the irreducibility of community. Assemblages do not have a linear mode of expression or causality; they are "polyphonic"⁴⁷ milieus of expression. This characteristic of assemblage points at a distinct characteristic of material community; assemblage elements generate something "other" than themselves, and each element is also something "other" than the assemblage. Instead of a functional or formalised organisation, what emerges are "patterns of unintentional coordination,"⁴⁸ collective expressions not

under control of any given agency, rather determined through differential participations and autonomies of various agencies. These subjective or unintentional polyphonic expressions are “communal effects.”⁴⁹

A way of figuring participation in this community is provided by Spinoza’s “common notions,” one of the two types of “adequate” knowledge laid out in his *Ethics*. According to Deleuze’s interpretation: a “common notion is *the representation* of a composition between two or more bodies, and *a unity of this composition*. . . . [I]t expresses the relations of agreement and composition between existing bodies.”⁵⁰ Representation and materiality are joined (“a unity”) in “something common.”⁵¹ In Spinoza’s monism, “the mind is the idea of the body, making the body necessarily the object of the mind”;⁵² therefore “forming common notions” is the process of entanglement of matter and meaning. Common notions in Spinoza move the body from passive into active modes, intensifications of a body through “understanding,” which is, following the above, always in common. Spinozist “joy” thus springs from this being-in-common, or rather, becoming-in-common. This material-discursive entanglement that we find in Spinoza is radically materialist and goes beyond humanist uses. In fact, as Rick Dolphijn argues, only some communal “understandings” involve humans.⁵³ In a new materialist key, from Spinoza to Haraway and Barad, commoning is *worlding*—*mattering* at large, a specific type of dynamics of differentiation, collectively enacted in an open-ended and polyphonic material community.

This conception relates to Karen Barad’s radically immanent/relational notion of “intra-action,” according to which “‘things’ don’t pre-exist; they are agentially enacted and become determinately bounded and propertied within phenomena.”⁵⁴ The sense of “intra-action” implies that bodies are not determined in advance but co-constituted through entanglements. However, we need a qualification here: in agential realism, the emergence of meaning is tied to the notion of “agential cut,” and certain agencies “come to matter” through “boundary-making practices.”⁵⁵ From a commoning-community perspective, this notion of “boundary-making” upon which the emergence of meaning is predicated runs a risk of remaking a logocentric understanding of participation. Rather than “inclusions” and “exclusions,” materialist community has to do more with “participation.” As a historian of commons Peter Linebaugh recently wrote: “Commoning is exclusive inasmuch as it requires participation. It must be entered into. . . . This is why we speak neither of rights nor obligations separately.”⁵⁶

Ecological, queer, and feminist ethics of care, hospitality, and openness are modes of thinking enactments of commoning-community participation. To reiterate, feminist commons are “a quality of relations, a principle of cooperation and of responsibility to each other and to the earth, the forests, the seas, the animals,”⁵⁷ to a multitude of “earth others” beyond the specific site.

In Barad’s description, “[i]ntra-actions always entail particular exclusions, and exclusions foreclose the possibility of determinism, providing the condition of an

open future,”⁵⁸ what might come to matter through future iterative intra-activity. In communal terms, the exclusions cannot wait for the future; *they are always already here*, co-constituting the *community*, the very possibility of *this* material reality; “*what[/who] doesn’t matter,*” *these are the ones that embody/know the past, the present, the future.*⁵⁹ They are Harney and Moten’s “undercommons,” the “before” and “after,” and, precisely, the *under* of any agential cut. The “hidden abode” of mattering, to paraphrase Marx. The undercommons, the infracommunities, they “surround” community understood as discursive practice that operates boundaries. Relations of cooperation and responsibility are forged and maintained through practices that might not ever even come to matter, through minoritarian/molecular dispositions and orientations.⁶⁰ Community always has a hole at its heart or in its boundaries, it is both more and less than the sum of its parts, and does not need to “come”: “one day, which is only never to come, we will be more than what we are. But we already are. We’re already here, moving. We’ve been around. We’re more than politics, more than settled, more than democratic.”⁶¹

A new materialist reading of commoning-community discloses a minoritarian power of generosity, hospitality, openness, resistance, and complexity that operates within the realm of agential cuts and within open commons and modes of mutualistic commoning. For philosophy and art with an *ethos* of belonging to a more-than-human world, the question is less about composing a “community to come” than about taking care for, *and* being taken care of, by “anotherness,” which was always already there.⁶² These practices should not remain principally within the institutional contexts of academia and art, as open as they might appear, but rather must begin to divest, refunction, and spill back into the realm of “the reproduction of everyday life”⁶³ curated with, for, and enjoyed by women, men, non-binary humans, vegetal, animal, and mineral earth others. With Hardt and Negri, “it is difficult to see the common, even though it is all around us.”⁶⁴ In a more-than-human world, the common is difficult to “see” (at a distance, as in Haraway’s critique of the “persistence of vision” as the mark of objectivity⁶⁵) because it is so profoundly *of* us and “we” are *of* “it”/“them.” The always reassembled “we” simply cannot *not* partake in material-discursive commoning-community; the question is rather that of orientation and ecology, of the degree of entanglement, or in feminist studies terms, of “ac/countability”⁶⁶ and “response-ability.”⁶⁷ There is no distance between a subject and multispecies in/organic commoning-community; there are only patterns of care and their un/making.

Linköping University (mirko nikolić)

and

Manchester Metropolitan University (Sam Skinner)

NOTES

1. This text started from and builds upon a workshop we curated in the framework of the New Materialism Training School in May 2016, at Tate Modern, London. The workshop was an open-air exercise that began with an instruction to meet outside the main Tate Modern building, followed by a walk at low tide along the shore of the river Thames, and finally across Millennium Bridge to the gardens of St. Paul's Cathedral. Each participant was asked to narrate a specific encounter with an "earth other" (Plumwood, *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*) and to somehow "invite" them into an experimental community-making process; these ranged from bones and driftwood to the river itself. In a community exercise on the lawn of St. Paul's (near where Occupy London had gathered between October 2011 and June 2012) the participants challenged verbal and material modes of speaking with and for those that "cannot speak for themselves," sensing and performing the "can't, yet must" imperative of more-than-human representation (Neimanis 2015).
2. Pickering, *The Mangle of Practice*. Karen Barad's agential realism provides another theory of posthumanist agency. For a critical review of various positions, see, Coole, "Agentic Capacities and Capacious Historical Materialism." See also Felicity J. Colman's entry on "Agency" in Gauthier and Skinner, *New Materialism Almanac*.
3. Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway*, 38.
4. Here we re-iterate Sandra Harding's important formulation of the feminist standpoint theory, encapsulated in the title of her book *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?*
5. Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes*, 428.
6. Delanty, *Community*, 10.
7. Cohen, *The Symbolic Construction of Community*; Anderson, *Imagined Communities*.
8. Esposito, *Communitas*, 77.
9. Rick Dolphijn and Iris van der Tuin write that "a new conceptualisation of difference" is one of the key aspects of "the methodology of the current-day rise of non-dualist thought." Dolphijn and Van der Tuin, *New Materialism*, 86.
10. Bruguera, "Glossary."
11. Wright, *Toward a Lexicon of Usership*, 3.
12. Tsing, "More-than-Human Sociality."
13. "Intra-action" is Karen Barad's model of posthuman/ist causality; "relata do not pre-exist relations; rather, relata-within-phenomena emerge through specific intra-actions." Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway*, 140.
14. Bishop, *Artificial Hells*, xii.
15. Mazzucato, *The Value of Everything*.
16. Kester, *Conversation Pieces*.
17. Braidotti, *The Posthuman*.
18. *Ibid.*, 49.
19. For some exhibitions that were inspired by Object-Oriented Ontology and/or Speculative Realism (SR), as affirmed in curatorial or artist statements, see *And Another Thing* (2011), dOCUMENTA(13) (2012) *Resonance And Repetition* (2012), *Things Matter* (2013), and *The Return of the Object* (2013), as well as a trio of shows curated by Susanne Pfeffer at Frediricianum: *Speculations on Anonymous Materials* (2013), *nature after nature* (2014), *Geographies of Contamination* (2014).

20. Kontturi et al., "Aesthetic intra-actions."
21. Barrett and Bolt, *Carnal Knowledge*.
22. Testimony of the liveliness of this question can be seen in a number of different positions regarding the import of recent new realisms (OOO and SR) and new materialism assembled in Emily Apter et al., "A Questionnaire on Materialisms: 41 Responses."
23. Gurney, *Brave Community*.
24. Hardin, "The Tragedy of the Common."
25. See: Hardt and Negri, *Commonwealth*; Linebaugh, *The Magna Carta Manifesto*; Linebaugh, *Stop Thief!* The full extent of discourse that evolved around the issue in the context of social struggles is impossible to survey here; as illustrative examples, see Hardt and Negri's 2012 *Declaration*, and the online journal *The Commoner* (2001–2012). Also, see projects and publications produced by Casco Art Institute: Working for the Commons. <https://casco.art>.
26. Hardt and Negri, *Commonwealth*, 172.
27. Tola, "Commoning With/in the Earth."
28. Amin and Howell, "Thinking the Commons," 9.
29. Gibson-Graham, Cameron, and Healy, "Commoning as a Postcapitalist Politics," 2.
30. Nancy, *The Inoperative Community*.
31. Esposito, *Communitas*.
32. Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway*.
33. Federici, "Feminism and the Politics of the Commons."
34. Linebaugh, *Stop Thief!*, 14.
35. Tsing, *The Mushroom at the End of the World*, 162.
36. See in particular work of Italian autonomist feminists Mariarosa Dalla Costa, Leopoldina Fortunati and Silvia Federici.
37. Rich, "Notes Towards a Politics of Location," 369.
38. Harney and Moten, *The Undercommons*, 17.
39. Deleuze, *Foucault*, 89.
40. Rich, "Notes Towards a Politics of Location," 378.
41. *Ibid.*, 384.
42. Robert Whittaker, quoted in Peter J. Morin, *Community Ecology*, 4.
43. Haraway, *Staying with the Trouble*.
44. Leopold, *Sand County Almanac*.
45. Fauth, et al., "Simplifying the Jargon of Community Ecology," 284.
46. Tsing, *The Mushroom at the End of the World*, 22.
47. *Ibid.*, 23.
48. De Landa, *Intensive Science & Virtual Philosophy*, 64.
49. Tsing, *The Mushroom at the End of the World*, 23.
50. Deleuze, *Spinoza*, 54. Our emphasis.
51. Deleuze, *Expressionism in Philosophy*, 280.
52. Dolphijn and Van Der Tuin, *New Materialism*, 94.
53. Dolphijn, "To Realize the Commons."
54. Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway*, 150.
55. *Ibid.*, 139–40.
56. Linebaugh, *Stop Thief!*, 15.

57. Federici, "Feminism And the Politics of the Commons."
58. Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway*, 234.
59. nikolić, "all that is air melts into city," 494.
60. Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*.
61. Harney and Moten, *The Undercommons*, 19.
62. Dolphijn, "The Revelation of a World that was Always Already There," 196.
63. Federici, "Feminism and the Politics of the Commons." Also, Preciado, "Baroque Technopatriarchy."
64. Hardt and Negri, *Commonwealth*, viii.
65. Haraway, "Situated Knowledges."
66. Barad, "Nature's Queer Performativity," 46–47.
67. Schrader, "Responding to *Pfiesteria piscicida*."

REFERENCES

- Amin, Ash, and Philip Howell. "Thinking the Commons." In *Releasing the Commons: Rethinking the Futures of the Commons*, edited by Ash Amin and Philip Howell. London: Routledge, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315673172>
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006.
- Apter, Emily, Ed Atkins, Armen Avanesian, Bill Brown, Giuliana Bruno, Julia Bryan-Wilson, D. Graham Burnett, Mel Y. Chen, Andrew Cole, Christoph Cox, Suhail Malik, T. J. Demos, Jeff Dolven, David T. Doris, Helmut Draxler, Patricia Falguières, Peter Galison, Alexander R. Galloway, Rachel Haidu, Graham Harman, Camille Henrot, Brooke Holmes, Tim Ingold, Caroline A. Jones, Alex Kitnick, Sam Lewitt, Helen Molesworth, Alexander Nemerov, Michael Newman, Spyros Papapetros, Susanne Pfeffer, Gregor Quack, Charles Ray, Matthew Ritchie, André Rottmann, Amie Siegel, Kerstin Stakemeier, Artie Vierkant, McKenzie Wark, Eyal Weizman, Christopher S. Wood, and Zhang Ga. "A Questionnaire on Materialisms: 41 Responses." *October* 155 (Winter 2016): 3–110. https://doi.org/10.1162/OCTO_a_00243
- Barad, Karen. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822388128>
- Barad, Karen. "Nature's Queer Performativity." *Kvinder, Køn & Forskning* 1–2 (2012): 25–53. <https://doi.org/10.7146/kkf.v0i1-2.28067>
- Barrett, Estelle, and Barbara Bolt, eds. *Carnal Knowledge: Towards a 'New Materialism' through the Arts*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9780755603435>
- Bishop, Claire. *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso Books, 2012.
- Braidotti, Rosi. *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity, 2013.
- Bruguera, Tania. "Glossary." Artist website, 2011. <http://www.taniabruguera.com/cms/609-0-.htm>.

- Cohen, Antony P. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Routledge, 1985. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203323373>
- Colman, Felicity J. "Agency." In *New Materialism Almanac*, edited by Sam Skinner and David Gauthier. <http://newmaterialism.eu/almanac/a/agency>, 2018.
- Coole, Diana. "Agentic Capacities and Capacious Historical Materialism: Thinking with New Materialisms in the Political Sciences." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 41(3) (2013): 451–69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829813481006>
- De Landa, Manuel. *Intensive Science & Virtual Philosophy*. London: Continuum, 2002.
- Delanty, Gerard. *Community*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza*. Translated by Martin Joughin. New York: Zone Books, 1990.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Foucault*. Translated by Seán Hand. London: Athlone Press, 1988.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy*. Translated by Robert Hurley. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1988.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.
- Dolphijn, Rick. "The Revelation of a World that was Always Already There: The Creative Act as an Occupation." In *This Deleuzian Century: Art, Activism, Life*, edited by Rosi Braidotti and Rick Dolphijn, 185–205. Leiden: Brill, 2015. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401211987_009
- Dolphijn, Rick. "To Realize the Commons." *Open! Platform for Art, Culture & Public Domain* (2016). <http://www.onlineopen.org/to-realize-the-commons>.
- Dolphijn, Rick, and Iris van der Tuin. *New Materialism: Interviews and Cartographies*. Ann Arbor, MI: Open Humanities Press, 2010.
- Esposito, Roberto. *Communitas: The Origin and Destiny of Community*. Translated by Timothy C. Campbell. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009.
- Fauth, J. E., J. Bernardo, M. Camara, W. J. Resetarits Jr, J. Van Buskirk, and S. A. McCol-lum. "Simplifying the Jargon of Community Ecology: A Conceptual Approach." *The American Naturalist* 147(2) (February 1996): 282–86. <https://doi.org/10.1086/285850>
- Federici, Silvia. "Feminism and the Politics of the Commons." In *Uses of a WorldWind: Movement, Movements, and Contemporary Radical Currents in the United States*, edited by Craig Hughes, Stevie Peace, and Kevin Van Meter. Oakland: AK Press, 2010. <http://www.commoner.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/federici-feminism-and-the-politics-of-commons.pdf>.
- Gauthier, David and Sam Skinner, eds. *New Materialism Almanac* (2016–2018). www.newmaterialism.eu.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K., Jenny Cameron, and Stephen Healy. "Commoning as a Postcapitalist Politics." In *Releasing the Commons: Rethinking the Futures of the Commons*, edited by Ash Amin and Philip Howell, 192–212. London: Routledge, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315673172-12>
- Gurney, John. *Brave Community: The Digger Movement in the English Revolution*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.7228/manchester/9780719061028.001.0001>

- Haraway, Donna. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14(3) (1988): 575–99. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066>
- Haraway, Donna. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822373780>
- Hardin, Garrett. "The Tragedy of the Common." *Science* 162(3859) (December 13, 1968): 1243–48. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.162.3859.1243>
- Harding, Sandra. *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking from Women's Lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjsf48h>
- Harney, Stefano, and Fred Moten. *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study*. Wivenhoe, NY: Minor Compositions, 2013.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991*. London: Michael Joseph, 1995.
- Kester, Grant H. *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art*. London: University of California Press, 2004.
- Kontturi, Katve-Kaisa, Milla Tiainen, Tero Nauha, and Marie-Luise Angerer, eds. "Aesthetic Intra-Actions: Practicing New Materialism in the Arts." *Ruukku* 9 (2018).
- Leopold, Aldo. *Sand County Almanac: And Sketches Here and There*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1949.
- Linebaugh, Peter. *The Magna Carta Manifesto: Liberties and Commons for All*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008.
- Linebaugh, Peter. *Stop Thief!: The Commons, Enclosures, and Resistance*. Oakland: PM Press, 2014.
- Mazzucato, Mariana. *The Value of Everything: Making and Taking in the Global Economy*. London: Penguin, 2019.
- Morin, Peter J. *Community Ecology*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444341966>
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Inoperative Community*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.
- Neimanis, Astrida. "No Representation without Colonisation? (Or, Nature Represents Itself)." *Somatechnic* 5(2) (2015): 135–53. <https://doi.org/10.3366/soma.2015.0158>
- nikolić, mirko. "all that is air melts into city. Minoritarian apparatuses for a more-than-human world." In *Research Methods in Environmental Law*, edited by Andreas Philippopoulos-Mihalopoulos and Victoria Brooks, 482–508. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781784712570.00029>
- Pickering, Andrew. *The Mangle of Practice: Time, Agency, and Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226668253.001.0001>
- Plumwood, Val. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Preciado, Paul B. "Baroque Technopatriarchy: Reproduction." *Artforum* 56(5) (January 2018). <https://www.artforum.com/print/201801/baroque-technopatriarchy-reproduction-73189>.

- Rich, Adrienne. "Notes Towards a Politics of Location," In *Essential Feminist Reader*, edited by Estelle B. Freedman, 367–84. New York: Random House, 2007. First published 1984.
- Schrader, Astrid. "Responding to *Pfiesteria piscicida* (the Fish Killer): Phantomatic Ontologies, Indeterminacy, and Responsibility in Toxic Microbiology." *Social Studies of Science* 40(2) (2010): 275–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306312709344902>
- Tola, Miria. "Commoning With/in the Earth: Hardt, Negri and Feminist Natures." *Theory & Event* 18(4) (2015).
- Tsing, Anna. "More-than-Human Sociality: A Call for Critical Description." In *Anthropology and Nature*, edited by Kirsten Hastrup, 27–42. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Tsing, Anna. *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400873548>
- Wright, Stephen. *Toward a Lexicon of Usership*. Eindhoven: Van Abbemuseum, 2013.