PIOTR JUSKOWIAK (ORCID: 0000-0003-1390-7368),
ŁUKASZ MOLL (ORCID: 0000-0002-2251-9351)

Communes and Other Mobile Commons

The article is the introduction to the special issue of *Theoretical Practice* which is dedicated to "the communes and other mobile commons". The editors of the issue explain how we could conceptualize various attempts to create communes in terms of mobile commons and mobile commoning. Since the exemplary case of the Paris Commune many social movements – urban, rural, indigenous, feminist, or migrant – experimented with communes as alternatives to state and capitalism and redefined in this way the meaning of spatial practices, work and the labor movement. Against the assumption that the commune is a necessary localized and sedentary political form, the authors who contributed to the special issue propose to grasp it from the perspective of subversive mobilities: as kinetic entities. The introduction presents the common ground on which these proposals meet each other and come into dialogue. Various models of mobile commons described here – communal, insurgent, liminal, temporary, latent, care, fugitive, maroon, black, indigenous, undercommons, uncommons, and many more – testify of a recent mobility turn in the theories of the commons.

Keywords: communes, mobile commons, subversive mobilities, commoning, Paris Commune

In reflecting on communes, we often encounter, not to say collide with, the seemingly contradictory question of the possibility of repetition, but also of transcending the experience of the Parisian communards. This challenge is particularly pertinent within the Marxist tradition, where each successive insurrection that ignites the political imagination – from the 1917 revolution to May 1968, the Zapatista uprising to the repeated occupations of public space in cities around the world since 2011 – is interpreted as a renewal of the energy that erupted in the spring of 1871 (see, for example, Lefebvre 1996; Harvey 2012; Merrifield 2011, 2013). Many of these interpretations are also imbued with the spirit of Paris: firstly, as a site for the production of high-quality theoretical knowledge; secondly, as a major capital city in the modern economy; and thirdly, as an arena for particular political events which are proving to be of a universal nature. Why is this the case, and is it worth fighting against these readings?

An important answer is provided here by none other than the communards themselves, especially if we think of them in the way Kristin Ross (2015) proposes, namely as a trans-geographical community stretching the values of the Paris Commune beyond the immediate place of struggle and its primary temporality. The one that postulated, but also practically realized, the basic principles of a universal republic, which was also advocated by Karl Marx, William Morris, and Peter Kropotkin, who were outside France at the time. The communards consciously rejected nationalism and state collectivism, undertaking instead a self-conscious experiment in being-in-common. They inaugurated this political exercise by, on the one hand, bringing together what had been separated by the urban redevelopment designed by Haussmann (Berman 1988) and, on the other, through developing a new formula for self-government, combined with the search for alternative modes of production to the capitalist mode. In the many voices of the direct and indirect participants in the events, we can hear in this context a resolute praise for cooperation, mutual aid, equality and solidarity, as well as a deep conviction of the collective nature of wealth, knowledge and culture. What was at stake, therefore, was a particular kind of 'insurgent universality' (Tomba 2019), which not only abhors all imperialism and separatism, but remains radically open to democratization and the inclusion of new participants (vide refugees, foreign rebels, artists, and, above all, women). In its aversion to traditional divisions – be they class, cultural, gender, or political – and physical constraints, it was also resolutely opposed to those forces that were responsible for their creation and instrumentalization. As such, it was the weapon of a popular upri-

sing against capital and the state, based on a revolutionary vision of belonging and the promise of absolute democracy. "Everywhere the word 'commune' was understood in the largest sense, as referring to a new humanity, made up of free and equal companions, oblivious to the existence of old boundaries, helping each other in peace from one end of the world to the other" (Reclus 1897, in Ross 2015: 5).

Everywhere the word 'commune' was understood in the largest sense, as referring to a new humanity, made up of free and equal companions, oblivious to the existence of old boundaries, helping each other in peace from one end of the world to the other.

Understood in this way, the Paris Commune not only practically abolished many of the oppositions that constrain left political thought – e.g. particularism vs. universalism, localism vs. globalism, community vs. class, reproduction vs. production (cf. Ross 2015) – but it was also a fundamentally mobile and, as we shall see below, transhistorical strategy for taking control of the space and conditions of one's own existence. Indeed, the typically communist movement of abolition undertaken in the face of structures of alienation and exploitation (Marx and Engels 1970), affirmed by Marx (1989) also in the context of the Commune, was being translated on the streets of Paris into a lack of geographical fundamentalism, an aversion to autarky and isolation, and an affirmation of liminality, networking and cooperation with similar spatial entities. It is rarely remembered in this context that the rise of the Parisian communards was accompanied by the even more quickly stifled communes in Marseille, Narbonne and Limoges (Hazan 2015: 109). Just as often overlooked is the experience of the banishment and exile of many communards to New Caledonia and the long-distance solidarity shown by some of them towards the anti-imperialist uprising of the Kabyle people in Algeria, who defended their communes against the French occupier (Nicholls 2019). Also, the barricades, i.e. the instruments of struggle suggesting closure, localism, and particularism, with which the events of 1871 are commonly associated, only appeared in the repertoire of the Commune in the last week of its brief existence (Hazan 2011: 241). More as a defensive measure or mechanism of separation, they served to halt the movement of the enemy (Berman 1988) – both the military troops sent into the city and the circulation of capital, freed by the Haussmannization of Paris (Harvey 2003). The limitlessness, translocality and mobility of the Commune thus opposed imperial mobility. Similarly, its power of connectivity and expansion has nothing to do with the absorption and subjugation of the outside that is characteristic of "extensive universalism" (Balibar 2002: 125). Rather, it was an incentive to liberate more territory and to fund new communes that could collectively form a networked federation of open cooperatives and, ultimately, fully reclaimed communist cities. Andy Merrifield (2011: 67) writes in this context about the methodology of moving through walls,

which was already intended by Blanqui or Reclus to challenge the traditional divisions between the city and the countryside, between the First, Second and Third Worlds, and between the West and the East or the North and the South. Its relevance is confirmed today by the words of amazement presented in the manifesto of the Invisible Committee (2009: 101): "What's strange isn't that people who are attuned to each other form communes, but that they remain separated. Why shouldn't communes proliferate everywhere? In every factory, every street, every village, every school?". The radical openness of communes broke with determinism and fatalism, according to which there exist chosen spaces and predestined subjectivities that can pursue social change.

Although transcending Paris was therefore inscribed from the outset in the Commune's excessive and multiscalar existence, a good way to reinforce this movement – not only in the language of theory – is to refer to practices of commoning and the production of the common. This is necessary, in our view, not only to provincialize the theory of the communes but also to reflect on the conditions of its persistence, proliferation and reproduction on the ground of everyday life. Indeed, one of the reasons for the failure of the Paris Commune is ultimately its ephemerality, rebel festivity of recapturing the city, so often affirmed by Lefebvre (1972, 2003), which nevertheless failed to soothe and fully satisfy the "cry of the people" (Tardi 2005). This is also why the great celebration of the people of Paris cannot serve as a direct model for later actions, especially when considering the much more diffuse networks of Empire and multitude (cf. Merrifield 2013, 30), but also the different and more complex nature of the crises to which contemporary communards must respond.

This challenge is rather better dealt with by much less spectacular mobile commons, which, especially in crisis situations, help people on the run (Trimikliniotis, Parsanoglou and Tsianos 2015) to stay put for as long as possible (Lees, Annunziata and Rivas-Alonso 2018). This fact is only seemingly at odds with the dynamic and liminal ontology of the commons, which we seek to analyze in this issue. Indeed, the rootedness in space, even if temporary and provisional, is ultimately a condition for the creation of alternative realities. And it is exactly this aspiration, so typical for most acts of commoning (Linebaugh 2008), that unites the various expressions of communal struggle emerging both before and after 1871. From the maroon communities of fugitive slaves, living in the outskirts of oppressive states in the hills, forests, jungles, basins, swamps, or deserts in the Caribbean, Zomia (Southern Asia), North Africa, Balkans or Eastern European steppes (Scott 2009), through the

From the maroon communities of fugitive slaves, living in the outskirts of oppressive states in the hills, forests, jungles, basins, swamps, or deserts in the Caribbean, Zomia (Southern Asia), North Africa, Balkans or Eastern European steppes, through the utopian attempts to re-build the Garden of Eden on Earth in the New World, to the proletarian, black, indigenous and guerrilla urban insurgencies, communes never ceased to serve as the laboratories of emancipation and production of anti-capitalist space.

utopian attempts to re-build the Garden of Eden on Earth in the New World (Boal et al. 2012), to the proletarian, black, indigenous and guerrilla urban insurgencies (e.g. Lazar 2008), communes never ceased to serve as the laboratories of emancipation and production of anti-capitalist space. As such they are always more than "just" alternative forms of political organization – in striving for absolute democratic modes of economic production, education, and social relations, they are proposing nothing less than a holistic project for a new society.

It is no coincidence that these proposals most often appear precisely in times of crisis, which not only today – although now particularly so, due to the economic-social-environmental-pandemic meta-crisis – most severely affect areas peripheral to the West: its former colonies, internal margins (ghettos of poverty, banlieues) or despised neighbors (e.g. Mexico, the Balkans, Eastern Europe). Although we are far from romanticizing such situations, for commoners crisis can sometimes be synonymous with possibility (Varvourosis 2022) – treated as an opportunity to rethink the dominant forms of inhabiting the planet and using its resources, a chance to remodel insufficiently democratic social relations, and an incentive to activate alternative forms of production: of things, spaces and subjectivities. This is when commons often prove to be, as Silvia Federici, Massimo De Angelis, or Antonio Negri write, the promise of a future social life. This, in turn, forces us to take a very different view of social innovation. After all, what is most noteworthy today in terms of being-in-common comes to us not necessarily from the Parisian Latin Quarter or Manhattan but from migrant squats in Greece or Bolivian neighborhood communities.

The language of mobile commons thus also allows us to rethink the more-than-class composition of commoners. We tend to associate the history of the Paris Commune with the names of great leaders, ideologues or commentators. Meanwhile, the event of this and other communes is above all the responsibility of the dispossessed and the excluded: e.g. proletarians, migrants, former prisoners and slaves, radical militants and activists, and finally political dissenters and heretics, forming a multi-colored mob who dream of another more autonomous and democratic world. Particularly now, their precariousness and instability translate into a greater awareness of entanglement with other, equally vulnerable forms of life, as well as a sensitivity to the needs of the broadly understood environment (Tsing 2015). Mobility of communes does not imply, in this case, an escape from responsibility for the temporarily inhabited territory, which is a structural feature of Harveyan capital (Harvey 2006), but on the contrary political and

The language of mobile commons thus also allows us to rethink the more-than-class composition of commoners.

ecological care for the here and now, as well as for the not entirely predictable future of a given place.

It is on this ground that the mobile commons mesh with the makeshift forms of space production (Vasudevan 2017). This is particularly evident in the case of squats and other forms of place occupation (e.g. community gardens or parks), which, out of necessity but also as a result of conscious decisions, renounce ecologically costly interventions into the urban fabric. They turn instead to various forms of reclaiming, remaking and repairing available materials, contradicting the thesis of the unproductive nature of reproductive labor. This draws our attention to the possibility of collectively producing and activating the given place through the intelligent use of waste and rubbish, as well as to the importance of tacit forms of resistance to capitalist labor relations (cf. Federici 2019). Importantly, based on improvised materialism (Vasudevan 2015), zero-waste sensibility (Linebaugh 2008), and a culture of care (Puig de la Bellacasa 2017), mobile commons thus open themselves up to interspecies forms of solidarity, cooperation, and sociability. This is confirmed by, among other things, the renaissance of permaculture, the popularization of ethical veganism, and many other ecocentric initiatives that grow out of the conviction that existing social-ecological relations need to be radically reworked. Such practices give us hope not only to mitigate the effects of the multiple crises of which current and potential commoners are the most frequent victims (especially environmental, climate, and humanitarian) but perhaps also provide us with the chance to retain them through the spread of similar practices, as well as the physical expansion of the common space (Stavrides 2016) consciously produced and managed by more-than-human communities.

Such an expansion of spatial commons requires the political work of the imagination, which, instead of holding tight to one location, can inspire other locations on a similar emotional-affective basis (cf. Merrifield 2011: 76; Castells 2012). The community of anger and hope, the collectivity of pain and care, or the aforementioned more-than-human experience of precarity cannot, however, overshadow the concrete material conditions in which each practice of commoning comes to develop. This does not, of course, negate the importance of translocal learning from other social movements or sharing experiences and strategies across geographical divides (McFarlane 2011). Quite the contrary. It does, however, place additional emphasis on the work of contextualized invention, adaptation, and creativity, as well as diagnosing problems and proposing solutions that may significantly differ from those encountered by historically distant and still-existing communes.

This caution corresponds very well with the very ontology of mobile commons, which in any particular case must reconcile situatedness with unfettered mobility, embeddedness with openness to the outside, as is well reflected in the metaphors of threshold and shared heterotopia proposed by Stavros Stavrides in his concept of common space. Communes are not only made of people on the move and not only circulate and ignite the struggle elsewhere, but the very forms of commoning that sustain them are in many cases hybrid, undetermined and viral. The fleeting conspiracies, revealing themselves here and there, the nomadic communities in-the-making, as in the case of clandestine migrant networks, camps, squats and shelters, the circulating information, gossip and ideas that help to organize spaces of flow, or the subversive uses of transport and communication infrastructures, vehicles and devices (which William Walters [2015] identified as sites of "viapolitics"), remind us that the insurgent aspect of communes remains possible only due to all these subtle and hidden acts of denizens' mobilization. Only with their experiences and capabilities, may we fight the most exclusivist political discourses and economic practices.

Communes are not only made of people on the move and not only circulate and ignite the struggle elsewhere, but the very forms of commoning that sustain them are in many cases hybrid, undetermined and viral.

It is worth examining some concepts which develop various aspects of mobile commons. Angelos Varvarousis (2022) stressed their liminal character, showing that the temporal, transitional and elusive functioning of these experiments does not necessarily mean that they are destined to perish without more permanent outcomes. The liminal potential triggers the process of transition: from crisis and provisional reactions to its course to the emergence of structures that draw from the repertoire of experiences, activities and ideas of carnivalesque commoning. The "liminal commons" structure the post-crisis landscape and multiply themselves in a rhizomatic and contagious way. Varvarousis shows this using the example of Greece, where the occupations and temporary mobilizations left behind many achievements, such as the whole constellation of social clinics and pharmacies, workers' cooperatives, banks of time and alternative currencies, neighborhood assemblies, networks of solidarity exchange, urban gardens, spaces liberated from the power of capital and the state, artistic collectives and recuperated factories.

A similar tension between ephemeral phenomena and permanent constituting of the new possibly post-capitalist world can be observed in the case of another form of mobile commons – those performed by migrants and their allies. Martina Tazzioli (2020) writes in this context of "temporary mobile commoning" to stress the processual and constantly renegotiated shape of bottom-up and floating structures of support which help to maintain the material guarantee for the right to

move. The spaces of flight and refuge which are opened and reproduced in the places of temporary shelter, routes of wandering, zones, and institutions of self-governance – even if they are fleeting and labile – they still play a part in producing something more foundational, something to-come that will haunt enclosed entities such as "fortress Europe". Tazzioli describes this phenomenon as the cartography of vanishing refugee spaces: an alternative, grassroots, and subversive cartography which – while remaining mobile and deterritorializing – happens outside the gaze of the state, stays out of the radar of regimes of circulations, and acts kind of subcutaneously – in the sphere to which Harney and Moten (2013) referred as "undercommons".

Situatedness which is under-the-deck and clandestine is typical also for the kind of mobile commoning which tends to be post-anthropocentric. For Anna Tsing (2015) the elusive and shifting socio-ecological relations are intertwined in the world of "latent commons". Being not exclusively human enclaves and crawling out from the various cracks and holes in the commodified order of capital, latent commons offer possible patterns for organizing motley pluriverses of becoming which resist the apparatuses of capture and the regimes of countability and governmentality. In that regard, post-human and multispecies commonalities are akin to "maroon commons" – the fugitive hideaways for fleeing subjectivities whose durability is dependent on deep knowledge of local ecology from below (Roane 2017) and the capability to navigate in spaces that are ungovernable from the top. The subaltern commoners, seeking lines of flight to the maroon commons, develop mobile practices and institutions of "sousveillance" (Browne 2015). They are composed as the world of fugitivity which Sylvia Wyner (1971) called "the plot – using wordplay: "the plot" is both the allotment, a close relation with the soil, and the conspiracy, intrigue and collusion of those who reject being pinned to the land. In this way, subversive models of movement are identical to the weaving of bottom-up counter-discourses of people on the move.

Being not exclusively human enclaves and crawling out from the various cracks and holes in the commodified order of capital, latent commons offer possible patterns for organizing motley pluriverses of becoming which resist the apparatuses of capture and the regimes of countability and governmentality.

Glen S. Coulthard, the theorist of "indigenous commons" (2014), convinces us that the kind of opacity for the imperial gaze of capital opens the possibility to decolonize not only resources such as water, plants, or animals but also the decolonization of the human – it paves a way to the horizon of non-possessive and non-colonized ontologies. Similar reflections come from the site of Latin American decolonial and indigenous social theory and social movements. Marisol de la Cadena and Mario Blaser (2018) point out the fundamental incommensurability between Western/modern ontologies which are based on dichotomies

such as society/nature, matter/ideas, or property/wastelands, and indigenous cosmologies for which all reality exists in the web of life that needs our care and reproductive work. The commons, when seen from this angle, can survive only if we manage to locate them anew in a relational and dynamic order of flows which – from the perspective of capitalist property and commodification – seems to be "uncommon". Commoning of the uncommon, as it is advocated by the authors, can be successful only if we are ready to see and accept the radical plurality and heterogeneity of the many worlds which are operational in organizing the web of life in many incommensurable, parallel and intersecting ways. The attempts to reduce them all to one, exclusive ontology – as in the capitalist regime of things which equalizes everything with property, commodity, and money-form – will result in their destruction. Arturo Escobar (2020) uses the term "ontological politics" to name such a model of collective struggle, because it focuses on the conservation of living worlds. Ontological politics is also pluriversal in its orientation because it is interested in creating and caring for the world in which many worlds fit. According to Escobar, the commons are not a separate sphere of social reality which could be occupied and organized, but they are inscribed, embedded, and spread out in those multiverses, acting as their true social base. It will be necessary to strengthen and develop the social relations of care – which Silvia Federici refers to, from a feminist point of view, as "care commons" – if we are to be able to protect these multiple worlds from the risk of extinction.

According to Escobar, the commons are not a separate sphere of social reality which could be occupied and organized, but they are inscribed, embedded, and spread out in those multiverses, acting as their true social base.

All the mentioned diverse forms of mobile commons – communal, insurgent, liminal, temporary, latent, care, fugitive, maroon, Black, indigenous, undercommons, uncommons, and many more – jointly compose a project of "mobility justice" whose aim is – to refer to Mimi Sheller's (2018) elaboration of the concept – "both the protection of the planet itself through a living process of commoning and the local mobilization of many networked mobile publics for the defense of the mobile commons".

How do mobile commons relate to the non-mobile, immobile or sedentary commons? Should we treat them as necessarily irreconcilable? Could the former be the supplement and the ally of the latter? Do we need both localized and enclosed commons organized around stable communities on the one hand, and motile and self-transforming mobile commons on the other? Or should we prioritize mobility over immobility? We believe that such questions are wrongly posed and tend to result in confusion and misunderstanding, rather than contribute to the creation of alternatives to capitalism. All communes are mobile commons

– this is our conviction – or they are not communes at all. Because no commune could flourish and reproduce itself over a longer period of time without weaving the socio-ecological web of life around its needs and relations with other entities. When separated and enclosed, communes are like a besieged fortress, crushed by external forces of capital and the state. Communes are not states and they cannot be statist. They have to multiply, pullulate and inseminate to maintain fruitful relations with each other. We adhere here to the view presented by Thomas Nail (2020) in his "kinetic materialism", namely that the state/static/statist form is just an ideological representation of the world which is constantly on the move and all structures that seem to be sedentary and immobile are in fact maintained and reproduced by complex flows and movements at their base. The advantage that communes could attain – against their static counterpart and adversary – would lie in gaining the consciousness of their dependency on the socio-ecological fabric of life (see Tsing 2015; Puig de la Bellacasa 2017; Federici 2019) and drawing lessons from it to organize the production of the common in such fabric. All these flows, which states assume to be just an "outside", external "nature", surrounding "environment", or outer "resources" to be enclosed, privatized, and commodified, are from the communal perspective not external at all, but are regarded the true foundation of commonist politics.

All these flows, which states assume to be just an "outside", external "nature", surrounding "environment", or outer "resources" to be enclosed, privatized, and commodified, are from the communal perspective not external at all, but are regarded the true foundation of commonist politics.

In this issue, we have collected a diverse set of original articles and reviews which oscillate around the aim of protecting, reclaiming, and constructing mobile commons. The opening article by Mimi Sheller, *Mobile Commoning: Reclaiming Indigenous, Caribbean, Maroon, and Migrant Commons*, extends the concept of mobile commoning to include its marginalized, non-Western and non-modern forms, which emerge from histories from below, from subaltern people on the move. Sheller tries to reclaim the social theory of the commons for various types of Indigenous, Caribbean, maroon and migrant commons. She intends to demonstrate that jointly these endeavors can be presented as the project of contestation against enclosures, coloniality, imperialism, and capitalist extractivism. Such a project does not fit easily into those ideas and practices around the commons which are typical for the global North, being the outcomes of Northern social movements and subjectivities. The possible zone of encounter and agreement between two traditions of mobile commons seems to be – for Sheller – the history from below. But the author claims that it has to be understood as the history of mobile subjects who are imperceptible to the gaze of authorities and who transgress – due to their excess of mobility – the regimes of enclo-

sures. All those who "do not fit" and don't have their proper place, constitute the affective and flowing commonality of fugitive commoners.

In the following article some of the main authors of the concepts of mobile commons and mobile commoning propose their actualization in the context of the pandemic and post-pandemic era. Nicos Trimikliniotis, Dimitris Parsanoglou, and Vassilis Tsianos – the authors of the book *Mobile Commons, Migrant Digitalities and the Right to the City* – reflect how pandemic regimes of control and the modulation of mobility changed the capacity of mobile commoners to act. Their theorizations are based on empirical research conducted in the geographical triangle between Cyprus, Greece, and Turkey which is a neuralgic zone for migration to the European Union. Although it enters into crisis time and time again – and the freedom to move suffers from many restrictions – the triangle could be also grasped as the crucial laboratory for the social movements and practices of resistance from below and on the move. The authors try to propose the mapping of the impact of the pandemic on the radicalization of tension between control and subversion. And the epidemiological universalization of containment and surveillance – because viruses do not respect borders – makes the experience of control more widespread and common than ever, creating the potential for mobile commoning on an unprecedented scale and urgency.

The third article shifts the ground from the South to the North of Europe – Sweden – but in fact, it problematizes the oversimplified relationship between migrants and their geographical location. Maja Sager, Emma Söderman, and Vanna Nordling reflect on the case of "Swedish Afghans" in Paris – the working of networks of support and solidarity created by those Afghan refugees whose asylum claims in Sweden were rejected, leading to their relocation to France. The activities of the network, organized in both countries, are transborder and transnational in their reach. At the same time, they are focused on the inclusion of Afghan refugees in Swedish society, where they had already established social bonds and identifications. "Swedishness", identity, and locality serve here as the vehicles for the demands associated with belonging and overcoming the condition of exile. Nevertheless, these demands are created in the form of diffused and elusive meeting experiences. The authors propose describing this paradoxical phenomenon of situatedness and dispersal as "im/mobile commons": the solidarity of the people on the move co-exists here with the imagery of the end destination – in this case, Sweden – as the expected overcoming of a mobile condition which is – for "Swedish Afghans" themselves – only temporary and transient. Im/mobile commons raises some doubts regar-

ding anarchist elaborations on mobile commons, in which the anti-identitarian and anti-particularistic nature of mobile commons is celebrated as their dominant characteristics.

Similar, but slightly different doubts concerning the overly optimistic hopes invested in the mobile commons – as germs of a different European community, performed by people on the move in a dispersed and processual way – are discussed in the text by Łukasz Moll. The author focuses on the practices of solidarity associated with people migrating from Belarus and Ukraine between 2021 and 2022. Moll discusses two completely opposite stances towards mobile commoning which were widespread on the Eastern borders of Poland and the EU during this period. The first reactions to mobile commoning – in the case of migrants who were transported by Belarusian authorities from all around the world to push them through the Polish/EU boundary – entailed that mobile commoning went clandestine and became a risky endeavor, actively tracked and fought by the Polish state under the conditions of the state of exception. But in the face of the Russian invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, mobile commoning was the crucial part of the official strategy of the Polish and civil society to provide hospitality to people who were escaping from the war: the development of the network of support, shelter and transportation was actively promoted by politicians and media. In his analysis, Moll tries to explain the phenomenon of such diverse responses to the migration challenge. For this purpose, he uses the concept of "differential commoning", with which he indicates that even horizontal and radical hospitality is entangled in the traditional dialectics of universalism and particularism, or inclusion and exclusion. The author argues, however, that despite these limitations, the mobile commoning which developed in Poland in the discussed period, serves as an important experience and a hint on how to redesign European borders.

The article of Jędrzej Brzeziński, *Anti-enclosures and nomadic habits: Towards a commonist reading of Deleuzoguattarian nomadology*, is a philosophical essay in which the author collects and re-interprets various nomadic motifs in the work of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari. Brzeziński identifies the sources of these motifs and how they became the parts of writings of the French thinkers. Then he demonstrates their potential significance for the conceptualization of mobile commons. His interpretation is drawn against widespread (mis)readings of Deleuzoguattarian nomadology, according to which it affirms postmodern capitalism in an accelerationist spirit. Brzeziński argues that nomadology should be understood as the project of organizing post-humanist terri-

tories of resistance against the enclosures of the commons. This project has the nomadic distribution of social relations in the enclosed space as its basis, which is elusive for all sedentary, bourgeois and capitalist models of social reproduction.

Such nomadic distributions – in their historical aspects – are followed by Martin Tharp in his article which is dedicated to the countercultural communal living arrangement in Czechoslovakia during the so-called "Normalization era" (1970-1989). Tharp is interested in broadening the field of oppositional practices in the discussed period with the experiences of creating the communes (*baráky*) which were marginalized in the historical research. The author demonstrates the transnational reach of the phenomenon of communes which pierced the "Iron Curtain" between the capitalist West and socialist East. In his opinion, the commonist or communalist opposition was a response to the socialist vision of modernity and modernization. Its history cannot be easily included in the narrative of the anti-communist resistance of the opposition. The communal counter-culture was focused on developing communities of refuge and dispersion which sought to maintain their utopian impulse while materializing in the social reality. Czechoslovak experiences seem to be an interesting point of reference for contemporary theories and practices of the commons, showing the *longue durée* of these structures also in the former "Second World".

In the final text of the issue the reader can find the review article by Stanisław Knapowski, who devoted his attention to the social history of the Paris Commune in relation to the work of Jean-François Dupeyron *Commun-Commune: penser la Commune de Paris (1871)*. The author highlights the unfulfilled legacy of the Commune, which still serves as an inspiration in many places around the world, sometimes in a direct and conscious way and sometimes not. The commoning of resources, the radical horizontal democracy in their governing, and the federal association of communes, were the three pillars of the Paris Commune's project. Seen from such a perspective, the Paris Commune seems to be an absolutely fundamental experience to study for all those contemporary thinkers who believe that the federation of the commons/communes could be a potential post-capitalist alternative. Following Dupeyron in this regard, Knapowski argues that the social history of the Commune was overshadowed by the "black legend" of the event on the one hand, and the military accounts on the other. The contribution of various ideologies of the French Left to the social experiments during urban insurrection was marginalized by the scholars and commentators of the Commune. From Knapowski's review, it seems that the dilemmas that

were faced by the Communards remain our dilemmas in seeking the postcapitalist forms of life.

References

Balibar, Étienne. 2002. *Politics and the Other Scene*. London and New York: Verso.

Berman, Marshall. 1988. *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. London and New York: Penguin Books.

Blaser, Mario, and Marisol de la Cadena. 2018. *Pluriverse. Proposals for a World of Many Worlds* In de la Cadena, Marisol, and Mario Blaser (eds.), *A World of Many Worlds*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Boal, Iain, Janferie Stone, Michael Watts, and Cal Winslow, eds. 2012. *West of Eden: Communes and Utopia in Northern California*. Oakland: PM Press.

Browne, Simone. 2015. *Dark Matters. On the Surveillance of Blackness*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Castells, Manuel. 2012. *Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age*. Cambridge and Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Coulthard, Glen S. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks. Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. London and Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Escobar, Arturo. 2020. *Pluriversal Politics. The Real and the Possible*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

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

Harney, Stefano and Fred Moten. 2013. *Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study*. Wivenhoe, New York, Port Watson: Minor Compositions.

Harvey, David. 2003. *Paris, Capital of Modernity*. London and New York: Routledge.

Harvey, David. 2006. *The Limits to Capital.* London and New York: Verso.

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

Hazan, Eric. 2011. *The Invention of Paris: A History in Footsteps.* Translated by David Fernbach. London and New York: Verso.

Hazan, Hazan. 2015. *A History of the Barricade*. Translated by David Fernbach. London and New York: Verso.

Invisible Committee. 2009. *The Coming Insurrection*. Los Angeles: semiotext(e).
Lazar, Sian. 2008. *El Alto, Rebel City: Self and Citizenship in Andean Bolivia*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
Lees, Loretta, Annunziata, Sandra and Clara Rivas-Alonso. 2018. "Resisting Planetary Gentrification: The Value of Survivability in the Fight to Stay Put". *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 108(2).
Lefebvre, Henri. 1972. "La Commune de Paris, Fête Populaire". *Dialogue* 11(3): 360-375.
Lefebvre, Henri. 1996. *Writings on Cities*. Translated and edited by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Lefebvre, Henri. 2003. "The Style of Commune". In Henri Lefebvre, *Key Writings*. New York: Continuum.
Linebaugh, Peter. 2008. *The Magna Carta Manifesto: Liberties and Commons for All.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Lowenhaupt Tsing, Anna. 2015. *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
Marx, Karl. 1989. "Marx to Ludwig Kugelmann, 12 April 1871". In Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Collected Works: Volume 44, 1870-1873*. New York: International Publishers.
Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. 1970. *The German Ideology*. New York: International Publishers.
McFarlane, Colin. 2011. *Learning of the City: Knowledge and Translocal Assemblage*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
Merrifield, Andy. 2011. *Magical Marxism: Subversive Politics and the Imagination*. London and New York: Pluto Press.
Merrifield, Andy. 2013. *The Politics of the Encounter: Urban Theory and Protest Under Planetary Urbanization*. Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press.
Nail, Thomas. 2020. *Marx in Motion: A New Materialist Marxism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Nicholls, Julia. 2019. *Revolutionary Thought After the Paris Commune, 1871-1885*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Puig de la Bellacasa, María. 2017. *Matters of Care: Speculative Ethics in the More Than Human Worlds*. Minneapolis and London: The University of Minnesota Press.
Roane, J.T. 2017. *Towards Usable Histories of Black Commons*. https://www.aaihs.org/towards-usable-histories-of-the-black-commons/.
Ross, Kristin. 2015. *Communal Luxury: The Political Imaginary of the Paris Commune*. London and New York: Verso.

Scott, James C. 2009. *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Sheller, Mimi. 2018. *Mobility Justice. The Politics of Movement in an Age of Extremes*. London and New York: Verso.

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

Tardi, Jacques. 2005. *Le Cri du people*. Casterman: Bruxelles.

Tazzioli, Martina. 2020. *The Making of Migration. The Biopolitics of Mobility at Europe's Borders*. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC and Melbourne: SAGE.

Tomba, Massimiliano. 2019. *Insurgent Universality: An Alternative Legacy of Modernity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trimikliniotis, Nicos, Parsanoglou, Dimitris and Vassilis S. Tsianos. 2015. *Mobile commons, migrant digitalities and the right to the city*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Pivot.

Varvarousis, Angelos. 2022. *Liminal Commons: Modern Rituals of Transition in Greece*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Vasudevan, Alexander. 2015. "The makeshift city. Towards a global geography of squatting". *Progress in Human Geography* 39(3): 338–359.

Vasudevan, Alexander. 2017. *The Autonomous City: A History of Urban Squatting*. London and New York: Verso.

Walters, William. 2015. „Migration, Vehicles and Politics: Three Theses on Viapolitics". *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol 18, Issue 4: 469-488.

Wynter, Sylvia. 1971. „Novel and History, Plot and Plantation". *Savacou*, no. 5 (June 1971): 95-102.

PIOTR JUSKOWIAK – urban scholar and cultural theorist, Assistant Professor at the Institute of Cultural Studies of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, Poland, and a member of the editorial board of *Praktyka Teoretyczna*. He is an author of *Przestrzenie wspólnoty: Filozofia wspólnotowości w perspektywie badań nad miastem postindustrialnym* (*Spaces of Community: Philosophy of Commonality in the Context of the Research on Post-Industrial City*, Poznań 2015). His areas of interest are critical urban studies; urban cultural economy; urban political ecology; and urban animal studies.

Address:
Institute of Cultural Studies
Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań
ul. Szamarzewskiego 89A
60-568 Poznań
email: pjusko@amu.edu.pl

ŁUKASZ MOLL – sociologist, philosopher, the Assistant Professor at the Institute of Sociology, University of Wrocław (Poland). Member of the editorial board of *Praktyka Teoretyczna* journal. The author of the monograph on nomadic European identity and the limits of the European universalism (*Nomadyczna Europa. Poststrukturalistyczne granice europejskiego uniwersalizmu*, Toruń 2021). His current research is focused on the plebeian commons as alternatives to capitalism.

Address:
Institute of Sociology
University of Wrocław
ul. Koszarowa 3
52-007 Wrocław
email: lukasz.moll@uwr.edu.pl

Citation:
Juskowiak, Piotr, and Łukasz Moll. 2022. „Communes and Other Mobile Commons." *Praktyka Teoretyczna* 4(46): 9–26.
DOI: 10.19195/prt.2022.4.1
Funding: The work on publication was financed by the National Science Centre (NCN) (project number: 2018/29/N/HS1/00853).

Autorzy: Piotr Juskowiak, Łukasz Moll
Tytuł: Komuny i inne mobilne dobra wspólne

Abstrakt: Artykuł stanowi wprowadzenie do specjalnego wydania *Praktyki Teoretycznej*, które zostało poświęcone „komunom i innym mobilnym dobrom wspólnym". Redaktorzy numeru wyjaśniają, w jaki sposób możemy konceptualizować rozmaite próby wytwarzania mobilnych dóbr wspólnych i mobilnego uwspólniania. Począwszy od wzorcowego przykładu Komuny Paryskiej wiele ruchów społecznych – miejskich, wiejskich, rdzennych, feministycznych czy migranckich – eksperymentowało z komunami jako alternatywami dla państwa i kapitalizmu i redefiniowało w ten sposób znaczenie praktyk przestrzennych, pracy i ruchu robotniczego. Wbrew założeniu, że komuna jest z konieczności zlokalizowaną i osiadłą formą polityczną, autorzy, którzy zgłosili teksty do naszego okolicznościowego numeru, proponują uchwycić ją z perspektywy subwersywnych mobilności: jako jednostki kinetyczne. Wprowadzenie prezentuje wspólny grunt, na którym te propozycje spotykają się i wchodzą ze sobą w dialog. Różne modele mobilnych dóbr wspólnych opisane w numerze – komunalne, powstańcze, liminalne, tymczasowe, utajone, opiekuńcze, zbiegowskie, maroońskie, czarne, rdzenne, podziemne, niepospolite i wiele innych – zaświadczają o najnowszym zwrocie ku mobilności w teoriach dóbr wspólnych.
Słowa kluczowe: komuny, mobilne dobra wspólne, subwersywne mobilności, uwspólnianie, Komuna Paryska