

MIMI SHELLER (ORCID: 0000-0001-9097-9563)

Mobile Commoning: Reclaiming Indigenous, Caribbean, Maroon, and Migrant Commons

Over the last two decades, the concept of ‘the commons’ has been rediscovered as a powerful organizing principle in social movements, radical political thought, and critical theory. The concept of commoning has also been adopted within discussions of migration and critical mobilities research. This article will first trace some of these emerging ideas of commoning as a relational practice found in many political mobilizations around ‘reclaiming the commons’. Then it will turn to approaches to commoning that seek to complicate Euro-American histories by centering Indigenous practices of radical commoning, Caribbean and African diaspora mobile commoning, and recent concepts such as undercommons, queer commons, and migrant mobile commoning. The article asks: How can such practices of radical mobile commoning help us envision ways to unmake the existing violent settlings and destructive im/mobilities of enclosure, coloniality, imperialism, and capitalist extraction?

Keywords: commoning, counter-plantation, Indigenous, maroon, mobilities, undercommons

Introduction: From commons to commoning

Over the last two decades, the concept of “the commons” has been rediscovered as a powerful organizing principle in social movements, radical political thought, and critical theory. In the 1990s, the anti-globalization movement’s call for “reclaiming of the commons” (Klein 2001) built on Silvia Federici and George Caffentzis’ critique of the “new enclosures.” Silvia Federici became known for her political activism as a member of the Wages for Housework Movement in New York in the mid-1970s, writing pamphlets such as *Wages Against Housework*, and *Counter-Planning from the Kitchen*. Federici, along with George Caffentzis and other collaborators, went on to describe the period of “new enclosures” in the late 20th century and explained how the idea of the commons helped many progressive movements fight back against it (Caffentzis and Federici 2014; Barbagallo et al. 2019). This and other work brought the idea of the commons into the 21st century, spanning both rural and urban locations of political struggles, in the Global North as well as in the Global South.

In the Global North one tradition of thinking about commons drew on the Nobel prize-winning work of political theorist Elinor Ostrom (1990), who demonstrated that ordinary people could (and did) create rules and institutions that allow for the sustainable and equitable management of shared resources. Open access and cooperative management and decision-making are central features of these commons. Against Garrett Hardin’s influential essay on the “tragedy of the commons”, which argued that commonly-held resources are subject to overuse and destruction (and inflamed racist white nationalist ideas of population control), Ostrom argued that commons have always been collectively managed and governed by rules of customary shared usage, not simply a disorganized free-for-all. She demonstrated how the regulation of the common pool resources (CPR) such as fisheries by self-governing institutions offers an alternative mode of shared governance, which has inspired subsequent work in political ecology (Blackmar 2006; Clement et al. 2019).

Another more radical tradition of thinking about commons emerged out of social history in the tradition of ‘history from below’. Building on readings of *The Ethnological Notebooks* of Karl Marx, and historians such as E.P. Thompson’s studies of the formation of the English working class, social historians extended cultural Marxist analysis toward the formation of the more complex, polyglot, and multi-ethnic working class of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Atlantic world, which

included sailors, enslaved people, port workers, and women, as well as the rural commoners whose land had been enclosed (Linebaugh and Rediker 2001). The historian Peter Linebaugh also traced the connections between Euro-American radical social philosophers of the commons and the anti-colonial struggles of the Irish, the Haitian Revolution, and the Indigenous peoples of North America, such as the Iroquois Federation (Linebaugh 2014). This work not only helped situate commoning as a widespread practice in opposition to capitalist modernization through enclosure and private property, but also influenced a generation of young activists and scholars within that radical tradition around the 1990s to the turn of the millennium (including my own work while in graduate school in the mid-1990s). Also embedded in this line of thought was an anthropological attention to “traveling cultures” (Clifford 1992), involving ideas of global exchange, hybridity, and creolization. The rejection of methodological nationalism and bounded societies fed into what became known as “the mobilities turn” in the social sciences (Sheller and Urry 2006).

At the same time, the idea of commoning was also taking on political life of its own, interacting with these theoretical trajectories. The Zapatistas rose up against the Mexican state in the 1990s to defend communal relations to land and indigenous ways of life in Chiapas, as well as creating new forms of political commoning. Social movements across Latin America and the Caribbean formed Via Campesina to resist the enclosures of land that were destroying peasant and Indigenous agroecologies. There was growing recognition of the diverse mobile subaltern counter-publics (e.g., Black, Latinx, Feminist, Indigenous) that have long created ways of life, insurgent movements, and autonomous spaces that some refer to as “Black commons” (Agyeman and Boone 2020). These Maroon and fugitive “undercommons” (Moten and Harney 2013) draw on deep forms of practiced knowledge of living outside binary structures of property, ownership, and capitalist extraction.

In the political sphere, also influential on these ideas and social movements reclaiming the commons were a series of books by the political philosophers Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, who called for building ‘commonwealth’ and ‘assembly’ through “constructing new, mobile constellations of shared life”. In *Assembly*, Hardt and Negri define ‘the common’ precisely as being that which is “in contrast to property, both private and public”:

It is not a new form of property but rather *nonproperty*, that is, a fundamentally different means of organizing the use and management of wealth. The common

designates an equal and open structure for access to wealth together with democratic mechanisms of decision-making. More colloquially, one might say that the common is what we share or, rather, it is a social structure and a social technology for sharing. (Hardt and Negri 2017, 97).

Commons, in short, are not empty unclaimed spaces, or *terra nullius*, but are *socially produced shared spaces or spaces for sharing*.

Commons, in short, are not empty unclaimed spaces, or *terra nullius*, but are *socially produced shared spaces or spaces for sharing*. Examples of potential commons include “the earth and its ecosystems”; immaterial forms of wealth such as ideas, codes and images; material commodities produced through cooperative forms of social labor; “social territories” produced through cooperation (i.e., what we might call sharing economies); and social institutions and services aimed at health, education, housing and welfare (Hardt and Negri 2017, 98). Hardt and Negri draw on Judith Butler’s notion of precarity as “a site of potential,” arguing that the vulnerability of ‘multitudes’ might in fact be a means for securing “forms of life grounded in the common” by exercising “open and expanding networks of productive social cooperation, inside and outside capitalist economy, as a powerful basis for generating free and autonomous forms of life” (Hardt and Negri 2017, 60).

These understandings of enclosure and commons helped to expand these concepts toward more abstract imaginaries of mobile commoning as “constellations of share life” that are not just shared places or common pool resources, but shared practices and ways of being together. This brought a shift towards the verb form of ‘commoning’, which is said to have been coined by Linebaugh, who with Federici and Caffentzis, was part of the Midnight Notes collective which argued that “Commons are not *things*, but social relations — of cooperation and solidarity. And commons are not *givens* but processes” (Barbagallo et al. 2019, 6).

Critical urban geography also began to employ the active concept of commoning “as complex social and political ecologies which articulate particular socio-spatial practices, social relationships and forms of governance that underpin them to produce and reproduce them” (Chatterton 2010, 626). The idea of ‘commoning mobility’ has more recently been propagated in critical migration studies (Papadopoulos and Tsianos 2013; Trimikliniotis, Parsanoglou, Tsianos 2015, 2016), in recent work on low-carbon mobility transitions (Nikolaeva et al. 2019), and in my own work on mobility justice (Sheller 2018). As noted by Nikolaeva, Adey and Cresswell, there is a renewed emphasis on “the processual, the spatial and the relational dimensions of commons [that comes] forward as the focus shifts towards *commoning* (Chatterton 2010; Williams 2017) and to strategies and practices which can work to “assemble more inc-

lusive, just and sustainable spaces” (Jeffrey, McFarlane and Vasudevan 2012, 2)” through a commoning of mobilities (Nikolaeva et al. 2019).

Radical geographers have argued for this kind of processual, rhizomatic, and fluid process of commoning as a crucial aspect of post-capitalist urban commons (e.g., Chatterton 2016). So although commons have been imagined as common pool resources such as a pasture, a forest, or some other form of materially grounded access to a place, recent approaches put the emphasis on the social relations and *processes of commoning* as relationships of sharing and caring. Mobile commoning can be understood as socially produced rules for sharing and moving together with others. Neither private nor public, mobile commoning suggests a temporary practice of dwelling-and-moving without taking ownership. Mobile commons are not just a shared territory, natural resource, or open access information, but suggest a radical way of moving together in the world, sharing spaces, and refusing private property. Commons thus hover between thing-ness and sets of relations, blurring the boundary between object and action.

Crucially, these more relational theories of commoning as a practice have leveraged the concept as a critique of settler colonialism and racial capitalism, which both have their bases in private property, enclosure, and extraction. As the sociologist Craig Fortier describes it, “A useful place to start imaging the process of unsettling and decolonizing the commons is by recognizing that the commons is not simply a piece of property or a resource, but a practice” (Fortier 2017, 60). Indigenous and Black critical theory bring to light both diverse existing movements for commoning and multiple radical understandings of commoning that take us beyond European histories, although still connected to the continuity of pre-modern practices such as gleaning, pottaging, and access to shorelines, forests, fishing, hunting, and foraging grounds (Linebaugh 2014). Nevertheless, twenty-first century Euro-American movements to “reclaim the commons” and “occupy” various sites of power sometimes have had the problematic tendency to claim land that had already been stolen from Indigenous peoples without reflecting on the pre-existing presence of First Peoples. Indigenous scholars such as Glen Coulthard (2014), Audra Simpson (2014), and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2017) have problematized any easy alignment between non-Indigenous practices of commoning and their own longstanding relationships to land and territories practiced by their respective communities (Dene, Mohawk, Nishnaabeg).

With this in mind, the scholar and activist Craig Fortier suggests possibilities for bringing into conversation the work of these Indigenous

More relational theories of commoning as a practice have leveraged the concept as a critique of settler colonialism and racial capitalism, which both have their bases in private property, enclosure, and extraction.

scholars and the kind of critical “black study” advocated by Stefano Harney and Fred Moten (2013) in order to “unsettle the commons”. Fortier argues that Moten and Harney’s concept of “the undercommons” suggests the potential and the possibility for place-based knowledge that “resists both *enclosure and settlement*” (Fortier 2017, 104). We can learn from many “small, diverse, and widespread attempts to live outside the dominant logics of our time”, how to “destabilize our intellectual, affective, spiritual, and material commitments to the power relations of white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, capitalism, and settler colonialism” (Fortier, 105). Like the relational thinking of many Indigenous epistemologies, Moten and Harney’s counter-point notion of the fugitive “undercommons” (2013) hints at some ways to mobilize the idea of the commons not simply as a place or a resource to be shared, but as a way of moving through the world, a relational counter-position, an embodied relation with others, and an epistemic perspective from below. The undercommons is imagined as a feeling, an improvisation, a break.

Queer theorist Lauren Berlant also highlighted the commons concept as “a powerful vehicle for troubling troubled times”, deploying it not as a naïve place-holder for community, but to point towards “the difficulty of convening a world conjointly, although it is inconvenient and hard, and to offer incitements toward imagining a livable provisional life”. Incoherent, ambivalent and “messed up”, the commons concept nevertheless holds out a claim upon us: “Under its name, across the globe, communities tap into legacies of occupation to contest ownership rights and resource justice, and under its name, people project a pastoral social relation of mutual attachment, dependence, or vitality” (Berlant 2016, 395-396). Berlant poetically described commoning as an activity, a verb, a movement, a connected mediation. It is a queer concept that holds out the possibility of different kinds of more hopeful political futures. Tiffany Lethabo King, in *The Black Shoals*, also describes a “feminist, Two Spirit, queer, and errant form of critique [that] also compels decolonizing movements to move outside the dominant logics and narratives of ‘nation’”. Her notion of the Black Shoals implies that “[t]hese instances of coming together gesture toward an otherwise mode of being human that holds space for one another’s well-being, joy, and future” (Lethabo King 2020, 27).

These radical Black, Indigenous, feminist and queer theories of commoning press at the limits of Euro-American ways of knowing, which continue to reproduce binary logics of subject/object, Man/Nature, male/female, whiteness/blackness, materiality/meaning, public/private etc. Theories of commoning also point us toward alternative genealogies

Berlant poetically described commoning as an activity, a verb, a movement, a connected mediation. It is a queer concept that holds out the possibility of different kinds of more hopeful political futures.

of the concept and practices of commoning within non-settler communities. As Federici recognized, “The new enclosures ironically demonstrated not only that commons have not vanished, but new forms of social cooperation are constantly being produced” (Federici 2018). In that spirit of more hopeful futures and radical pasts, this article will revisit Indigenous, Caribbean and African-diaspora dimensions of mobile commoning in the Americas, showing how existing forms of mobile commoning extend decolonial frameworks by re-enchanting the world as a relational practice of everyday life that is more-than-human. It will ask: How can the cultural practices of Indigenous, Caribbean, and African diaspora mobile commoning help us envision ways to unmake the existing violent settlements and destructive enclosures and (im)mobilities of coloniality, imperialism, genocidal capitalist extraction, and ongoing climate disasters?

Indigenous Commoning

Across the place called Turtle Island — named by white settlers as America — diverse Indigenous peoples’ relations to land, water, places and mobilities have very different genealogies than those that have informed European theorizations of the commons. Many scholars have noted the important role of traditions of Indigenous environmental mobilities in allowing for multi-local, multi-generational, and trans-species sets of relations. In the traditions of the Anishinaabe, for example, “philosophies focus on fluid and transformative relationships as constituting the fabric of resilient societies”, in contrast to “how colonial power can operate as a containment strategy that works to curtail mobility”, suggesting alternative ways of thinking about migration, mobilities, displacement and climate justice (Whyte et al. 2019, 319). Nishnaabeg scholars such as Gerald Vizenor and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson describe Indigenous forms of sovereignty through the concept of “transmotion” (Simpson 2011, 89). Simpson argues “that Native transmotion is based on a reciprocal relationship with nature that is neither monotheistic nor territorially sovereign” and can be understood as an “interdependence between humans, animals, the natural world, the ancestors, and the cosmos” (as described in Fortier 2017, 79). Transmotion is suggestive of the multiplicity of transits and transfers across various kinds of boundaries that make mobile commoning possible: moves of comingling across space, subjectivity, materiality, sexuality, animality, temporality, and spirituality are all in play.

Across the place called Turtle Island — named by white settlers as America — diverse Indigenous peoples’ relations to land, water, places and mobilities have very different genealogies than those that have informed European theorizations of the commons.

Michelle A. Lelièvre's *Unsettling Mobility* (2017) also characterizes the Mi'kmaw practices of movement in Nova Scotia as far more than simply relocating from one place to another. Instead, she shows how movement can *emplace* people on the lands across which they move. Disrupting binaries of settled vs. mobile, Mi'kmaw mobility practices show how “both mobile and sedentary practices, the narratives associated with those practices, and the embodied experiences of them contribute to how people make places — in other words, to how they settle” (Lelièvre 2017). In this regard, practices such as seasonal mobility and access to particular landscapes —including rivers, forests, islands, shorelines, and mountains — have become a form of protest and assertion of cultural and political subjectivity for many Native American groups. Across the Wabanaki lands of the Northeast, where missionaries sought to settle Native peoples as small farmers, the Wabanaki have thus challenged the notion of settlement as sedentary.

A wide range of scholarship shows how Indigenous ontologies in many parts of the world avoid the separation of “Man” and “Nature” that has plagued Western philosophy. Non-binary understandings of mobility/settling incorporate a kind of relationality that is conducive to thinking in terms of commoning. People, animals and plants are in and of the land they come from and move through, and the land has both material and spiritual dimensions that are embodied in respectful human relations.

In white colonial settler states, in contrast, enclosure was (and is) crucial and settlement was sedentary, exclusionary, and grounded in the creation of private property. Even though original treaties made with Indigenous groups implied that they would still have rights to passage, and to hunt and gather food across certain lands in perpetuity — which were held in common by entire peoples — these treaties were quickly violated and land was stolen. Across white settler jurisdictions such as the United States, Canada, and Australia, existing indigenous commons were violently seized for private (individual and corporate) and public (state) property, and genocide ensued whether directly through attacking entire villages and killing or driving off all the people (see Linebaugh 2014 on Thomas Jefferson's policies to exterminate the Iroquois), or indirectly through massive forest cutting, eliminating species through hunting in certain territories, damming rivers, and blocking fish runs and spawning grounds.

Previously common pathways, waterways, and access across shared land used to gather common resources (plant fibers, foraged food, fishing and hunting rights) eventually became surrounded by private and public

(i.e., state) property, as enclosures and fences increasingly constricted human mobility. This process continues today. Most resource extraction takes place on once common-access Indigenous lands that were seized through settler colonialism, expropriation, and expulsion. Common land and common passage have been blocked by private property holders, corporations, and the state in various ways. Oil drilling, mining, forestry, and the building of hydroelectric dams have utilized the seizure of the commons, often in the form of “public” land, to generate private profits. In doing so, they have destroyed those commons, violating the social rules for sharing, allocating, and preserving places for future generations.

Yet, such forms of commoning are not a historical artefact that was simply wiped away with time, in fact they are constantly being renewed and practiced by Indigenous communities today, from the anti-extractivist challenges to lithium mining in remote places such as the Salar de Atacama in Chile (<https://yestolifenotomining.org/latest-news/ynm-lithium-communiqué/>) to the encampments to stop the building of oil pipelines across Native Lands in Turtle Island. As Silvia Federici noted, new forms of social cooperation are constantly being produced. The same argument can be found as well in the Caribbean and African diaspora commoning in the Americas. There is a deep and ongoing creation of emergent commons, as Clyde Woods argued, with “working class leadership, social vision, sustainable communities, social justice, and the construction of a new commons” (in Woods 2017, xxviii; as cited by Heynen 2020). This is another kind of mobile commoning that emerged within, between, and on the edges of plantation geographies, through the persistent counter-plantation practices that I turn to next.

Commoning as Counter-Plantation

Commoning also emerged in the transatlantic plantation zone, as people resisting slavery overturned capitalist forms of private land ownership and rejected the owning of human beings and brutal systems of enslavement. Caribbean, Afro-Indigenous, and African diaspora commoning took place along extra-state margins (marronage), within interstitial spaces of the plantation zone (the counter-plantation, ‘free spaces’, family land), and around settlement edges (piracy, banditry, criminality). Commoning took place at the juncture of built and natural environments (woods, rivers, swamps, underground); at the edges and interstices of urban and national formations (streets, borders, margins); and on the fugitive peripheries of geo-political-ecologies (maritime spaces, coastal

Commoning also emerged in the transatlantic plantation zone, as people resisting slavery overturned capitalist forms of private land ownership and rejected the owning of human beings and brutal systems of enslavement.

ports, islands), wherever runaways and resisters established counter-practices of mobile survival. The historian Julius S. Scott depicted these subversive mobilities in *The Common Wind*, his evocative narrative of the anti-slavery and anti-colonial communication networks that spanned subaltern worlds across the Atlantic and Caribbean, stirring rebellion and spreading news of revolution (Scott 2018).

This Atlantic world commons also came into social history “from below” through the work of Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker. The transformation of the noun “common” into the verb “commoning” was used by Linebaugh (2008) to highlight the active and collective process of making commons. Tracing the seafaring culture of sailors, pirates, and merchant seamen of the Anglo-American maritime world, Rediker likewise argued that “Mobility, fluidity, and dispersion were intrinsic to the seaman’s life”, producing a “nomadic” culture without firm geographic boundaries. Mobile workers spread information, ideas, and new practices around the ports of the Atlantic world, along with an insurrectionary politics, and they were not only European and North American, but also “West Indian, African and even Indian” (Rediker 1987, 297). In the midst of slavery, dislocation, piracy, exploitation, and incarceration, there took shape a mobile world of “sailors, pilots, felons, lovers, translators, musicians” and “mobile workers of all kinds [who] made new and unexpected connections” (Linebaugh and Rediker 2001, 6). The “many-headed hydra” formed by these rebellious working classes was a motley crew of “dispossessed commoners, transported felons, indentured servants, religious radicals, pirates, urban laborers, soldiers, sailors, and African slaves” (Linebaugh and Rediker 2001, 2-3).

Among the millions of African people captured, imprisoned and transported across the Atlantic into enforced slavery, thousands escaped and moved throughout the Americas in a vast system of subversive mobilities. Maroon communities escaped the plantations and found refuge deep within the hilly interiors of islands and coastal areas, or inside the swamps of North America, places where they also intermingled with Native Americans. Newly discovered primary sources and archeological evidence suggest that there was far more extensive maroon settlement in places such as the Great Dismal Swamp than historians had previously imagined (Diouf 2016; Sayers 2016; Nevius 2021; Morris 2022). Significant Maroon communities existed in French Guiana, in the Saramaka Maroon regions of Dutch Guiana (later Suriname), in the hilly interiors of Jamaica and Saint Domingue (where they successfully launched the Haitian Revolution), in the famous *quilombo* of Palmares in Brazil, in the *palenques* of Cuba and Colombia, in the Dismal

Swamp between Virginia and North Carolina, and many other forgotten places where fugitives “shoaled” together and sometimes joined forces with Indigenous communities (Lethabo King 2020). Recent studies have focused on the complex mobilities and interconnections between Maroon and Indigenous communities that exceeded the control of settler colonialism and indeed undermined it (Diouf 2016; Sayers 2016; Morris 2022). The self-emancipation of these rebel slave communities depended on their capability to move away from the plantation zone, to hide in remote places, to resist the slave patrols that sought after them, and to reproduce alternative food systems (Price 1987) and indeed alternative abolitionist geographies (Bledsoe 2017; Wright 2019).

Marronage of necessity invented a new relation to the land, to nature, and to forms of co-existence, as the Antillean political ecologist Malcom Ferdinand describes in his remarkable *Decolonial Ecology*, recently translated from the French:

Many Maroon escapes were conditioned by the *encounter* with a nature and a land that was sheltered from the plains of the plantations and the colonial order... The mountains of Martinique, Guadeloupe, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Jamaica, and Cuba, the great forests of Suriname and French Guiana, and the swampy environments of Mato Grosso in Brazil or those of Louisiana acted as ‘natural allies’, facilitating the dissimulation of fugitives and the survival of Maroon communities. This is more than just taking flight, as the Maroons practices ‘a skillful fugue [*fugue*]’ that disrupts colonial borders and opens up spaces of creation that are camouflaged by forests and swamps... *the Maroon must inhabit the uninhabitable*... Hillside-hideouts, hostile spaces become inhabited land. A *matrigenesis* emerges from this process of acclimatization by which the land and nature come to constitute the material womb and matrix of the Maroons’ existence (Ferdinand 2022, 149).

Through this “Maroon ecology” and politics of encounter, the settler colonial matricide is transformed into a matrigenesis of “Mother-Earth” (Ferdinand 2022, 149), which is very much a form of mobile commoning. Rejecting the ownership of land as private property and of people as slaves, Maroons, self-liberated slaves, and other runaways built new ways of living that reclaimed or reinvented “abolitionist ecologies” (Heynen 2020) as collective agro-ecological, communal, and spiritual (re)connections to the world.

Yet Maroon communities also forced accommodation of plantation capitalism to their ongoing existence through “petit marronage” and continuous small trade with enslaved workers. The historian Marcus

Rejecting the ownership of land as private property and of people as slaves, Maroons, self-liberated slaves, and other runaways built new ways of living that reclaimed or reinvented “abolitionist ecologies.”

Nevius shows how the Great Dismal Swamp became a “city of refuge” where slave-labor camps on the periphery of the swamp engaged in ever-shifting trade with those mobile runaways hiding in its deep interior (Nevius 2021). As the historian Natasha Lightfoot likewise emphasizes, drawing on the work of Stephanie Camp (2004), enslaved people in Antigua used spaces such as provision grounds and open-air marketplaces to create “a *rival geography* that defied the spatial confines of enslavement”. These “alternative ways of knowing and using plantation space” created a “rival geography [that] was characterized by motion: the movement of bodies, objects, and information within and around plantation space” (Lightfoot 2015, 47). Rival black geographies were a mobile commoning within the interstices of plantation societies, which also generated new kinds of collective relations (both human and more-than-human) that can serve as models for reparative relational commoning today.

In the Caribbean, this counter-plantation culture took the form of “family land” in the Anglophone territories and “lakou” in Haiti and the Francophone regions. As Jean Casimir (2020) shows for Haiti, the *moun andeyo* [outside people] — the largely African-descended rural peasantry — survived via a “counter-plantation system” that relied on small-scale landholding and spiritual relations to the land, known as the *lakou*. Often inhabited by generations of the same family, and a resting place for ancestral spirits, *lakou* became sites of ongoing resistance to exploitation and commodification because such land could not be individually sold or alienated from the collective kin group — it resisted property relations and supported human freedom to come and go, to be anchored in place and to move freely knowing there would be a place to return to. Against human enslavement and private property, the *lakou* represents a mobile commoning that freed people from capitalist relations of ownership.

In the Southern United States, similar arrangements took the form of “heir’s land” which was land deeded to groups of descendants, without individual title. These commonly held lands ensured all descendants of the family access and use in common, while moving back and forth to other places and not necessarily living there. More specifically, the geographer Nik Heynen has worked with the Gullah Geechee people of Sapelo Island, inspired by the late Ms. Cornelia Walker Bailey who sought “to build a commons out of the ruins of the plantation” expressed through her idea of ‘re-Earthing’. Heynen suggests that this “resonates with ideas Clyde Woods was discussing toward the end of his life about the political importance of the commons for Black geographies”

(Heynen 2020, 97). Heynen calls for going beyond the European theoretical tradition that analyzes commons and enclosure through the work of Karl Marx, Karl Polyani, and E.P. Thompson, since they “are based in Eurocentric frameworks that do not take seriously either the uneven power-relations of colonial history, white supremacy or patriarchy as defining societal characteristics of property relations, law or any of the interconnected institutions of society in between” (Heynen 2020, 107). The formation of “an agro-ecological model of commoning” on Sapelo Island can thus be imagined as an “abolitionist commons” (Heynen 2020, 108).

Like the re-Earthing movement created on Sapelo Island in Georgia, many recent movements of Indigenous cultures, Black farmers, and other food justice movements such as Via Campesina have proffered alternative farming, eating, and sharing foodways that suggest some possible designs for commoning. Black and Native American farmers across Turtle Island are reclaiming their relation to land, seeds, water and soil through food sovereignty and #LandBack movements, which entail diverse mobilities as much as place-making. Beyond land itself, we can also think of this in terms of re-Oceaning, including reclaiming the many existing practices that communities around the world rely on to gather and forage in the sea, on reefs, and at the margins between land and sea through maintenance of access to shorelines, beaches, river deltas, and various fisheries around the world. Such movements also call for protecting coral reefs, protecting beaches from sand mining, and stopping the growing business of deep-sea mining.

Black commons also blur the distinction between settlement and mobility, a topic that has been taken up more widely in the formation of African diaspora vernacular cultures. The musicologist Ben Barson, for example, argues that the traveling brass bands that arose out of sugar plantations in Louisiana generated a form of resistant commoning. Plantation workers turned music “into a means of exodus, allowing working-class Black structures of affiliation, work, and community to take root in and against a society that had attempted to extinguish these spaces... Building off a centuries-long inheritance, such bands reproduced a common that created new geographies of Black social life and created opportunities for plantation workers to contribute to an emerging Creolized culture that would come to be called jazz” (Barson 2022, 152-153).

The emergence of Blues music has more generally been described as a kind of subaltern commons by Robin D.G. Kelley (1996), Angela Y. Davis (1999) and Paul Gilroy (2010), suggesting a kind of musical mobility among roving practitioners and performers, as well as the

making of hidden undercommons and free spaces. These subaltern cultures of black commoning inform the lives so hauntingly described by Saidiya Hartman in *Wayward Lives, Beautiful Experiments*, in which she creates a “critical confabulation” of the Great Migration from the plantations of the US South to the urban ghettos of Philadelphia and New York. She describes the “long steady movement” of Black people as a “choreographed flight from rape, terror, and lynching” and towards the “tumult, vulgar collectivism, and anarchy” of the emerging ghetto (Hartman 2019, 108, 4). The lives they make inspire her understanding of the “wayward” — which is crucial for understanding forms of abolitionist commoning:

Wayward, related to the family of words: errant, fugitive, recalcitrant, anarchic, willful, reckless, troublesome, riotous, tumultuous, rebellious and wild... the avid longing for a world not ruled by master, man or the police. The errant path taken by the leaderless swarm in search of a place better than here. The social poesis that sustains the dispossessed. Wayward: the unregulated movement of drifting and wandering; sojourns without a fixed destination, ambulatory possibility, interminable migrations, rush and flight, black locomotion; the everyday struggle to live free. The attempt to elude capture by never settling. Not the master’s tools, but the ex-slave’s fugitive gestures, her traveling shoes. Waywardness articulates the paradox of cramped creation, the entanglement of escape and confinement, flight and captivity. Wayward: to wander, to be unmoored, adrift, rambling, roving, cruising, strolling, and seeking. To claim the right to opacity... It is the practice of the social otherwise, the insurgent ground that enables new possibilities and new vocabularies; it is the lived experience of enclosure and segregation, assembling and huddling together. It is the directionless search for a free territory; it is a practice of making and relation that enfolds within the policed boundaries of the dark ghetto; it is the mutual aid offered in the open-air prison. It is a queer resource of black survival. It is a *beautiful experiment* in how-to-live (Hartman 2019, 227-228).

In this stunning description of the Black mobile commons, we understand the ways in which generations of dispossessed and expropriated people have nonetheless practiced mobile commoning — as a way to exercise freedom in both the rural and urban worlds that uprooted and policed them, unmoored and confined them, and the structures of governance that sought to both capture and evict them. Bringing together Moten and Harney’s undercommons with Hartman’s wayward subjects,

In this stunning description of the Black mobile commons, we understand the ways in which generations of dispossessed and expropriated people have nonetheless practiced mobile commoning — as a way to exercise freedom in both the rural and urban worlds that uprooted and policed them, unmoored and confined them, and the structures of governance that sought to both capture and evict them.

we can imagine a “wayward undercommons” of experiments in mobile commoning as both a way of dwelling in places and in sharing free movement across space.

Migrant Commoning and Commoning Mobilities

The contemporary politics of migration and bordering speaks to all of these strands of mobile commoning. The politics of enclosure, displacement and capture engrained in settler colonialism and racial capitalism leads to the contemporary forms of migrant interdiction, detention and deportation that deny life to Indigenous, Black and Brown commoners. To cross the border is to seek the freedom of collective encounters and reclaim mobile commoning. As the late queer theorist José Esteban Muñoz put it, in *The Sense of Brown*:

The brown commons is not about the production of the individual but instead about a movement, a flow, and an impulse to move beyond the singular and individualized subjectivities. It is about the swerve of matter, organic and otherwise, the moment of contact, the encounter and all that it can generate (Muñoz 2020, xxxiii).

Free movement across space is of course deeply connected to the question of mobility regimes that control migration and uphold the free flow of capital alongside the controlled movement of labor. Mobility regimes are racialized, gendered, and sexually policed — countered here by the queer “sense of brown” commons as dispersed and rhizomatic flows (Muñoz 2020).

Migration has also been identified as a site for making new commons and mobile practices of commoning. Hardt and Negri note the significance of migrants, who they say play a fundamental role in shaping the contemporary world since they engage in making new commons:

[Those] who cross border and nations, deserts and seas, who are forced to live precariously in ghettos and take the most humiliating work in order to survive, who risk the violence of police and anti-immigrant mobs, demonstrate the central connections between the processes of translation and the experience of ‘commoning’: multitudes of strangers, in transit and staying put, invent new means of communicating with others, new modes of acting together, new sites of encounter and assembly — in short they constitute a new commons without ever losing their singularities (Hardt and Negri 2017, 152-153).

This migrant commoning through an ongoing effort of encounter and assembly is crucial to the mobile commons as a space of radical potentiality. Migrant commoning pushes at the boundaries of mobility justice and suggests the more radical *unsettling* of borders in a world marked by climate disasters and displacement, especially of Indigenous, Black and Brown people.

The concept of “mobile commons” first began to appear in the study of migration to challenge state-centered approaches with a more autonomous understanding of migrants’ own perspectives. Papadopoulos and Tsianos initially characterized the mobile commons as consisting of five main elements: “the invisible knowledge of mobility” such as knowledge about transit routes, shelters, border crossings etc.); an “infrastructure of connectivity” such as media platforms, word of mouth, and social networks; “a multiplicity of informal economies” including knowledge of how to secure short-term work or engage with smugglers; “diverse forms of transnational communities of justice” such as solidarity groups, shelters, and NGOs; and “the politics of care” such as providing affective support, building trust, caring for people’s relatives, etc. (Papadopoulos and Tsianos 2013, 191-192).

Further studies of migration have begun to discuss an “ontology of moving people” in which mobile commons are “generated, used, and extended... between people on the move”, including the “shared knowledge, affective cooperation, mutual support and care between migrants” while on the move (Trimikliniotis, Parsanoglou, and Tsianos 2015, 19; Trimikliniotis, Parsanoglou, and Tsianos 2016, 1041). Scholars also highlight the role of practices of social reproduction and women’s unpaid reproductive work as necessary to value and reclaim in building social relations in commons (Angulo Pasel 2019). The materiality of labor, energy, and reproduction are also crucial here. Anna Davidson’s work on theorizing “radical mobilities” furthermore pushes beyond a simply critical analysis of mobility justice towards “a rhizomatic understanding of mobility as material-semiotic transformation of energy. This ontology shifts understandings of what just and sustainable mobilities can be” (Davidson 2021, 25).

In the broader field of mobility studies, commoning mobilities seeks to take back the common shared space of the street and transport infrastructure. In theorizing *mobility as common*, Nikolaeva, Adey and Creswell seek to envision more “inclusive and collaboratively governed” cities, in which planners and policymakers draw “on the logics of commoning such as communal decision-making practices, openness to new forms of perceiving the right to mobility as well as the right to immo-

bility (the right not to be displaced), the awareness of the social production of mobility and the power relations inherent in it, as well as the commitment to creating equity and working in the interest of the public good” (Nikolaeva et al. 2019, 353). They suggest that commoning mobilities goes beyond shared transportation or public accessibility, to questions of decision-making, equity, and shared space in the name of the public good.

In my own book *Mobility Justice* I sought to show how power and inequality inform the governance and control of (im)mobilities, connecting across the scales of the body, the city street, urban infrastructure, national borders, and planetary extractive economies through the concept of mobility justice (Sheller 2018). This led me to the notion of commoning mobilities as a way of addressing intersecting challenges of uneven mobilities. If control over (im)mobilities is a primary way in which dominant hierarchies of gender, race, sexuality, nationality and disability are produced, then commoning mobilities can enact new ways of being in the world, becoming a method for moving toward mobility justice, environmental justice, racial justice, climate justice, and social justice. Mobile commoning implies a kind of mindful movement, shared with others, and based upon forms of solidarity, reciprocity, caring, trust, generosity, and stewardship. It means moving over the Earth lightly, carefully, with concern for others, and accompaniment across difference (cf. Sultana 2021, 2022).

Conclusion

In this article I have suggested ways to build on Indigenous, Black, Brown, and African diasporic theories of the commons to push forward recent political mobilizations around “reclaiming the commons”. By centering the existing radical notions of commoning that are grounded in Indigenous, Black, Caribbean and African diaspora philosophies and practices, we can connect the tradition of European social history “from below” to contemporary struggles for relational commoning, migrant justice, and queer undercommons. While we cannot ignore the incommensurabilities and contradictions that arise from co-creating commons within settler colonial spaces, we can reflect on these conjoined histories to imagine alternative futures that might unsettle settler colonialism and the traditional commons in productive ways (Fortier 2017). Tracing the histories of Indigenous Maroon, Afro-Caribbean and African-American commoning as relations of mobile place-making, we see the contours

Mobile commoning implies a kind of mindful movement, shared with others, and based upon forms of solidarity, reciprocity, caring, trust, generosity, and stewardship.

Tracing the histories of Indigenous Maroon, Afro-Caribbean and African-American commoning as relations of mobile place-making, we see the contours of a fugitive undercommons that challenges binary concepts of race, gender, nation, and sexuality.

of a fugitive undercommons that challenges binary concepts of race, gender, nation, and sexuality. Indeed, the various threads of mobile commoning that I have described here are in fact braided together, into a powerful confluence of Indigenous, Black, Brown and multiracial commoning that is informing rising social movements that also call into question existing binaries of gender and sexuality.

This is just a preliminary sketch of some thinking in this area, and some thinkers who have inspired this train of thought. Far more work is needed not simply to unearth these forms of knowledge and praxis, but to re-Earth and re-Ocean them, as Ms. Bailey understood, by putting more-than-human practices of mobile commoning into practice more widely and urgently. Another dimension of this thinking pertains to how academics can help build participatory praxis around commoning with communities, as Nik Heynen has attempted to do in Sapelo Island. How is knowledge mobilized through commoning, shared through the “common wind” (Scott 2018), and intentionally turned towards commoning rather than enclosure? How do we turn the relations between land, water, thought, and energy into actions for the common good, and make the shared commoning of lifeways into more sustainable, wayward, radical, mobile politics? That is the challenge passed down to us by the converging encounters of Indigenous, Black, Brown, Caribbean and African diaspora mobile commoning.

References

- Agyeman, Julian, and Kofi Boone. 2020. “Land loss has plagued black America since emancipation — is it time to look again at ‘black commons’ and collective ownership?” *The Conversation*, June 18, <https://theconversation.com/land-loss-has-plagued-black-america-since-emancipation-is-it-time-to-look-again-at-black-commons-and-collective-ownership-140514>.
- Angulo Pasel, Carla. 2018. “The Journey of Central American Women Migrants: Engendering the Mobile Commons” *Mobilities* 13(6): 894-909.
- Barbagallo, Camille, Nicholas Beuret, and David Harvie, eds. 2019. *Commoning: With George Caffentzis and Silvia Federici*. London: Pluto Press.
- Barson, Benjamin. 2022. “You can Blow Your brains out and You Ain’t getting nowhere’: Jazz, collectivism, and the struggle for ecological

- commons in Louisiana's Sugar Parishes." In Bronhill, Leigh, Salvatore Engel-Di Mauro, Terran Giacomini, Ana Isla, Michael Löwy, and Terisa E. Turner (eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Ecosocialism*. London: Routledge.
- Berlant, Lauren. 2016. "The Commons: Infrastructures for troubling times." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 34(3): 393-419.
- Blackmar, Elizabeth. 2006. "Appropriating 'the Commons': The Tragedy of Property Rights Discourse." In Low, Setha, and Neil Smith (eds.). *The Politics of Public Space*, 49-80. New York and London: Routledge.
- Bledsoe, Adam. 2017. "Marronage as a past and present geography in the Americas." *Southeastern Geographer* 57(1): 30-50.
- Caffentzis, George, and Silvia Federici. 2014. "Commons against and beyond capitalism." *Community Development Journal* 49: 92-105.
- Camp, Stephanie M.H. 2004. *Closer to Freedom: Enslaved Women and Everyday Resistance in the Plantation South*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Casimir, Jean. 2020. *The Haitians: A Decolonial History*. Translated by Laurent Dubois. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Chatterton, Paul. 2016. "Building transitions to post-capitalist urban commons." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 41: 403-415.
- Chatterton, Paul. 2010. "Seeking the urban common: furthering the debate on spatial justice." *City* 14: 625-628.
- Chatterton, Paul, David Featherstone, and Paul Routledge. 2012. "Articulating climate justice in Copenhagen: antagonism, the commons, and solidarity." *Antipode* 45: 602-620.
- Clement, Floriane, Wendy Harcourt, Deepa Joshi, and Chizu Sato. 2019. "Feminist political ecologies of the commons and commoning." *International Journal of the Commons* 13(1): 1-15.
- Clifford, James. 1992. In Grossberg, Lawrence, Cary Nelson, and Paula A. Treichler (eds.). *Cultural Studies*, 96-116. New York: Routledge.
- Coulthard, Glean Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Davidson, A.C. 2021. "Radical Mobilities." *Progress in Human Geography* 45(1): 25-48.
- Davis, Angela Y. 1999. *Blues Legacies and Black Feminism: Gertrude 'Ma' Rainey, Bessie Smith, and Billie Holiday*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Diouf, Sylviane A. 2016. *Slavery's Exiles: The Story of the American Maroons*. New York: NYU Press.

- Federici, Silvia. 2018. *Re-Enchanting the World: Feminism and the Politics of the Commons*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.
- Ferdinand, Malcolm. 2022. *Decolonial Ecology: Thinking from the Caribbean World*. Translated by Anthony Paul Smith. Cambridge and Medford, MA: Polity Press.
- Fortier, Craig. 2017. *Unsettling the Commons: Social Movements Within, Against, and Beyond Settler Colonialism*. Winnipeg: Arp Books.
- Gilroy, Paul. 2010. *Darker than Blue: On the Moral economies of Black Atlantic Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2017. *Assembly*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hartman, Saidiya. 2019. *Wayward Lives, Beautiful Experiments: Intimate histories of riotous Black girls, troublesome women, and queer radicals*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Heynen, Nik. 2020. "A plantation can be a commons': re-Earthing Sapelo Island through Abolition Ecology." *Antipode* 53(1): 95-114.
- Jeffrey, Alex, Colin McFarlane, and Alex Vasudevan. 2012. "Rethinking enclosure: space, subjectivity and the commons." *Antipode* 44: 1247-1267.
- Kelley, Robin D.G. 1996. *Race Rebels: Culture, Politics, and the Black Working Class*. New York: The Free Press.
- Klein, Naomi. 2001. "Reclaiming the Commons." *New Left Review* 9: 81-89.
- Lelièvre, Michelle A. 2017. *Unsettling Mobility: Mediating Mi'kmaq Sovereignty in Post-Contact Nova Scotia*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Lethabo King, Tiffany. 2020. *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Lightfoot, Natasha. 2015. *Troubling Freedom: Antigua and the Aftermath of British Emancipation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Linebaugh, Peter 2008. *The Magna Carta Manifesto*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Linebaugh, Peter 2014. *Stop, Thief!: The Commons, Enclosures, and Resistance*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.
- Linebaugh, Peter, and Marcus Rediker. 2001. *The Many Headed-Hydra: The Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- McLaren, Duncan, and Julian Agyeman. 2015. *Sharing Cities: A Case for Truly Smart and Sustainable Cities*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Morris, J. Brent. 2022. *Dismal Freedom: A History of the Maroons of the*

- Great Dismal Swamp*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Moten, Fred, and Stefano Harney. 2013. *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning and Black Study*. London: Minor Compositions.
- Muñoz, José Esteban. 2020. *The Sense of Brown*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Nevius, Marcus P. 2021. *City of Refuge: Slavery and Petit Marronage in the Great Dismal Swamp, 1763-1856*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Nikolaeva, Anna, Peter Adey, Tim Cresswell, Jane Yeonjae Lee, Andre NÓvoa, and Cristina Temenos. 2019. "Commoning mobility: Towards a new politics of mobility transitions." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 44: 346-360.
- Nordling, V., Sager, M. and Söderman, E. 2017. "From citizenship to mobile commons: reflections on the local struggles of undocumented migrants in the city of Malmö, Sweden." *Citizenship Studies* 21: 710-726.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Papadopoulos, Dimitris, and Vassilis S. Tsianos. 2013. "After Citizenship: Autonomy of Migration, Organisational Ontology and Mobile Commons." *Citizenship Studies* 17(2): 178-196.
- Price, Richard, ed. 1987. *Maroon Societies: Rebel Slave Communities in the Americas*, Second Edition. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Pulido, Laura. 2018. „Geographies of Race and Ethnicity III: Settler Colonialism and Non-Native People of Color." *Progress in Human Geography* 42(2): 309-318. 10.1177/0309132516686011.
- Rediker, Marcus. 1987. *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: Merchant Seamen, Pirates, and the Anglo-American Maritime World, 1700-1750*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sayers, Daniel O. 2016. *A Desolate Place for a Defiant People: The Archaeology of Maroons, Indigenous Americans, and Enslaved Laborers in the Great Dismal Swamp*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida Press.
- Scott, Julius S. 2018. *The Common Wind: Afro-American Currents in the Age of the Haitian Revolution*, Reprint. London and New York: Verso.
- Sheller, Mimi. 2018. *Mobility Justice: The Politics of Movement in an Age of Extremes*. London and New York: Verso.
- Sheller, Mimi, and John Urry. 2006. "The New Mobilities Paradigm." *Environment and Planning A* 38: 207-226.
- Simpson, Audra. 2014. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the*

- Borders of Settler States*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. 2017. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. 2011. *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence and a New Emergence*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring.
- Sultana, Farhana. 2021. "Critical climate justice." *The Geographical Journal* 188(1): 118-124.
- Sultana, Farhana. 2022. "Resplendent Care-full Climate Revolutions." *Political Geography* 99(1): 102638. DOI: 10.1016/j.polgeo.2022.102638.
- Trimikliniotis, Nicos, Dimitris Parsanoglou, and Vassilis S. Tsianos. 2015. *Mobile commons, migrant digitalities and the right to the city*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Pivot.
- Trimikliniotis, Nicos, Dimitris Parsanoglou, and Vassilis S. Tsianos. 2016. "Mobile Commons And/In Precarious Spaces: Mapping Migrant Struggles and Social Resistance." *Critical Sociology* 42(7/8): 1035-1049.
- Turner, Matthew D. 2016. "Political ecology III: The commons and commoning." *Progress in Human Geography* 41: 795-802.
- Walters, William. 2015. "Migration, Vehicles and Politics: Three Theses on Viapolitics." *European Journal of Social Theory* 18(4): 469-488.
- Whyte, Kyle, Jared L. Talley, and Julia D. Gibson. 2019. "Indigenous Mobility Traditions, Colonialism, and the Anthropocene." *Mobilities* 14(3): 319-335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2019.1611015>
- Williams, Miriam J. 2017. "Urban commons are more-than-property." *Geographical Research* 56(1): 16-25.
- Woods, Clyde. 2017. *Development Drowned and Reborn: The Blues and Bourbon Restorations in Post-Katrina New Orleans*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Wright, Willie Jamaal. 2019. "The morphology of marronage." *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2019.1664890>.

MIMI SHELLER, Ph.D. – is Inaugural Dean of The Global School at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, in Massachusetts. She was previously Professor of Sociology, Head of the Sociology Department, and founding Director of the Center for Mobilities Research and Policy at Drexel University in Philadelphia. She served as President of the International Association for the History of Transport, Traffic and Mobility (2014–2017), founding co-editor of the journal *Mobilities*, and Associate Editor of *Transfers: International Journal of Mobility Studies*. Dr. Sheller has published more than 130 articles and book chapters, and is the author or co-editor of fifteen books, including *Advanced Introduction to Mobilities* (Edward Elgar, 2021); *Island Futures: Caribbean Survival in the Anthropocene* (Duke University Press, 2020); *Mobility Justice: The Politics of Movement in an Age of Extremes* (Verso, 2018); *Aluminum Dreams: The Making of Light Modernity* (MIT Press, 2014); *Citizenship from Below* (Duke University Press, 2012); *Consuming the Caribbean* (Routledge, 2003); and *Democracy After Slavery* (Macmillan Caribbean, 2000).

Address:

Dean of The Global School
Worcester Polytechnic Institute
email: msheller@wpi.edu

Citation:

Sheller, Mimi. 2022. „Mobile Commoning: Reclaiming Indigenous, Caribbean, Maroon, and Migrant Commons.” *Praktyka Teoretyczna* 4(46): 29–52.

DOI: 10.19195/prt.2022.4.2

Autorka: Mimi Sheller

Tytuł: Mobilne współnianie: odzyskiwanie rdzennych, karaibskich, zbiegowskich i migranckich dóbr wspólnych

Abstrakt: W ciągu dwóch ostatnich dekad koncept dóbr wspólnych został ponownie odkryty jako skuteczna zasada organizacyjna dla ruchów społecznych, radykalnej myśli politycznej i teorii krytycznej. Koncept współniania został również przyjęty w obrębie dyskusji nad migracjami i krytycznymi badaniami wokół mobilności. Niniejszy artykuł zaczyna od prześledzenia niektórych spośród wyłaniających się idei współniania jako relacyjnej praktyki obecnej w wielu politycznych mobilizacjach na rzecz „odzyskiwania dóbr wspólnych”. Następnie zwraca się w stronę podejść wobec współniania, które usiłują sproblematyzować jego euro-amerykańskie historie poprzez koncentrację na rdzennych praktykach rady-

kalnego współniania, karaibskich i obecnych w afrykańskiej diasporze form mobilnego współniania i najnowszych koncepcji takich jak podziemne dobra wspólne, queerowe dobra wspólne czy migranckie mobilne współnianie. Artykuł stawia pytanie: w jaki sposób praktyki mobilnego współniania mogą pomóc nam wyobrazić sobie sposoby na zdemontowanie istniejących przemocowych układów i destrukcyjnych nie/ruchomości wyznaczanych przez grodzienia, kolonialność, imperializm i kapitalistyczną ekstrakcję?

Słowa kluczowe: współnianie, kontr-plantacja, ludy rdzenne, maroni, mobilności, podziemne dobra wspólne