

# Introduction: Strategic entanglements – un/commoning as relational labour of articulating resource modalities

Critique of Anthropology

2025, Vol. 45(1) 3–14

© The Author(s) 2025



Article reuse guidelines:

[sagepub.com/journals-permissions](https://sagepub.com/journals-permissions)

DOI: 10.1177/0308275X251315275

[journals.sagepub.com/home/coa](https://journals.sagepub.com/home/coa)**Andreas Streinzer** 

University of Vienna, Austria

**Jelena Tošić**

University of St Gallen, Switzerland

## Abstract

In the introduction to this special issue, the authors focus on ‘strategic entanglements’ in the study of the commons, commoning, and accumulation by dispossession. They challenge the recent scholarly focus on projects that understand themselves as outside of capitalisms or other hegemonic economic systems. Instead, Streinzer and Tošić understand social reproduction as a totality of assemblages of actors and relations of capital, labour, property, investment, kinship, state, commons and more at play. In these assemblages, the commons coexist, compromise and collaborate with other forms of resource organisation and property regimes. The special issue zooms in on how actors navigate these entanglements to create, sustain, or undo their own projects and politics. Strategic entanglements is hence a perspective that helps in understanding the inter-dependences of various forms of property regimes and in investigating the kinds of relational labour involved in articulating them.

## Keywords

Commons, commoning, entanglement, labour, capitalism

---

## Corresponding author:

Andreas Streinzer, Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Vienna, NIG, Universitätsstraße 7, Vienna 1010, Austria.

Email: [andreas.streinzer@univie.ac.at](mailto:andreas.streinzer@univie.ac.at)

## Introduction

Anthropology is again debating the commons and commoning. The 2022 EASA conference in Belfast was based on the theme of ‘Transformation, Hope and the Commons’, and the German Association conference in 2025 bears the title ‘Un/Commoning Anthropology’: these are only two large events where questions of common resource organisation have been put centre stage.

The world gives anthropology plenty of reasons to talk about resource politics. The age of extinction and climate collapse, the exacerbation of dispossession and commons grabbing, contestations of the radicalisation of racial capitalism; every angle on the multiple crises of the contemporary requires us to think about for whom and to what ends resources are organised.

We and the authors of this special issue have taken this opportunity to think about the orientation of scholarship in the anthropology of the commons and commoning. Based on a critique of narrow definitions and the under-exploration of the articulation of the commons with other resource modalities, we propose a focus on strategic entanglements.<sup>1</sup>

Recent anthropological work on the commons tends to use categorical definitions of the commons, dividing them analytically from other forms of resource organisation, and then focusing on their organisation of worldviews, boundary work or, in the case of uncommoning, capture. This focus on carving out resources and managing them among a group of people, the kinds of stewardship, and the political imaginaries attached to them, is important and has produced vibrant scholarship. Yet, it centres the exceptionality of the commons in a way that makes it difficult to understand them as entangled with other forms of resource organisation and property regimes, as parts of the whole of social reproduction.

This special issue proposes looking at what we call ‘strategic entanglements’ between various forms of resource organisation or property regimes. This perspective understands them in their specific features, while holding in view their articulation with other forms of organisation of resources and property, and how the idea of the commons is captured, manipulated, or compromised in commoning and uncommoning efforts that do not fall easily into the categories usually in focus in the anthropology of the commons. With this focus, we seek to contribute to recent efforts at understanding projects of collective resource organisation in broader terms than the narrow focus on commoning (Bäumer Escobar, 2020; Mögenburg, 2022; Morgen and Erickson, 2017; Schwenkel, 2022; Trémon, 2022).

## The commons: Other to capitalism and the market?

The commons are discussed in several anthropological literatures, each with their own analytical frameworks and themes. The ‘commons’ are often understood as an economic anthropological modality of resource organisation conceived in Polanyian categories of society versus the market (Gudeman, 2008). The literature on ‘commoning’ centres left-leaning projects that involve collective ownership and management, and tend towards non-commodified social relations (Bodirsky, 2018: 125). This approach often concerns

the more urban (Susser, 2017) and egalitarian (Ticktin, 2021: 38) forms of commoning. Employing a distinction from Don Kalb and Massimiliano Mollona, they fall into a more idealist perspective (Kalb and Mollona, 2018: 7) on the commons that foregrounds the motivating values and aims of often counter-cultural projects. We see our argument as being based more in what Kalb and Mollona call ‘anthropological political economy’ (Kalb and Mollona, 2018: 7), which does not understand the commons as outside or otherwise to capitalism, but rather as a part of an integrated whole that is social reproduction (Narotzky, 2012). Such a perspective is more interested in the material circumstances and historical possibilities in which such projects arise, by which people – as a result of political tactics or necessity, or both – organise collective forms of ownership and stewardship. This view also brings into focus forms of uncommoning, of resource grabs, and of ‘accumulation by dispossession’ (Harvey, 2004), and tends to stem from neo-Marxian frameworks and those that employ social reproduction perspectives (Weiss, 2022).

## **Social reproduction and the entanglement of various realms of economic practice**

A social reproduction perspective is a lens that allows us to see various forms of labour (Narotzky, 2018), property regimes (Bodirsky, 2018), relations of social organisation (James, 2020), as well as hierarchies of difference, be they race (Bhattacharyya, 2018) or gender (Ferguson, 2016; Gleeson, 2019), and how they work together in re-creating (capitalist) societies. In contemporary ‘unitary perspectives’ (Bhattacharya, 2017; Vogel, 2017), scholars understand a wide array of productive and reproductive forces and their social organisation, at play (Bear et al., 2015). These articulations and this interplay exist in, as we argue, complex entanglements. Rather than being neatly distinguishable cogwheels that together turn the wheel of history, social reproduction is more an assemblage of actors and relations of capital, labour, property, investment, kinship, state, commons and more. Its parts are interdependent, and they co-constitute and create each other in their relations.

These dialectical assemblages (Campbell, 2021; Streinzer, 2024) require a double sensitivity on the part of scholars trying to understand the actors and projects involved in them. First, the categorical distinctions between them as either capitalist or non-capitalist, state or market collectives (and so on) is a matter of boundary making in the actually existing configurations of social reproduction. Boundary making is a process that involves law (Eckert and Knöpfel, 2020), struggles for responsibility (Fraser and Jaeggi, 2018), and, among others, the kinds of oppositions that actors re-create in their anti-capitalist endeavours, such as many forms of commoning. While these forms of making difference and relating are important in their own right, they require a second analytical sensibility: to understand them in their relations to one another, while actors work on the assumption that they are actually separate. It is to this second sensibility that we want to contribute with our proposal of strategic entanglements.

In the literature, the imaginary geography of commons and commonings often rests on analytical oppositions (or the signature anthropological move to first define categorical

boundaries and then claim they are permeable or blurry). This perspective has benefits. Such oppositions and boundaries allow us to tease out when forms of resource organisation shift, are taken away, or are resisted, or fought against. This is important for engaged and critical anthropology, as well as for these actors in the world who contest the rising inequalities, booming emissions, and increasing authoritarianism that come with the capitalist conjuncture through which we live. For them, and for us, these distinctions are important. For a thorough analysis, however, they are not the whole picture. Rather, the conditions, conjunctures, and co-constitutions in which they are created are crucial to understanding the relations and interdependencies in which projects of un/commoning exist.

So, while farming commoners, for example, might be proud owners of land and producers of milk, their sustainable existence might be dependent on capitalist milk markets. Urban commons might strategically work together with state actors such as municipalities to avoid eviction or other forms of intervention, creating their relatively autonomous socio-economic spaces by agreed-upon detachment from the state. Kinship networks might be crucial for collective land ownership. And many more examples can point to the importance of keeping the circumstances of the commons and its interdependencies in the picture.

When looking at these articulations in social reproduction, we see how they play together, in their differences, in creating the economic configurations in which people live, labour, and make ends meet. We understand this addition to the literature on the commons with Susana Narotzky: 'Instead of an either/ or we now have a with/ and approach to different modalities and moralities of provisioning and economic growth, where people's actions are framed according to different value realms' (Narotzky, 2012: 246). The special issue is about the kinds of relational labour that create, maintain, or break strategic entanglements between these different realms, as people seek to navigate the dependencies and power differentials in which they try to make a living and a life worth living (Harvey and Krohn-Hansen, 2018: 8).

## **Impure coexistences and the labour of strategic entanglement**

Our proposal is to re-focus attention on what Elsa Noterman calls the 'actually existing commons' as 'political project[s] based in, and co-constitutive of, the struggle over sites of capitalist production' (Noterman, 2016: 434). The relational labour that people engage in is then a part of contemporary class relations (Bodirsky, 2018: 126), understood as unstable bundles of interdependencies (Kalb, 2015: 14). How people attempt to act in them and seek to create, shield, and maintain their collective projects of commoning then becomes less a question of categorical distinctions, and more about the affordances of the specific situations in which people find themselves when trying to common. The distinction in relation to the mostly idealist anthropology of commoning becomes apparent with an example from Andreas' work in Greece.

The financial crisis that riddled households, companies, and government finances had created an environment in which authoritarian austerity was organised to 'save Greece' (Streinzer, 2024). An unprecedented number of initiatives, collectives, and associations

mushroomed, seeking to balance necessity and political aspiration of an outside to austerity and capitalism (Streinzer, 2018). When Andreas arrived in Volos in 2014, the local initiatives were nevertheless desperate. They had read an impressive amount of literature about commoning and that is what many wanted to do: to push back the market and the state and to create their own economic circuits. And yet, when it came to necessities such as agricultural products or circumventing state authorities, they felt as if they were failing. The hope surrounding the political purity of their endeavour met an always impure reality. Farmers were reluctant to engage with them, authorities looked at them with a suspicious eye, and they could not escape remaining integrated into capitalist and state structures. When it came to agriculture, farmers might have had land and labour, but they needed machinery, fertiliser, and fuel, and all of these needed to be bought from capitalist markets. The need for money, to pay for inputs and pay back debt, chained them to an integration they wanted to turn away from. Production was controlled by various authorities, who insisted that selling among associates needed to be taxed, and hygiene controlled. It was not only state bureaucrats who wanted to increase control: other farmers suffered from the cheaper competition of the commoners.

Briefly, the questions they discussed among themselves and with Andreas were about how to coexist with other forms of resource organisation. They strategised about the right kinds of balance and the speed of commoning. How could they navigate relations with state and market actors, how should they substitute other forms of resource organisation step-by-step, where was the challenge too big, where could they not escape entanglement. The reality of the entangled existence of their commoning made them ask questions about strategies and tactics in their respective entanglements.

Hence, we started to work on a perspective that does not shy away from seeing these entanglements, but instead focuses on them as a contribution to thinking about and with commoning from a sympathetic political stance, and yet a sceptical anthropological one. Sceptical, because we see how important claims to political purity and the imaginary of an alternative to capitalism can be for economic movements. And rightly so. Yet, time and again, it turns out that much of their everyday labour and thinking revolves around how to act in forms of articulation and entanglement (Bodirsky, 2018; Narotzky, 2012; Trémon, 2022).

Often, this seems to haunt the recent literature on the commons and commoning, confronting it with a challenge to the idea of a pure politics, outside of the state and capitalism. And often entanglements smack of the three dirty Cs: compromise, coexistence, and collaboration. Yet – and we read this in a range of ethnographic examples – actors engaged in commoning are very aware of the necessity of strategic entanglements to be able to claim some sort of socio-economic space in which one can be relatively autonomous – creating room for manoeuvre by acknowledging interdependence. To account for these kinds of moves and thoughts, while providing a robust picture of commoning in the contemporary conjuncture, in our special issue, we explore the practices and relations created, maintained and undone by strategic entanglements.

Strategic entanglements as a perspective is not a counter-proposal to the literatures already focusing on commons, commoning, or forms of uncommoning, such as accumulation by dispossession. Rather, it is an attempt to contribute to the analytical and

critical strength of the literature by providing a perspective that might lead us out of ‘feedback loops’ (Streinzer, this special issue) and what Sherry Ortner calls ‘ethnographic refusal’ (Ortner, 1995), that posits too easily an either/ or perspective concerning resistance. Strategic entanglement is infused with perspectives from various literatures: the processual and relational from discussions of commoning; the categorical and the thinking about boundary work from the commons; and the critical contextualisation of capitalist dynamics from accumulation by dispossession. And yet, through respective critiques, we hope to add to them by showing how commoners and people engaged in un/commoning act strategically, balance out, aim for the parasitic or fugitive, and other forms of articulating resource modalities.

## **Fragments of attachment and detachment**

This perspective focuses on the practice, relations, and circumstances of un/commoning as it exists in various attachments and detachments to other forms of resource organisation, such as state, capitalist, socialist, feudal, gift, kinship, and others. Besides an analysis of the resource modalities involved in producing, maintaining or undoing configurations of commoning, we want to think about the politics of definition that people engage in when they argue what, when, and where something is ‘common’. We also consider how people aim to strategically act in the respective entanglements as commoning or uncommoning (more or less of that defined as commons), and what they leave out in the process. Hence, the perspective is first and foremost ethnographic, in the sense of following and reconstructing – that is, to detect ‘fragments’ (Mezzadri, 2021) and to link them to an analysis of the situation and genealogies in which they exist and make sense.

The analytical framework of strategic entanglements goes beyond categorical definitions: it claims that commons and commoning is not only boundary work, as a horizontal practice of conceptual bordering and working on categories; but also integration, as a vertical practice of engaging with the effects and necessities of global capitalism and other forms of resource organisation that put commoners in relations of dependence and differentiation. The commons are always already related to other forms of resource organisation, and this perspective allows for a thorough analysis of both the economic relationalities as well as the imaginaries and histories in which people think about them, or ignore parts of them. Hence, we understand un/commoning as a modality of resource organisation and as relational practice of attaching and detaching from other such modalities.

We understand our critique in this special issue to be inherently political. We acknowledge the vision of commons as different outsides of hegemonic/dominant forms of resource control and distribution, yet we want to sharpen and extend the boundary-making lens by zooming in to how commoning practices engage strategic and ambivalent entanglements with non-commons, and how these processes change through time and socio-economic transformations. This focus reconstructs how modalities of resource provision are made and imagined as commons, how the commons are in relation to other forms of the organisation of resources (such as capitalist modes) or how they can be

sustained as commons in a mainly capitalist ecology of social reproduction, and how anthropology can advance the debate by integrating several sets of critique in an understanding of what the question of commons entails.

## The issues and the articles

The articles compiled in this collection all add to this critique, and qualification, of literature in the anthropology of commoning and the commons. They all follow a distinct critique from which we take different routes that an analysis of strategic entanglements can produce. In order to address the multiple crises that force us to think and think again about resource organisation, we have grouped the papers in the collection in relation to three central themes.

### *Commons as relations of nature, society, future*

The first line of critique brings the focus on strategic entanglements to analyses of human–environment relations in an age of extinction, climate crises, and energy shortage. The articles problematise the idea that ‘nature’ primarily exists as resources for the sustenance of human society. As Marisol de la Cadena reminds us, such a view also rests on a Eurocentric understanding of the ontological difference between nature and society ([de la Cadena, 2018](#)). We think beyond this and include engagements with how the use and organisation of resources are entangled with the more-than-human. Hence, the authors of this set of articles discuss ‘commons’ through an ecological and political-ecological lens, one that understands them as relations between environments, societal infrastructures, and futures. The perspectives critique an all-too-settled understanding of commons as ‘Other’ to capitalism, and instead look at the relations of mutual dependence and potential exploitation that common resources can entail.

Miriam Tola, in her article, works with the possibilities of collective flourishing in capitalist ruins. From a critical environmental humanities perspective, she takes us to the Bullicante lake in Rome, Italy, formerly an abandoned industrial area that was supposed to become a shopping centre. Activists attempted to stop the development, aided by the expansion of the lake. Interestingly, the lake emerges as a strategic partner hindering commodification, forming ‘relations of care and repair in a situated struggle for countering urban property arrangements and crafting enduring paths of decommodification’.

Charlotte Bruckermann’s article analyses how future ecological civilisations are imagined in China. She discusses the proposed environmental policies of the Communist Party and their efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Bruckermann introduces the idea of the atmospheric commons to trace carbon as air pollution, as an asset in financial markets, and through the perspectives of ‘sci-fi enthusiasts and eco-utopian thinkers in both rural and urban areas, [and] their own visions for a shared future that go beyond the narrow focus on growth, markets, and pricing’.

### *Commons as resource modalities*

The second line of critique builds on decades of experiences with the existing commons and the more recent commoning practices. The authors foreground the complex historical realities of widely different circumstances and times. In some cases, ages-old commons can only exist in strategic coexistence with capitalism or other regimes; in others, labour-intensive forms of stewardship are handed to activists or commoners as a by-product of cost-saving measures under austerity and state-led development. Such complex entanglements need to be understood beyond the simple duality of commons/non-commons. The authors of this section of our critique highlight how commons and non-commons are externally and internally connected. They focus on commons as resource modalities that exist in relation, and often in strategic relation, to capitalism or state forms of organising resources. Also, they are not exempt from societal mechanisms reproduced within commons, such as exclusion or discrimination, or the very character of selective access to resources among commoners.

Katharina Bodirsky proposes an anthropology of actually existing commons, as ‘wider interdisciplinary study of commoning by highlighting [...] ambiguities and their implications for post-capitalist transformation’. In doing so, she highlights the processual and relational qualities of forming, attributing and appropriating value in a variety of economic processes and the formation of social worth. Her account hence includes the multiple, intersecting modes of valuation at play in processes in and around commons, as well as power, inequality and exploitation.

Tobias Haller then discusses one of the most prominent examples of commons in the literature: the Swiss commons systems. Frequently hailed as ideal-type of old commoner’s associations, Haller focuses on ‘the real transformations with their strategic entanglements in which these commoners find themselves today in Switzerland’. He discusses internal and external power asymmetries alongside the historical processes that formed contemporary Swiss commons systems. His article adds to the plea for historical analysis of commoning, uncommoning, and the institutional changes and power transformations of local contexts.

Anne-Christine Trémon enlarges the focus beyond commons and the community and proposes to scale up the conceptual vocabulary to look at ‘socialising resources’. She argues with material based on fieldwork concerning cooperative shareholding companies in Shenzhen, China, which engage in a form of state-led commoning. In her discussion, Trémon points out that ideas of the inherent properties of modalities of resource organisation are misleading and instead centres ‘an analysis of their actual accessibility and availability’. Furthermore, she nuances the conceptual register for an anthropology of socialisation by distinguishing between common goods and club goods.

### *Commons as contested capture(s)*

The third line of critique is to go beyond the focus on bottom-up or leftist projects of commoning, and instead analyse the co-optation and strategic entanglement of collective projects by and with neoliberalism, far-right political actors, or elite circles that carve out

state and market resources for their own benefit. The authors both advance a critique of the commons as inherently emancipatory, and aim to understand how they are entangled in political projects that exclude, introduce norms, crowd out others, and so on. As the authors argue, this delicate critique is necessary to think against authoritarianism and nativism, and the ability of those tendencies to capture ideas from the left and translate them into populist arguments for exclusion. Hence, in this line of critique, the authors address how imaginaries of commoning are used by elite actors in authoritarian settings or by other exclusionary ideological projects. The authors also focus on the denial, reversal, or appropriation of the collectivist language of the commons to contribute to a better understanding of commons as resource modalities that are not politically pure.

Lindsay Vogt's article opens the section, focusing on a state-led form of commons: knowledge portals in India. From their inception, these were 'not necessarily anti-, despite-, or post-capitalist (Chatterton et al., 2012: 611) but, rather, were positioned at their outset to work *alongside* (with) neoliberalization'. In the political context of growing authoritarianism, these projects were designed as open and public forms of discussion and sharing resources, but increasingly turned to become an 'almost exclusively managerial domain over time'. Vogt's diachronic and ethnographic analysis shows how larger projects of commoning might foster and legitimise tech-sector access to state planning and public resources.

Violetta Zentai then takes us to an engagement with actors not usually discussed in the anthropology of commoning: radical right-wing political actors in Hungary. She analyses social media communication as attempts at creating 'political commons' by 'interlacing visions of inclusion and exclusion'. While claiming to establish new forms of morality and commonality, these actors actively engage in what Zentai calls 'political uncommoning'. This uncommoning of the political space is framed in anti-gender (sexist, homophobic, anti-gender-equality) messages, while working towards exclusionary visions of political collectives and commons.

Finally, Andreas Streinzer brings the political-economic situation of elites in Austria into view. Proposing the notion of 'over-commoning', his article urges a focus on resource grabs from above that employ a language of collective benefit. As against accumulation by dispossession, over-commonings are the strategic attempts to benefit from state jobs, consultancy fees, and honorariums that his interlocutors relate to ideas of sinecure and nepotism. For anthropologies of commoning, the article adds some new vocabulary that distinguishes between 'commons talk', 'uncommoning', and 'over-commoning' when analysing how commoning for some can mean uncommoning for others.

## Conclusion

In conclusion, thinking with the more-than-human, the compromised, and the authoritarian provides routes to think of commons as necessarily entangled with other resource modalities and property regimes, and the political-economic conjunctures in which people attempt to struggle for an otherwise, including forms of valuation and values that we might not always associate with the projects most often discussed in the recent anthropology of commoning.

Our approach stresses the importance of such thinking beyond political purity and innocence, which makes it important and analytically productive to ethnographically zoom in on the diverse and shifting entanglements of commons and non-commons, and their co-constitutions in terms of a spatio-temporal relation between resources and various intersecting constituencies. Such perspective helps to better understand economic and ethical practice, inequality and hierarchy in social reproduction, as the authors show for both capitalist and state communist settings.

### Acknowledgements

This special issue has been in the making for several years. Many thanks to all who were part of this project at one point or the other, to the authors who were part of a discussion workshop at the University St Gallen, and the many who have read and commented on, or reviewed our drafts and followed our conversations. Scholarship is a collaborative effort, and in the case of this special issue, especially so. Thanks to all participants of the workshop in 2021, in which we started talking about entanglements, and to Violetta Zentai in particular, who stressed the strategic orientation of actors in entanglements during the workshop. Many thanks to the editors at *Critique of Anthropology*, who supported the project from early on. Thanks also to our colleagues at the 'Moralizations of Inequality' project (PI Jelena Tošić), the School for Humanities and Social Sciences at the University St Gallen and the Swiss National Science Foundation who made this project possible.

### Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: The Swiss National Foundation funded the work on the special issue in the project 'Europe's Un/Deserving. Moralizations of Inequality in Comparative Perspective' (MOI) (Project number 192170).

### ORCID iD

Andreas Streinzer  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5898-5573>

### Note

1. Scholarship is a collaborative effort, and in the case of this special issue, especially so. Thanks to all participants of the workshop on 'Un/commoning' in St Gallen in 2021, in which we started talking about entanglements, and to Violetta Zentai in particular, who stressed the strategic orientation of actors in entanglements during the workshop.

### References

Bäumer Escobar V (2020) The fiscal commons. *Social Analysis* 64(2): 59–78.

- Bear L, Ho K, Tsing A, et al. (2015) *Gens: A feminist manifesto for the study of capitalism*. Cultural Anthropology. Available at: <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/652-gens-afeminist-manifesto-for-the-study-of-capitalism> (accessed 29 March 2018).
- Bhattacharya T (ed) (2017) *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression*. London: Pluto Press.
- Bhattacharyya G (2018) *Rethinking Racial Capitalism: Questions of Reproduction and Survival*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Bodirsky K (2018) The commons, property, and ownership. *Focaal* 2018(81): 121–130.
- Campbell S (2021) Rendering assemblage dialectical. *Anthropological Theory* 21(2): 228–247.
- Chatterton P, Featherstone D and Routledge P (2012) Articulating climate justice in Copenhagen: Antagonism, the commons, and solidarity. *Antipode* 45: 602–620.
- de la Cadena M (2018) Uncommons: Theorizing the contemporary, *Fieldsights*, 29 March.
- Eckert J and Knöpfel L (2020) Legal responsibility in an entangled world. *Journal of Legal Anthropology* 4(2): 1–16.
- Ferguson S (2016) Intersectionality and social-reproduction feminisms. *Historical Materialism* 24(2): 38–60.
- Fraser N and Jaeggi R (2018) *Capitalism: A Conversation in Critical Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Gleeson JJ (2019) An aviary of queer social reproduction. In: *Hypocrite Reader* 94, Available at: <https://hypocritereader.com/contributor/jules-joanne-gleeson/> (accessed 9 December 2024).
- Gudeman S (2008) *Economy's Tension: The Dialectics of Community and Market*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Harvey D (2004) The 'new' imperialism: Accumulation by dispossession. *Socialist Register*: 63–87.
- Harvey P and Krohn-Hansen C (2018) Introduction. Dislocating labour: Anthropological re-configurations. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 85: 1–19.
- James D (2020) Householding and social reproduction. *Focaal* 2020(86): 125–128.
- Kalb D (2015) Introduction: Class and the new anthropological holism. In: Carrier JG and Kalb D (eds) *Anthropologies of Class: Power, Practice and Inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–27.
- Kalb D and Mollona M (2018) Introduction: Introductory thoughts on anthropology and urban insurrection. In: Kalb D and Mollona M (eds) *Worldwide Mobilizations: Class Struggles and Urban Commoning*. New York: Berghahn, 1–29.
- Mezzadri A (2021) Introduction: Marx's field as our global present. In: Mezzadri A (ed) *Marx in the Field*. London: Anthem Press, 1–16.
- Mögenburg H (2022) Entrenched provisionality. *Focaal* 2022(94): 57–71.
- Morgen S and Erickson J (2017) Incipient 'commoning' in defense of the public? *Focaal* 2017(79): 54–66.
- Narotzky S (2012) Alternatives to expanded accumulation and the anthropological imagination: Turning necessity into a challenge to capitalism? In: Barber PG, Leach B and Lem W (eds) *Confronting Capital: Critique and Engagement in Anthropology*. London: Routledge, 239–252.
- Narotzky S (2018) Rethinking the concept of labour. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 24(S1): 29–43.

- Noterman E (2016) Beyond tragedy: Differential commoning in a manufactured housing cooperative. *Antipode* 48(2): 433–452.
- Ortner SB (1995) Resistance and the problem of ethnographic refusal. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37(1): 173–193.
- Schwenkel C (2022) Social housing and feminist commoning in urban Vietnam. *Focaal* 2022(94): 20–37.
- Streinzer A (2018) Doing economic relations otherwise: Everyday politics of solidarity in the TEM currency network in Volos, Greece. *Ethnologia Europaea* 48(1): 69–83.
- Streinzer A (2024) Fiscal extraction by sovereignty: Calculative bordering and differential entanglement in the Eurozone crisis. *Anthropological Theory* 24(3): 311–324.
- Susser I (2017) Commoning in New York City, Barcelona, and Paris: Notes and observations from the field. *Focaal* 2017(79): 6–22.
- Ticktin M (2021) Building a feminist commons in the time of COVID-19. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 47(1): 37–46.
- Trémon A-C (2022) Commoning and publicizing. *Focaal* 2022(94): 1–19.
- Vogel L (2017) Foreword. In: Bhattacharya T (ed) *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression*. London: Pluto Press, x–xii.
- Weiss H (2022) Social reproduction as the reproduction of capitalism. *Focaal – Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 2022(93): 105–111.

### Author Biographies

**Andreas Streinzer** is Tenure Track Professor in Economic Anthropology at the University of Vienna. His work focuses on the organisation of social reproduction and the relations, practices, and moralities that become normalised, institutionalised, or contested in reproducing capitalisms. He was a postdoctoral researcher throughout the project ‘Europe’s Un/Deserving: Moralizations of Inequality in Comparative Perspective’ (PI Jelena Tošić), and is affiliated with the Institute for Social Research, Frankfurt am Main.

**Jelena Tošić** is Titular Professor for Migration Studies at the University of St Gallen. Her research interests include (forced) migration, borders, inequality, education, mobility and dance. She was PI of the project ‘Europe’s Un/Deserving: Moralizations of Inequality in Comparative Perspective’ (MOI, 2021–24) at the University of St Gallen and EASA Book Series co-editor (2021–24).