RIGE

Review of International
GEOGRAPHICAL EDUCATION

Beyond capitalist enclosure, commodification and alienation: Postcapitalist praxis as commons, social production and useful doing

Maxim KROHMER[1]University of Cologne, Cologne, GERMANY
Alexandra BUDKE[2]University of Cologne, Cologne, GERMANY

Abstract

The idea of postcapitalism is used to forward a spatial agenda in this study. We sketch out its features across three transitional landscapes between capitalism and postcapitalism: the fight against enclosure via the creation of commons, the fight against commercialization through socially useful production, and the fight against alienation from work through joyful doing. The second part of the article delves into three current debates—community economies, post-work, and autonomous perspectives—to examine the many ways in which postcapitalism is being used. After that, we shed light on the ways in which platform cooperatives, as a social practice, connect to postcapitalist debates and terrains. Finally, we take a look at the postcapitalist social and geographical environment, which is still in its early stages and not fully constituted.

I Introduction

The increasing breadth of geographical research that seeks to construct deep and comprehensive understandings of the flaws of humanity's current state has impressed us in recent years. Land, labour, and migrant struggles have all been the subject of academic research (Davies and Isak-jee, 2015; Harrison and Lloyd, 2012; Macken-zie and Dalby, 2003; Ahmed, 2012; Jenkins, 2014; Correia, 2008; Lewis et al., 2015); climate activism, anti-globalization, and radical protest movements have all been the subject of meta-analysis (Montagna, 2006; Chatter- tonne, 2010; Lo'pez, 2013;

Wainwright and Kim, 2015). references cited include: 2003, Lessard-Lachance and Norcliffe (2013), Routledge (2015), Pusey et al. (2012), Russell (2014), Sundberg (2007), Halvorsen (2015), Norda: s and Gleditsch (2007), and others. also, fights against gentrification, particularly those centering on "the right to stay put" (Wallace, 2014; Shaw and Hagemans, 2015; Newman and Wyly, 2006). While this is happening, geographers are putting forth a variety of innovative solutions to express a more equitable and sustainable world in various domains, such as community and popular education (Motta, 2013; mrs kinpaisby, 2008; Noterman and Pusey, 2012; Pusey, 2017);

1

alternative and community economies (Gibson-Graham and Cameron, 2013; North and Huber, 2004; North, 2014; Cornwell, 2012; Taylor, 2014); food justice and urban agriculture (Ghose and Pettygrove, 2014; Tor-naghi, 2014; Heynen, 2010; Crossan et al., 2016); commons and radical democracy (Springer, 2011; Bresnihan and Byrne, 2015); and low-impact housing (Jarvis, 2011; Thomp-son,2015).

The larger reform agenda and analytical insights that emerge from this synergy are the primary foci of this article. We argue that it combines criticism of the present capitalist system with proposals of alternatives beyond it, taking the shape of a new agenda for post-capitalist spatial research and practice. Gibson-Graham (2006) laid the groundwork for our study by expanding on the term "postcapitalism" to describe the many ways in which postcapitalist communities, economies, and subjects might thrive outside of the capitalist system. This document has a dual purpose. Firstly, we aim to bring attention to the potential implications of postcapitalist analysis for geography and geographers. This is happening at a time when the term is becoming popular as a means to offer 'radical hope' and 'concrete utopias' (Dinerstein, 2014) that can be achieved in contrast to our current state of extreme inequality, crisis, and despair (Castree, 2010; Derickson et al., 2015). Second, by considering many schools of thought and how they connect to distinct landscapes of capitalist transition, we hope to get a deeper comprehension of the nuances inherent in postcapitalism's applications. Some important disclaimers should be made right from the start. There are many ways to look at the uneven society we live in, but capitalism is only one ofthem. such as racism, sexism, and social stratification. Additionally, postcapitalism and capitalism are not inherently incompatible. These trends are ever-changing and should be seen both in relation to one another and as independent phenomena. Using John Holloway's (2010) research as a guide, we define postcapitalism as an ideology and movement that operates inside, outside of, and in opposition to the current state of affairs. Despite capitalism, there is a part of life that you have to endure, and that part is dealing with the exploitation and alienation that comes with it. On the other hand,

one may always find methods to challenge capitalism, stand up to the current quo, and use whatever academic or non-academic tactical possibilities that arise in order to halt or even reverse its effects. By using prefigurative activity to bring about future possibilities in the here and now, there is a component of life beyond capitalism (Springer, 2014). Lastly, a postcapitalist future is not in the cards. Outside of capitalism, there are possible futures in which global civilization disintegrates due to factors including extensive sickness, isolationism, ecological collapse, global war, and oppressive social control. That is not the focus of our investigation, but such futures are possible and are happening in certain regions of the globe. This study instead delves into a critical examination of the several factors that have the potential to bring up revolutionary social futures that diverge greatly from the capitalist present in both material anddiscursiveaspects.

The paper starts by placing postcapitalist tendencies—such as the common, social production, and useful doing—in the context of three terrains of transformation (Wright, 2010). In these terrains, we observe the dynamic interplay between the crisis tendencies of contemporary capitalism—such as enclosure, commodification, and alienation—and a set of postcapitalist tendencies. After that, the article examines three collections of work that question post-capitalism and suggest a variety of paths away from capitalist economics and social relations, including: the Community Economies Collective's feminist-oriented neo-Marxist viewpoint, as shown in JK Gibson-Graham's work; the post-work perspective, which argues that society needs to evolve technologically faster and more complexly in order to escape capitalism; and lastly, autonomous, Open Marxist, and anarchist approaches to social reproduction, which value politically autonomous ways of reproducing ourselves and our communities (Bonefeld et al., 1995; Clough and Blumberg, 2012). Then, to illustrate postcapitalism in action, we consider platform cooperatives. Finally, we take a cursory look at the postcapitalist social and geographical environment. As a field, post-capitalists have an

emerging future agenda that could be put to good use by doing things like building a relational and knowledge common, highlighting the socially beneficial parts of academic production, and finding ways to put our skills to use every day.

II Capitalism and postcapitalism: Three terrains of transformation

We must situate our discussion of postcapitalism in relation to capitalism in order to proceed. Erik Olin Wright's (2010) recent work serves as our definitional starting point. Wright emphasises the necessity to build and define the modern argument against capitalism. To summarise, the following are involved: Unnecessary human suffering is generated by capitalist class relations, particularly through exploitation and competition. Capitalism creates conditions for people to live flourishing lives, but it blocks the extension of these conditions more generally. The unequal distribution of private property and wealth limits the principles of democratic political equality and individual freedom.

It's based on the negative social and environmental consequences of a consumerist bias and the erosion of widely held values like safety, community, and spirituality, in contrast to the promotion of militarism, privatisation, and competition, and it's incompatible with equality of opportunity because it imposes unselected burdens on others. It's also inefficient because it overconsumes natural resources, creates negative externalities, promotes monopolies, and contributes to social inequality. The focus of this article is outside capitalism, yet it is important to note that geography has a long history of critical examination of capitalism. This work has explored a wide range of topics, including militarism, developmentalism, imperialism, and dispossession. It has also intersected with various critical perspectives, such as patriarchy, racism, and feminist theory

(Blaut, 1975; Hart, 2010; McDowell, 1986; Glassman, 2006; Gibson-Graham, 2006). Additionally, it has attempted to understand the different ways capitalism works, its spatial development, and its uneven geographical impacts (Wills, 2000; Harvey, 2006), as well as its entanglements with neoliberalization (Peck and Tickell, 2002; Birch and Siemiatycki, 2015). Rather than building upon these already-established criticisms, what we aim to do here is to draw attention to three transformational terrains where the crisis-laden features of capitalism and postcapitalism interact and clash; we are dealing with contestable relational and partial social forms. There has been an effort to go beyond, surpass, or at least restrict the reach and influence of capitalism ever since it came into being. Thus, capitalism and its alternatives have a similar past. Capitalism itself has always faced challenges from social forms of commoning, which exist prior to and are fundamental to on the lives of individuals (Linebaugh, 2014). Further analytical and practical insights into the future possibilities and limitations of postcapitalism may be gained by critically focusing on this dynamic interaction into the present day across three terrains. Our goal is to record all the interrelated ways in which postcapitalism is used to organise production and social connections, value creation, land ownership and administration, and financial transactions.

1 Enclosure and commons

The interplay between postcapitalist commons and capitalist enclosure is the first thing we highlight. Although the process of enclosure precedes capitalism, it gains structural importance within it (Sevilla-Buitrago, 2015). It relates to a specific spatiality in the longue durée of the capitalist mode of production. It draws attention to the violent and structural

tendencies of capitalism, including slavery, forced labour, social displacement, dispossession, and the industrial system. According to Sevilla-Buitrago (2015), this phenomena has far-reaching effects since it affects production, social reproduction, consumption, and subjectification. For a long time, historians have analysed the processes of capitalist enclosure in relation to the enclosure of common land (Federici, 2004; Hill, 1996; Linebaugh, 2014), and more recently, they have examined these processes in relation to public space, seed patents, knowledge, and housing (Bollier, 2002; Federici, 2009; Hodkinson, 2012; Midnight Notes Collective, 1990), among other topics. Researchers in the field of geography have added to the conversation around enclosure by writing on what is known as "acumulation by dispossession" (Jeffrey et al., 2012; Sevilla-Buitrago, 2015) and how violent enclosure has persisted to the current day (Glassman, 2006; Prudham, 2007). Early human societies relied heavily on rudimentary accumulation and enclosure processes for the development of

as well as to the continuous evolution of capitalism (Bonefeld, 1988, 2001). We separate from sources of self-reproduction and guarantee that our labour force is sold on the market via these enclosure procedures (De Angelis, 2017). Processes of enclosure often form the core of contemporary battles. A few examples of topics that have recently been the subject of debate include the following: the growing commercialization of higher education institutions (Amsler, 2011; Myers, 2017; Radice, 2013; Sealey-Huggins and Pusey, 2013), the destruction and commodification of natural habitats and their "resources," the gentrification and displacement that characterise urban areas (Gillespie, 2016; Hodkinson, 2012; Stavrides, 2014), and the 'new enclosures' brought about by structural adjustment

(Midnight Notes, 1990). Efforts to establish postcapitalist commons coexist with these unfair and sometimes violent enclosure processes. An essential resource for investigating non-market social wealth and production models is the common. According to Caffentzis and Federici (2014), De Angelis (2017), and Federici (2012), there is a lot of literature on the topic of the common as a way for social groups to co-own, co-produce, and co-manage social goods and spaces, as well as on social organisations that reject individualistic ideas of property and ownership. Noterman (2016), Jeffrey et al. (2012), Eizenberg (2012), Bresnihan and Byrne (2015), and more recently, discussions of the common in geography have resulted in more sophisticated understandings and applications. The role of the urban common in opposing urban enclosure (Hodkinson, 2012) and offering areas to experiment with alternative (postcapitalist) social forms (Gibson-Graham et al., 2016) has been more and more discussed recently (Gidwani and Baviskar, 2011).

More and more people are looking to the idea of the common to better understand non-capitalist ways of managing one's own affairs, owning property together, and creating shared places and things. In addition to being a set of commodities and places that need to be protected from the enclosure and commercialization by capitalists, the common is also a tool for resisting capitalism, forging postcapitalist subjectivities, and creating shared forms of value (Caffentzis, 2010; Hart, 2010; Vieta, 2016). Indeed, according to De Angelis (2017), the common is a space where power dynamics may "explode" the constraints of everyday existence in a capitalist society. That is why commoning is a collective activity. According to Gibson-Graham, Cameron, and Healy (2016), communing communities that are not just reactive to capital

but also contain non-human action may be uncovered via a postcapitalist politics that includes commoning. From this vantage point, the driving forces behind social change may be anything from the working class and social movements to governments and individuals, or even strong coalitions including all of the aforementioned.

2 Commodification and socially useful production

We next draw attention to a second dynamic that includes capitalist commodification processes and the need to create communal production forms that are more socially beneficial. Producing goods and services and establishing a market society are the bedrock of capitalism, a social connection. This is best shown in Marx's (1990) explanation of the nature of value formation in capitalist society, Chapter 1 of Capital. We are a part of this value creation loop after capitalist control over social reproduction forms has been established.

as a result of the manufacturing and buying of goods.

As the structuring basis of our lives and the progenitor of the consumer society it creates, the commodity form is central to our social life. Our increasingly submerged existence in the organising principles of capital is shown by the commercialization of ever-expanding areas of life. Among the most helpful overviews of commodification's essential features—including privatisation, ali-nation, individuation, abstraction, value, and displacement—is that provided by Castree (2003). Public service supply and stocks of natural assets, such as air, water, and forests, are only a few examples of how these commodification traits have expanded and permeated modern life. One of the key factors supporting the survival and spread of capitalism is the never-ending quest for new sectors to commodify.

The pervasiveness of commodification has led to a set of larger negative societal impacts that are threatening the very foundations of market systems. For instance, it reduces non-monetized gift and barter exchange, introduces precarious work, distorts relations between people (particularly in terms of equal gender relations), introduces value creation across a range of mundane social activities, and limits production to profit maximisation (Nelson and Timmerman, 2011). Primarily, the growing enclosure and trade of naturally occurring entities on the market is one of several possible ecological tipping points caused by their increasing commercialization and transformation into natural capital (Raw- orth, 2017).

Novel parallel social modes of production and reproduction that generate non-commodified social goods are attracting increasing attention in this setting. That they are grounded in genuine material need is crucial. as well as the aspirations that support human happiness, not the maximisation of value and profit. Many other movements have emerged in recent years in an effort to challenge capitalism production practices; they include eco-socialists, ecofeminism, anticapitalist organising, deep green economics, and antigrowth economics (Wall, 2015). A shift away from the current economic model and towards more equitable social organisation of production is essential if we are to dismantle the foundations of commodification and profit maximisation.

There are hints of these methods that create socially beneficial output and figuratively "reclaim the economy" (Gibson-Graham et al., 2013). With its emphasis on use or experience value rather than exchange value, the larger social and solidarity economy (SSE) fosters a more stable economic system that reins in the excesses of market economies (North and Scott Cato, 2018). This gives rise to complementary currencies, cooperative

organisational structures, barter markets, and reciprocity, as well as to activities centred around the home and the community (North, 2014). As an alternative to capitalism, whole-scale ideas like Parecon (Albert, 2004) have been proposed. Researchers at the UK's Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change use the term "foundational economy" to describe the everyday but crucial parts of society's economy that provide people with necessities for living well (Bowman et al., 2014). This fits in with the larger community wealth-building movement, which aims to change the economic system's fundamentals by making sure money stays in the community (Dubb, 2016). To what degree are forms of value and commodities socialised and commonized in this territory, leading to the creation of "a new measure and meaning of the commons" (Neary, 2016: 369), is the central question.

3 Alienation and doing

The third terrain of transformation is already at our fingertips. For capitalist societies, social alienation is a necessary condition for the creation of trade value to predominate. Marx argues that private property leads to "alienated labour" rather than the other way around (Clarke, 1991: 67). Workers in a capitalist system sell their labour power to make goods for other people, and then they become emotionally and physically detached from the products of their employment. The bulk of our daily lives are characterised by activities from which we are emotionally detached from the outcomes. When we do things, we restock our social reproduction resources, which we use to seek out the extras that can make our lives better— or at least help us recover from the monotony, boredom, and loneliness that characterise our daily lives.

A phenomenon that autonomous Marxists have dubbed the "social factory" (Tronti, 1966) has the effect of exporting capitalist social relations from conventional sites of production like the factory to society at large, further deepening this sense of alienation. The more this progresses, the more neoliberal subjectivity rules our interpersonal interactions, and we are progressively reduced to logical economic subjects (Bondi, 2005). Individualization and categorization, the separation, control, and exploitation of people via the use of social categories, identities, and classes, are the foundational mechanisms that support this alienation. In order to break free of this alienation and labour, we must dismantle the social ties of commodity production and their capacity to structure existence. This is not a liberation for individuals, but for all of humanity. Doing good for society is what fights this trend towards estrangement. Our main source is Holloway's (2010) approach to critiquing capitalism, which he defines as "doing" as deliberate, physical action as opposed to "abstract labour," and the work of William

Morris referred to productive labour as opposed to pointless effort. Abstract work is a component of the two-faced character of labour as it is structured under capitalism. Concrete labour creates value for use, while abstract labour creates value for trade. "The story of the cracks [in capitalism] is the story of a doing that does not fit into a world domi-nated by labour," Holloway (2010: 84) explains, and "doing" refers to action that is not dictated by others or has the ability to be self-determined. "Our doing is not totally subsumed into abstract labour," proposes Holloway (Holloway, 2010: 97). All this "doing" adds up to excess. This goes beyond the bounds of the capitalist value system's control over social interactions, and "the crack [in capitalism] is the revolt of doing against labour." Alloway (2010) states on page 85: Human ingenuity serves as the fulcrum around which everything revolves. The foundation of the system that is killing us is capital, which is created via one kind of activity, work. The opposite of capital production is the process of doing, or just "doing," which works to build a new civilization. That is according to Halloway (2010: 85). Holloway establishes alternative social interactions fundamental to his idea of "cracks" by linking "doing" with the rejection of abstract labour and value, and by extension, the denial of capital's essence. By linking his theory of capitalism's "cracks" with "doing" and, by extension, social production, Holloway makes sure that the negation and creativity spaces that emerge from these cracks are in a good position to reject the tools used to subjugate us. People may combat alienating specialism and categorization by social or beneficial action, and they can also self-explore social roles and identities outside of those restricted by alienated job. According to Marx's suggestions in the German Ideology, a postcapitalist society would allow him to "hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticise after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever having to rest."

eventually becoming a critic, shepherd, fisherman, or hunter (1972: 53).

III Contemporary debates on postcapitalist futures

Postcapitalism is being used by an increasing number of authors, critics, and activists to describe a wide variety of alternatives to capitalism in economics and employment. Here we single out three current social praxis tendencies—community economies, post-work, and autonomous politics—because of the unique, complementary, and sometimes conflicting perspectives they bring to the table regarding postcapitalist thought. Though they do so in different ways, they all relate back to the three transformational terrains we discussed before. Their analysis sheds light on the following topics: the scope and character of enclosure, commodification, and alienation; community production, socially useful doing, and the common; the function and significance of technology in shaping the future of work; and the changing dynamics among civil society, social movements, and the state. Below, we will go into these three tendencies one by one. To start, the phrase "community economies perspective" is kind of a catch-all for a body of critical literature that has long criticised capitalism and, more crucially, the subjectivities, social practices, and spatialities that support its alternatives. A group of scholars known as the Community Economies Collective is among the leading voices in favour of this. Cameron and Gibson-Graham (2013), Gibson-Graham (2006), and Cameron and Gibson (2005) have all contributed to a comprehensive definition of postcapitalism in geography, building on the foundational feminist-oriented and neo-Marxist work of JK Gibson-Graham. Their recommendation that academics and activists alike shun political-economics because of its "captalocentrism" is a major contribution of this strategy.

with the capitalist economy taking the stage (Gibson-Graham, 1996). Their methodological stance, which they call "reading for difference," goes even beyond, arguing that capitalism is only one of many other types of economies that really coexist. When capitalocentric rhetoric presents capitalism as the

only viable economic system, this variety becomes less apparent. Through a postcapitalist subject engaged in "new practices of the self," the community economies approach has offered a thorough analysis of how to imagine, negotiate, construct, and implement a life beyond capitalism (Gibson-Graham, 2006: xxvii). Research conducted by Gibson-Graham and colleagues has shown several instances that challenge the neoliberal argument that no alternatives exist (Gibson-Graham et al., 2013; Gibson-Graham and Roelvink, 2010; Gibson-Graham and Roelvink, 2011). Imagining new things is a major emphasis. As an example, Healey argues that the capitalist ideology that gives our economic structure is the obstacle to postcapitalism (2015: 347). This method has contributed significantly to deconstructing the capitalocentric imagination and its trajectory by illuminating alternative economic practices that challenge the hegemonic capitalism imaginaries with emerging postcapitalist ones. This is the realm of advocacy, conjecture, and optimism (Dinnerstein, 2014), where there is room to dream and recreate. More important than providing answers, postcapitalism is asking questions, or at least acknowledging the need to ask questions. In this view of community economics, common-and community-owned enterprises like cooperatives, land trusts, and community development organizations—as well as resubjectivization and meso-level organizations—are potential ways to challenge capitalism. Such pursuits allow for the articulation of subjectivities that unquestionably direct attention away from abstract capital-centric pursuits that are commodified and alienated (Healy, 2015). Nevertheless, statistical

there are still unanswered questions about the scalability of these and the potential for resubjectivization to pose a fundamental threat to abstract labour and the production of capitalist value (Dean, 2012). When it comes to social enterprise personalities, especially those with a radical leaning, many kinds of subjectivization fall short. We need to delve more into the possibility—or necessity—of postcapitalist subjects as members of larger politicised movements, rather than letting them exist independently as agents of change. Such meso-level postcapitalist ideas may struggle to flourish in an unfavourable macro-level context. When it comes to supporting and funding alternative economies, there is a need for clarification about the larger project of radical municipalization (Plan C and Russell, 2017) and the state's involvement in particular (Cumbers, 2015; Routledge et al., 2018). Pitts and Dinerstein (2017b) identify the post-work viewpoint as the second domain of postcapitalist discourse; this approach, in its broadest sense, investigates the rationale behind the potential automation of labour and the introduction of policies like universal basic income as means to end the need for workers. Beginning with Lafargue's (1907) 'right to be lazy,' continuing through Guy Debord's Situationist call to 'never work,' Andre Gorz's (1997) 'farewell to the working class,' Bob Black's (1985) 'abolition of work,' and more recent critiques like Weeks' 'the problem of work,' (2011) and David Graeber's (2018) discourse on the phenomenon of 'bull- shit jobs,' there is a long tradition of criticism of work. The so-called accelerationist approach, which has gained more and more support since its critics first used the word (Noys, 2010), closely overlaps with this post-work viewpoint (Williams and Srnicek, 2013). According to Noys (2014), accelerationism originated in the work of Lyotard, Deleuze, and Guattari, and continued into the 1990s with Nick Land's reactionary accelerationism and the 2013 release of the Accelerationist Manifesto. Supporters of rapid progress want to quicken the pace of technological advancement, which will both simplify and complicate life. Williams and Srnicek (2013) stated it thus way in the Accelerationist Manifesto, which brought accelerationism to a broader audience: The political heresy known as accelerationism holds that the only way to confront capitalism radically is to speed up its processes of uprooting, alienating, decoding, and abstracting, rather than to wait for it to collapse due to its inherent contradictions.

This method seems to be at home with the state, technology, and modernity as a means of escaping capitalism's constraints. Actually, escaping capitalism could be easier if we just use it. Instead of giving up on the larger enlightenment effort, it contends that it should be carried out to completion. From this vantage point, technology is

being constrained by capitalism and should be repurposed for more equitable and communal purposes.

Similarly, Paul Mason (2015) has been a leading voice in highlighting the rise of new transitional practices in the form of modular and micro-project design. In this model, peer-to-peer networks manage and execute an ever-expanding postcapitalist global common via collaborative production and the sharing economy. Expanding on this idea, Srnicek and Williams (2015) highlight the potential benefits of future technologies, such as UBI, complete automation, and the elimination of the need for human labour. They point to what they term "folk politics" as a roadblock to movements and battles in this book. Folk politics is defined by them as: a constellation of modern left-wing intuitions and ideas that underpins practical approaches to political organisation, behaviour, and thought. This kind of thinking has the potential to cripple the Left, making it unable to address systemic issues, build long-term solutions, or go beyond narrow interests. stated in 2015, on page 9. Particularly affecting social movements is the dedication to horizontalism, which Srnicek and Williams describe as manifesting itself in a variety of ways. This includes con- sensus decision-making and an apparent emphasis on localism as an elevated level of political engagement. Regarding Williams and Srnicek: One camp adheres to a folk politics of localism, direct action, and unrelenting horizontalism; the other camp lays out the groundwork for what can only be described as an accelerationist politics, one that is comfortable with the modernity of abstraction, complexity, globalisation, and technology. This is the most significant schism in the modern Left. ten (2015:).

Williams and Srnicek propose a "left modernity" as an alternative to folk politics. Also, contrary to what some left-wing intellectuals have proposed, we should not reject hegemonic politics (Day, 2005), but rather, as a new "common sense," we should oppose neoliberal hegemony with left-wing hegemony (Routledge et al., 2018). The common at the national or even global level is enlarged in post-work. Commons like this are administered by bigger coalitions of governmental and civil society players and rely more on technology than community economic models. Supplemented by a Universal Basic Income, automation facilitates equally socially valuable production with the goal of producing work-free and leisured social activities. But it's debatable whether or not the structural societal problems of commercialization and alienated employment are genuinely addressed by the increased leisure time made possible by automation. As an example, QQ has contended that: Instead of leading to a "fully automated luxury communism," postcapitalism—or, more precisely, radical Keynesianism—seems to be the first step towards a state-capitalist economy. Thus, communism's aims are in direct opposition to postcapitalism, which is essentially a doctrine of social change. In 2018, QQ

Similarly, accelerationism may be "a plea for a beneficent class of technocrats who can gradually reform capitalism for the masses," according to the Internationalist Communist Ten-dency (2018). The authors go on to imply that Srnicek and Williams "wants to get rid of wage labour by creating a new populist metanarrative and infil-trating left wing parties - without the working class ever taking power, and without the aboli- tion of capitalist social relations" (ICT, 2018). A broader macropolitical-economic approach centred on large-scale class rea-lignments and responses to social and ecological crises supports the post-work, post-capitalist stance. Its goal is not to outlaw automation per se, but rather to centralise ownership of it within the state. This is a very paradoxical stance, as it allows the state to acquire greater power without question. Organisational structures are not inherently neutral, nevertheless, as pointed out further by the Internationalist Communist Tendency (2018). The political system, individual governments, labour unions, and networks are not malleable enough to fulfil every possible purpose. Thus, the concept that a rejuvenated and radicalised party political system—like Corbyn in the UK or Saunders in the USA—could seize control of the state and eliminate the need for workers and replace it with initiatives like the citizen's income is quite debatable, even if it is a desired goal. Accelerationism is defined by Pitts and Dinerstein

(2017b: 4) as a "anti-human pro-machine philosophy" that prioritises abstract ideas like speed and metal above more tangible endeavours like grassroots efforts to construct alternative social reproduction models. According to Pitts and Dinerstein (2017a) and Dinerstein, Pitts and Taylor (2016), the British Labour Party is giving these ideas a lot of thought. However, there are a number of reasons why the left would be wrong to advocate for a UBI income and complete automation as postcapitalist ideals. The first is that universal basic income (UBI) is not the same as a meaningful

capitalism's ills extend beyond the workplace to include our enslavement to material wealth and consumption. Their view of money is that it is a kind of "social domination" rather than an objective "thing" that serves to enable commerce (Diner-stein et al., 2016). Secondly, they contend that technology is not apolitical and that the post-work society that advocates of this postcapitalist model envision does not eliminate the capitalist social relations, the commodity form, or the environment-damaging levels of consumption that exist today. This postcapitalist perspective "consolidates capitalism," as pointed out by Dinerstein and Pitts (2016). To build new kinds of social reproduction in the Social and Solidarity Economy—kinds that don't depend on us surviving under the dominion of money, the state, and value—Diner-stein, Pitts, and Taylor (2016) propose a "concrete" common utopia as an alternative to so-called "fully auto-mated communism" (Bastani, 2018). A number of related problems arise from post-work, particularly as they relate to the effects of its emphasis on macro-level results and change agents formed by the formal state and made possible by technological platforms and artefacts. When it comes to the common good, established rules and regulations for government are passed down through the ranks of a strong nation-state that gives special treatment to a certain political actors' spatial imagination. The gradual reshaping of production towards more socially beneficial goals is intertwined with bigger, more centrally planned, and technologically enabled endeavours. Social doing is re-engineered as part of a larger design for human leisure time, even if labour may become less abstract. This kind of tension is seen in political groups like

Syriza, which has had to make tough decisions in order to remain in power, often going against the wishes of its supporters and members (Ovenden, 2015).

The possibility of autonomous social practices and forms to construct capital-ism-challenging organisational and social (re)production techniques is the emphasis of the third postcapitalist strand. Initiatives and conflicts that question the state and its liberatory power are the primary focus of this body of work. Collective and networked organising among radicalised social movements and civil society actors is the focus of analytical investigation. Accordingly, research on politically independent social reproduction models predicated on resource and asset self-management is receiving a lot of attention (Holloway, 2010; Cleaver, 2000). According to Chatterton et al. (2010) and Clough and Blumberg (2012), the Autonomous Geographies Collective further developed this idea by investigating the mechanisms that may be used to break free from the capitalist system. Analytical ideas from Italian Operaismo and post-Operaismo, together with those from autonomism, feminism, ecologism, and Open Marxism, are included into this method. Some important characteristics of this autonomous strategy are as follows. In order to understand how people within this system reproduce themselves socially and materially, social movements and the politics surrounding social reproduction are studied analytically (Dalla Costa and James, 1973; Federici, 2012). Autonomy, self-management, and self-valorization are also discussed, as well as their potentials (Cleaver, 1992). An individual's capacity to make choices in freedom and their ability to collectively and equally participate in a given society's institutions are both highlighted by the concept of autonomy, which originates from the Greek word "autos-nomos," meaning self-legislation (Castoria- dis, 1991). Italian autonomism and the autonomous Marxist tradition gave rise to theoretical work on social reproduction and autonomy (Cleaver, 2000). Organisations like

Numerous strikes, occupations of factories, sabotage, and squats were sparked by Autonomia Operaio (Workers Autonomy), Potere Operaio

(Worker's Power), and Lotta Continua (The Struggle Continues), which expanded the struggle beyond the factory and into the city at large, with an emphasis on community, feminist, and working-class struggles (Lotringer and Marazzi, 1980). Squatting, looting, and pirate radio were all part of the 1977 movement, which was the pinnacle of Italian independence. It also brought attention to the capitalist exploitation of women's unpaid social reproductive labour in the house (Federici, 1975). This separate tradition stands for what are often thought of as prefigurative or interstitial tactics. Hence, this view indicates that, inside the cracks of capitalism, postcapitalist social reproduction is taking shape, with resistance and struggle, to foreshadow and create alternatives to capitalism. Examples of their disruptive tactics include community gardens, radical social centres, temporary encampments, and flash mobbing (Feigenbaum et al., 2013; Montagna, 2006). They are also good at quickly prototyping micro-scale commons. In these times, people are quick to join communities and try out new skills for producing and doing things in ways that benefit society, all while relying on deeply democratic and consensual decision-making processes, caring and compassionate relationships, and other socially beneficial practices.

A new spatial sensibility is developing in autonomous postcapitalist politics, particularly among transnational activists, around highly networked, non-contiguous micro-commons that rule themselves (Feather-stone, 2003). It takes many forms, including democratic and communicative activities including nonviolent communication and consensual decision-making, social centres, squatting, and emotional activism (Graeber, (2017), Pusey (2010), Katsiaficas (1997), and Vasude-van (2017). Networked assemblies that experiment with innovative forms of decentralised social authority have been given greater legitimacy by the Occupy and Squares movements (Halvorsen, 2015; Pickerill et al., 2016; Kaika and Karaliotas, 2014). This kind of geography represents a major shift in analysis away from the post-work method and is representative of the criticism that accelerationists raise at a simplistic and isolated kind of popular politics. The connection between experimental autonomous activity and institutional formations at the state and meso levels requires more investigation. Does safeguarding the former cause advances in the latter to lose their power? Does the presence of unfavourable macro-level state conditions, such as hostile media coverage, direct repression, or police infiltration foil these experiments? (Mitchell and Heynen, 2009). It is possible that these shorter-lived autonomous experiments are more powerful for serving as temporary and continuing seedbeds for invention, experimentation, and learning about potential post-capitalist futures than for being able to lay down longer-term possibilities. One possible explanation is that they function as a "internet of ideas" that links disparate regions' disruptive strategies and networks via rhizomatic processes. More alignment and support from meso-level structures—particularly trade unions, civil society groups, the media, and a radicalised municipal culture—makes these types of transitory innovations thrive.

IV Postcapitalist praxis

Postcapitalist terrains of enclosure, commodification, and alienation merge and grow in tandem with Anthropocene (Castree, 2015; Derickson and MacKinnon, 2015) or, more precisely, capitalocene (Haraway, 2016) socio-environmental catastrophes. However, the question of what Does the way people now live their lives intersect with post-capitalist concepts like community economics, post-work, autonomous organising, and the terrains of commoning and socially beneficial production and doing? Although postcapitalism is visible in theory and certain areas of practice, it has not yet found broad application. Instead, what we see is a mosaic of fragmented, new, and complex impulses, with people trying to work inside, outside, and against the capitalist present (Holloway, 2010). As a response to the consequences of overshooting Earth's life-supporting systems, on which we rely fundamentally, and the perpetuation of inequality and human suffering, there has been an effort to embed de-growth and social/solidarity economies. These tendencies are visible across various areas of temporary social and economic practices. Civic

energy, low-impact housing, urban agriculture, restorative design methods, socially-just mobility, communal wealth-building, circular economies, and citizen empowerment are just a few examples. We have selected the growing field of platform cooperatives to illustrate postcapitalist praxis for the sake of this article since it provides several analytical insights into the three postcapitalist terrains that we have identified. The current fascination with platform coop-erativism stems from the fact that it combines the ever-expanding digital and creative economies with long-standing principles of community democracy, worker self-management, unionisation, common ownership, ethical principles, wealth-sharing, and social value creation. Take the United Kingdom as an example; the pace of employment growth in the digital economy is double that of the whole economy. One of the main arguments in favour of platform cooperatives is the belief that, by sharing resources and responsibilities, they may make the digital economy more democratic and fair for workers.

Although cooperation is an essential component of capitalism (as Marx (1990) pointed out), cooperatives are an independent organisational structure that emerged in reaction to capitalist labour. One practical answer to the antagonistic connection between labour and capital that Marx highlighted is cooperatives, according to Neary (2017). There was a chance to exercise radical forms of democracy in cooperatives, as well as get some say in production ownership and working conditions. As an alternative model based on self-management, cooperatives have long served as an example of ideals such as self-help, self-responsibility, democracy, equality, equity, and solidarity. Critical discussions on the rise and consequences of digital labour, the so-called sharing and collaborative economy, and related platforms like Uber, TaskRabbit, and Deliveroo gave rise to the term platform cooperativism (Scholz, 2016; Scholz and Schneider, 2016). The gig economy's exploitative and alienating labour, knowledge enclosure, anti-union actions, the concentration and extraction of social wealth and surplus value, and the commodification of formerly non-commodified aspects of life, such as neighborhood-based sharing and household and community work, are just a few

of the many concerns brought to light by the corporate-controlled sharing economy that are pertinent to the larger critique of capitalism. Repurposing human sharing and cooperation for more common, ethical, less commercialised, socially beneficial, and cooperative goals is the goal of platform cooperatives. Among the many new platform cooperatives is Fairmondo, a cooperative marketplace that competes with Amazon and eBay; A platform for group decision-making called Loomio, which is available as open source software; Examples include the artist-run stock photography cooperative Stocksy and the worldwide worker-owned data organisation CoLab. as well as the Data Commons Cooperative, an organisation that facilitates data sharing among solidarity economy cooperatives. Among the most enlightening is FairCoop, a website that promotes the sharing of knowledge and resources among cooperatives with the goal of creating a more equitable and cooperative global economic system. Local nodes that accept the FairCoin cryptocurrency as payment form its backbone. Numerous organisations are showing interest in platform cooperatives, such as the P2P Foundation, the Platform Cooperativism Consortium at the New School University of New York, and the annual OpenCoop conference.

Particularly in light of the progressive possibilities presented by the quickening pace of digital technologies and related post-work scenarios, this dynamic sector of the digital economy provides crucial insights into the kind of arenas where postcapitalist futures will be acted out. To start, there is an open plan to create a digital infrastructure that more people can own. On this platform, users not only help each other out, but also contribute to the greater good by exchanging open-source software, data, and information. As it is being constructed, the shape and purpose of this digital common continue to be the central concern. It includes both location-based efforts to establish nodes that serve as meeting places for hacktivists and social activists in general and geographically dispersed networks of digital creative workers. The possibility of using the digital common to undermine and eventually replace, instead of just

coexisting with, everyday life under capitalism is something that requires more investigation. Unresolved concerns about ownership and control affect both micro-level coalitions of member-owned cooperatives and macro-level initiatives by progressive national governments seeking to harness the potential of cooperatives on a broader scale.

Secondly, if platform cooperatives are limited to an online digital space, they will have limitations.

common. The true promise lies in integrating digital with community wealth-building projects that are place-based, with the goal of addressing widespread poverty, neglect, and capital outflow in specific areas. This article focuses on the Cleveland model, which originated in Cleveland, Ohio, and aims to establish large-scale employee-owned enterprises as a means of alternative wealth creation and wealth sharing. In this model, stakeholders unite to foster local economic development, green job creation, and neighbourhood stabilisation (Alpero-vitz, 2004). The Catalan Integrated Cooperative is no different; it has over 2,500 members who work together as independent cooperatives on projects ranging from healthcare to housing to transportation. It has built a physical centre, "AureaSocial," in Barcelona, and its members engage in education, a cooperative basic income platform, eco/collective shops, gatherings, and events. 'An alternative economy in Catalonia that can meet the needs of the local community more effectively than the existing system, thus creating the conditions for the transition to a postcapitalist mode of organiza-tion of social and economic life,' is how it has been overall described (Dafermos, 2017). This model, in conjunction with a supportive infrastructure of platform cooperatives, appears to provide an ideal setting for significant postcapitalist experiments, particularly those involving new kinds of community-based doing and shared economic ownership that can go beyond autonomous micro-local initiatives.
Thirdly, platform cooperatives are involved in the pursuit of less capital-centric and more ethical economic activities, particularly those that include non-commodified and socially beneficial production methods. This is clearly seen in many domains, such as knowledge-sharing, open data platforms, and reskilling. One thing that all cooperative platforms

have in common is a commitment to doing business in an ethical manner while simultaneously increasing market share to the suppliers of corporations, and to the worker-members themselves by capturing and retaining value. Scholz (2016) argues that the open and cooperative digital economy has a greater problem in determining if the admirable spirit of cooperation and ethics can undermine the commodity form and the emergence of a market society.

Last but not least, there is an obvious need to use technology to make employment more inclusive and stable, especially for gig workers so they have more agency and stability in their careers. We have already shown that, in addition to a joint reformulation, the complete negation of labour is essential to the constructive doing that must accompany it. The precise character of the work vision that arises from cooperative platforms and the degree to which it embodies "doing" that actively opposes the production of capital on a daily basis need more critical investigation. Some worry that these types of entities might pave the way for corporate takeovers or demutualization, the process of releasing assets for private financial benefit. Despite this, the existing activity levels indicate that platform cooperatives will keep expanding and settling into a productive set of social and labour practices that may be seen as alternatives to the corporatized digital economy. How platform cooperatives mix disruptive impulses with activities that make use of preexisting institutional resources and structures and experiment both within and outside of these that are already in place requires careful examination. The future of these trends, and their potential incorporation into new logics of capital accumulation, requires careful observation.

V Conclusion

In this article, we have set out to investigate postcapitalism as a means of advancing a programme of spatial research and practice.

In order to achieve this, we have sketched out its general outline across three transformational

terrains: resisting enclosure while simultaneously experimenting with new postcapitalist subjectivities through the creation of commons; countering the penetration of commodification through the development of socially useful production; and cracking capitalism through the rejection of insecure labour and pointless effort through forms of useful doing. We have also shown that the phrase is being used in many contexts and with distinct intentions, such as in discussions about post-work, autonomous politics, and community economics. When it comes to the mechanics of postcapitalism, none of these viewpoints provides a superior analytical framework. They all provide useful information, however. One of these is the importance of acknowledging the existence of non-capitalist economic forms alongside capitalist ones. Another is the possibility of post-capitalist resubjectivization, particularly through the commons, and the possibility of radicalising the left modernity project further by reclaiming the state and advanced technology. Lastly, self-management and radical micro-politics can serve as incubators for new alternatives.

We believe that these viewpoints may be usefully brought into fruitful discussions. Our research suggests that the postcapitalist practices most suited to meet the future's problems will include elements of the trends we've observed. We must emphasise again that the three terrains we identified—doing, socially beneficial producing, and constructing the common—must be somehow realised for practices to be postcapitalist. Furthermore, they must be cognizant of the influence of autonomous radical social action on a micro level, community and diversified economies on a meso level, and state and other large-scale social actor interventions on a macro level. The limitations of all of these must also be shown to them. Harnessing the force of radical micro-experiments while avoiding naïve localism or romanticised folk politics and dealing with the state and big tech without succumbing to either is a challenging task.

succumbing to bureaucratic and centralising inclinations. In order to resolve these conflicts, we have relied on Wright's (2010) three-pronged approach to strategic aim. Interstitial behaviours that break free and leave down prefigurative future markers, symbiotic attempts to operate within existing institutions, and the ruptural impulse to disrupt the system will always coexist. In some geographical locations, these tendencies will manifest differently. Social movements and political actors dedicated to disruptive practices, institutional actors changing regime practices from within, and a constellation of disruptive interstitial experiments laying down clear markers for novel future pathways are all factors that could accelerate change during moments of strategic convergence.

Here we may draw on the insights learned from our empirical example of platform cooperatives. In contrast to the corporate internet, there is an obvious push to build a digital economy that is more compassionate and ethical. We need to learn more about how this shapes and uses the commons, whether virtual or physical, how it creates socially beneficial doing rather than precarious useless toil, and how it impacts the accumulation of surplus value and the expansion of commodification. While certain parts may be enamoured with technical solutions and the state structure, others may be more naïve and believe in self-governing micro-political experiments. Before we wrap up, we'd like to share our thoughts on the The postcapitalist social and geographical environment is still in its early stages of development and is not entirely obvious (Mason and Whitehead, 2012). On a very basic level, postcapital-ism must strive towards the inverse if the capitalist system creates profound geographical and social inequality. Commons, socially beneficial spaces, should be constructed by postcapitalist social and geographical forms in order to prevent the accumulation of surplus value, individualization, commodification, and enclosure.

creation and action. This politics of space is intricate and multi-faceted. In all likelihood, it will not serve as a model for societal transformation across a single nation. Different, non-contiguous groups of activity will link together via what Katz (2001) referred to as counter-topographical networks. Thus, postcapitalist geographies, particularly those expressed via the nation-state, would lack a distinct and unifying scalar politics (Marston et al., 2005). Civic energy, community financial anchoring, low-impact housing, and digital cooperatives are a few examples of the large-scale spatial entitities that are likely to be reflected. In the future, there will be hybrid platforms that combine various services, abilities, and tools to perform the function of a broker. In order to see the possibilities of postcapitalism, one needs a new kind of spatial literacy, one that is attuned to the horizontal and diffuse connections and capabilities that emerge via collaborative and peer-to-peer networks that unite online and offline commoning activities. The connection between the state and politicised meso-level civil society activities presents a significant geographical challenge. It is unclear whether the state can effectively counteract capitalism's excesses and become a strong ally of a more radicalised civil society, despite the desire to create a new type of state that is participatory, enabling, and deeply self-critical (Wainwright, 2018). We hope that we have laid out a future agenda for postcapitalist research and practice that geography might pursue in many different ways. We hope, first and foremost, that this will pique the interest of scholars and researchers in postcapitalism. For the sake of educating the next generation of scholars, politicians, and educators, we call for an increase in relevant conferences, grants, seminars, and course modules.

familiar with these concepts and the pressing issues that give rise to them (also see Routledge and Derickson, 2015; Derickson and Routledge, 2015). In addition, new concerns are arising that have the potential to influence the course of our field in the years to come. These include: what, exactly, would an academic common look like in terms of information and interpersonal relationships; how can we return to our jobs the parts that involve doing good rather than just doing it; and, finally, how can we make sure that our work as a field represents socially beneficial production that doesn't contribute to the further privatisation, commodific These are matters of great importance and difficulty. However, we propose them in the interest of generating more theoretical and practical momentum for postcapitalist futures in our field, in the workplace, and in society at large.

References

Ahmed W (2012) From militant particularism to anti-neoliberalism? The Anti-Enron Movement in India. *Antipode* 44(2): 1059–1080.

Albert M (2004) *Life after Capitalism*. London: Verso.

Amsler S (2011) Beyond all reason: Spaces of hope in the struggle for England's universities. *Representations* 116(1): 62–87.

Alperovitz G (2004) *America Beyond Capitalism: Reclaiming Our Wealth, Our Liberty, and Our Democracy*. London: Wiley.

Autonomous Geographies Collective (2010) Beyond scholar activism: Making strategic interventions inside and outside the neoliberal university. *ACME: An*

International E-Journal for Critical Geographies 9(2): 245–275.

Bastani A (2018) *Fully Automated Luxury Communism: A Manifesto*. London: Verso.

Birch K and Siemiatycki M (2015) Neoliberalism and the geographies of marketization: The entangling of state and markets. *Progress in Human Geography* 40(2): 177–198.

Black B (1985) *The Abolition of Work and Other Essays*. Port Townsend, WA: Loompanics Unlimited.

Blaut JM (1975) Imperialism: The Marxist theory and its evolution. *Antipode* 7: 1–19.

Blomley N (2007) Making private property: Enclosure, common right and the work of hedges. *Rural History* 18(1): 1–21.

Bollier D (2002) Reclaiming the commons. *Boston Review* 27(3–4). Available at: http://bostonreview.net/archives/BR27.3/bollier.html (accessed 1 December 2018).

Bondi L (2005) Making connections and thinking through emotions: Between geography and psychotherapy. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30(4): 433–448.

Bonefeld W (1988) Class struggle and the permanence of primitive accumulation. *Common Sense* 6: 54–65.

Bonefeld W, Gunn R and Psychopedis K (1995) *Open Marxism: Emancipating Marx* (Vol. 3). London: Pluto Press.

Bonefeld W (2001) The permanence of primitive accumulation: Commodity fetishism and social constitution. *The Commoner 2* (September). Available at: https://libcom.org/files/PrimAccum.pdf (accessed 1 December 2018).

Bookchin M (1982) *The Ecology of Freedom: The Emergence and Dissolution of Hierarchy*. Palo Alto, CA: Cheshire Books.

Bowman A, Ertu̇rk I and Froud J (eds) (2014) *The End of the Experiment? From Competition to the Foundational Economy*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bresnihan P and Byrne M (2015) Escape into the city: Everyday practices of commoning and the production of urban space in Dublin. *Antipode* 47: 36–54.

Cameron J and Gibson K (2005) Participatory action research in a poststructuralist vein. *Geoforum* 36(3): 315–331.

Caffentzis G (2010) The future of 'the commons': Neoliberalism's 'plan B' or the original disaccumulation of capital? *New Formations* 69: 23–41.

Caffentzis G and Federici S (2014) Commons against and beyond capitalism. *Community Development Journal* 49 (suppl. 1): i92–i105.

Castoriadis C (1991) *Philosophy, Politics, Autonomy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Castree N (2003) Commodifying what nature? *Progress in Human Geography* 27(3): 273–297.

Castree N (2010) Crisis continuity and change: Neoliberalism, the left and the future of capitalism. *Antipode* 41(SI): 185–213.

Castree N (2015) Unfree radicals: Geoscientists, the Anthropocene and left politics. *Antipode* 49(S1): 1–9.

Chatterton P (2010) So what does it mean to be anti-capitalist? Conversations with activists from urban social centres. *Urban Studies* 476: 1205–1224.

Chatterton P (2013) Towards an agenda for post-carbon cities: Lessons from Lilac, the UK's first ecological affordable cohousing community. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37(5): 1654–1674.

Chatterton P and Pickerill J (2010) Everyday activism and transitions towards postcapitalist worlds. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 35: 475–490.

Clarke S (1991) *Marx, Marginalism and Modern Sociology: From Adam Smith to Max Weber*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cleaver H (1992) The inversion of class perspective in Marxian theory: From valorisation to self-valorisation. *Open Marxism* 2: 106–144.

Cleaver H (2000) *Reading Capital Politically*. Edinburgh: AK Press.

Clough N and Blumberg R (2012) Toward anarchist and autonomist Marxist geographies. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 11(3): 335–351.

Cornwell J (2012) Worker cooperatives and spaces of possibility: An investigation of subject space at collective copies. *Antipode* 44: 725–744.

Correia D (2008) 'Rousers of the rabble' in the New Mexico Land Grant War: La Alianza Federal de Mercedes and the violence of the state. *Antipode* 40: 561–583.

Crossan J, Cumbers A, McMaster R and Shaw D (2016) Contesting neoliberal urbanism in Glasgow's community gardens: The practice of DIY citizenship. *Antipode* 48: 937–955

Cumbers A (2015) Constructing a global commons in, against and beyond the state. *Space and Polity* 19(1): 62–75.

Dafermos G (2017) The Catalan Integral Cooperative: An organizational study of a post-capitalist cooperative. *Commons Transition*. Available at: http://commonstransition.org/the-catalan-integral-cooperative-an-organizational-study-of-a-post-capitalist-cooperative/ (accessed 1 December 2018).

Davies T and Isakjee A (2015) Geography migration and abandonment in the Calais refugee camp. *Political Geography* 49: 93–95.

Dalla Costa M and James S (1973) *The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community*. Bristol: Falling Wall Press.

Day RJ (2005) *Gramsci Is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements*. London: Pluto Press.

Dean J (2012) *The Communist Horizon*. London: Verso Books.

De Angelis DM (2017) *Omnia sunt communia: On the Commons and the Transformation to Postcapitalism*. London: Zed Books.

Debord G (1963) Never work. Available at: https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/debord/1963/never-work.htm (accessed 23 July 2018).

Derickson KD and MacKinnon D (2015) Toward an interim politics of resourcefulness for the Anthropocene. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 105(2): 304–312

Derickson KD and Routledge P (2015) Resourcing scholar-activism: Collaboration transformation and the production of knowledge. *Professional Geographer* 67(1): 1–7.

Derickson KD, MacLeod G and Nicolas V (2015) Knowing about crisis. *Space and Polity* 19(1): 91–96.

Dinerstein AC (2014) *The Politics of Autonomy in Latin America: The Art of Organising Hope*. London: Springer.

Dinerstein AC, Pitts FH and Taylor G (2016) A post-work economy of robots and machines is a bad utopia for the left. *The Conversation*. Available at: https://theconversation.com/a-post-work-economy-of-robots-and-machines-is-a-bad-utopia-for-the-left-59134 (accessed 1 December 2018).

Dubb S (2016) *Conversations on Community Wealth Building*. New York: Democracy Collaborative.

Eizenberg E (2012) Actually existing commons: Three moments of space of community gardens in New York City. *Antipode* 44(3): 764–782.

Featherstone D (2003) Spatialities of transnational resistance to globalization: The maps of grievance of the Inter-Continental Caravan. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28(4): 404–421.

Federici S (1975) *Wages against Housework*. Bristol: Falling Wall Press.

Federici S (2004) *Caliban and the Witch*. New York: Autonomedia.

Federici S (2009) Education and the enclosure of knowledge in the global university. *ACME: An International e-journal for Critical Geographies* 8(3): 454–461.

Federici S (2012) *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Feigenbaum A, Frenzel F and McCurdy P (2013) *Protest Camps*. London: Zed Books.

Fortunati L (1995) *The Arcane of Reproduction: Housework, Prostitution, Labor and Capital*. New York: Autonomedia.

Ghose R and Pettygrove M (2014) Urban community gardens as spaces of citizenship. *Antipode* 46: 1092–1112.

Gibson-Graham J-K (1996) *The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gibson-Graham J-K (2006) *A Post Capitalist Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gibson-Graham J-K and Cameron J (2013) *Take Back the Economy: An Ethical Guide for Transforming Our Communities*. Minneapolis University of Minnesota Press.

Gibson-Graham J-K and Roelvink G (2011) The nitty gritty of creating alternative economies. In: Martin B (ed.) *Social Alternatives Special Issue: The Value of Techniques* 30(1): 29–33.

Gibson-Graham J-K, Cameron J and Healy S (2016) Commoning as a postcapitalist politics. In: Amin A and Howell P (eds) *Releasing the Commons: Rethinking the Futures of the Commons*. London: Routledge, 192–212.

Gidwani V and Baviskar A (2011) Urban commons. *Economic and Political Weekly* 46(50): 42–44.

Gillespie T (2016) Accumulation by urban dispossession: Struggles over urban space in Accra, Ghana. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 41(1): 66–77.

Glassman J (2006) Primitive accumulation, accumulation by dispossession, accumulation by 'extra-economic' means. *Progress in Human Geography* 30(5): 608–625.

Gorz A (1997) *Farewell to the Working Class: An Essay on Post-Industrial Socialism*. London: Pluto Press.

Graeber D (2013) *The Democracy Project: A History, a Crisis, a Movement*. London: Spiegel and Grau.

Graeber D (2018) *Bullshit Jobs: A Theory*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Halvorsen S (2015) Taking space: Moments of rupture and everyday life in Occupy London. *Antipode* 47: 401–417.

Harrison JL and Lloyd SE (2012) Illegality at work: Deportability and the productive new era of immigration enforcement. *Antipode* 44: 365–385.

Haraway D (2016) *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hart G (2010) D/developments after the meltdown. *Antipode* 41: 117–141.

Harvey D (2006) *Spaces of Global Capitalism: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development*. London: Verso.

Healy S (2015) Communism as a mode of life. *Rethinking Marxism* 27(3): 343–356.

Heynen N (2010) Cooking up non-violent civil-disobedient direct action for the hungry: Food not bombs and the resurgence of radical democracy in the US. *Urban Studies* 47(6): 1225–1240.

Hodkinson S (2012) The new urban enclosures. *City* 16(5): 500–518.

Hodkinson S and Chatterton P (2006) Autonomy in the city? Reflections on the social centres movement in the UK. *City* 103: 305–315.

Holloway J (2010) *Crack Capitalism*. London: Pluto Press.

Internationalist Communist Tendency (2018) Back to the future: Rebranding social democracy. Available at: https://libcom.org/blog/back-future-rebranding-social-democracy-12042018 (accessed 23 July 2018).

Jarvis H (2011) Saving space, sharing time: Integrated infrastructures of daily life in cohousing. *Environment and Planning A* 43(3): 560–577.

Jeffrey A, McFarlane C and Vasudevan A (2012) Rethinking enclosure: Space, subjectivity and the commons. *Antipode* 44(4): 1247–1267.

Jenkins K (2014) Unearthing women's anti-mining activism in the Andes: Pachamama and the 'mad old women'. *Antipode* 47: 442–460.

Kaika M and Karaliotas L (2014) The spatialization of democratic politics: Insights from Indignant Squares. *European Urban and Regional Studies May:* 1–15.

Katsiaficas G (1997) *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous Movements and the Decolonization of*

Everyday Life. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Katz C (2004) *Growing Up Global: Economic Restructuring and Children's Everyday Lives*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lafargue P (1907) *The Right to Be Lazy: And Other Studies*. London: CH Kerr.

Lessard-Lachance M and Norcliffe G (2013) To storm the citadel: Geographies of protest at the Summit of the Americas in Que´bec City *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 103(1): 180–194.

Lewis H, Dwyer P, Hodkinson S and Waite L (2015) Hyper-precarious lives: Migrants, work and forced labour in the Global North. *Progress in Human Geography* 39(5): 580–600.

Linebaugh P (2008) *The Magna Carta Manifesto: Liberties and Commons for All*. London: Verso.

Linebaugh P (2014) *Stop, Thief!: The Commons, Enclosures, and Resistance*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.

Lo´pez MA (2013) The squatters' movement in Europe: A durable struggle for social autonomy in urban politics. *Antipode* 45: 866–887.

Lotringer S and Marazzi C (1980) Italy-autonomia-the return of politics. *Semiotexte*, 3(3), 8–22.

Mackenzie AF and Dalby S (2003) Moving mountains: Community and resistance in the Isle of Harris, Scotland, and Cape Breton, Canada. *Antipode* 35: 309–333.

Marston SA, Jones JP and Woodward K (2005) Human geography without scale. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30: 416–432.

Marx K (1990) *Capital, Volume I*, trans. Fowkes B. London: Penguin Books.

Marx K and Engels F (1972) *The German ideology*. New York: International Publishers Co.

Mason K and Whitehead M (2012) Transition urbanism and the contested politics of ethical place-making. *Antipode* 44: 493–516.

Mason P (2015) *Postcapitalism. A Guide to Our Future*. London: Allen Lane.

McDowell L (1986) Beyond patriarchy: Of women's subordination: a class-based explanation. *Antipode* 18: 311–321.

Midnight Notes (1990) The new enclosures. *Midnight Notes* 10: 1–9.

Mitchell D and Heynen N (2009) The geography of survival and the right to the city: Speculations on surveillance, legal innovation and the criminalization of intervention. *Urban Geography* 30(6): 611–632.

Montagna N (2006) The de-commodification of urban space and the occupied social centres in Italy. *City* 103: 295–304.

Motta SC (2013) Teaching global and social justice as transgressive spaces of possibility. *Antipode* 45: 80–100.

kinpaisby mrs (2008) Taking stock of participatory geographies: Envisioning the communiversity. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33(3): 292–299.

Myers M (2017) *Student Revolt: Voices of the Austerity Generation*. London: Pluto Press.

Neary M (2016) Value: Critical pedagogy, participatory art and higher education – a new measure and meaning of the common(s). In: Ladkin S, McKay R and Bojesen E (eds) *Against Value in the Arts and Education: Disruptions*. London: Rowman and Littlefield, 355–374.

Neary M (2017) Sustainability and the politics of abolition. Available at: https://nearymike.wordpress.com/2017/06/07/1516/ (accessed 23 July 2018).

Neeson JM (1996) *Commoners: Common Right, Enclosure and Social Change in England, 1700–1820*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nelson A and Timmerman F (2011) *Life without Money*. London: Pluto Press.

Newman K and Wyly E (2006) The right to stay put revisited: Gentrification and resistance to displacement in New York City. *Urban Studies* 43: 23–57.

Norda°s R and Gleditsch N (2007) Climate change and conflict. *Political Geography* 26(6): 627–638.

North P (2014) Ten square miles surrounded by reality? Materialising alternative economies using local currencies. *Antipode* 46(1): 246–265.

North P and Huber U (2004) Alternative spaces of the 'Argentinazo'. *Antipode* 36: 963–984.

Noterman E (2016) Beyond tragedy: Differential commoning in a manufactured housing cooperative. *Antipode* 48(2): 433–452.

Noterman E and Pusey A (2012) Inside, outside and on the edge of the academy: Experiments in radical pedagogies. In Haworth R (ed.) *Anarchist Pedagogies: Collective Actions Theories and Critical Reflections on Education*. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 175–199.

Noys B (2010) *Persistence of the Negative: A Critique of Contemporary Continental Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Noys B (2014) *Malign Velocities: Accelerationism and Capitalism*. London: John Hunt Publishing.

Ovenden K (2015) *Syriza: Inside the Labyrinth*. London: Pluto Press.

Panitch L and Gindin S (2011) Capitalist crises and the crisis this time. *Socialist Register* 47: 1–21.

Peck J and Tickell A (2002) Neoliberalizing space. *Antipode* 34: 380–404.

Pickerill J and Maxey L (2009) Geographies of sustainability: Low impact developments and radical spaces of innovation. *Geography Compass* 3(4): 1515–1539.

Pickerill J, Krinsky J, Hayes G, Gillan K and Doherty B (eds) (2016) *Occupy! A Global Movement*. Routledge: London.

Pitts F and Dinerstein A (2017a) Corbynism's conveyor belt of ideas: Postcapitalism and the politics of social reproduction. *Capital and Class* 41(3): 423–434.

Pitts H and Dinerstein A (2017b) Postcapitalism, basic income and the end of work: A critique and alternative. *Bath Papers in International Development and Wellbeing* 55. Available at: https://research-information.bristol.ac.uk/files/136697962/Pitts_and_Dinerstein_2017_Postcapitalism_basic_income_and_the_end_of_work_CDS_WP.pdf (accessed 1 December 2018).

Plan C and Russell B (2017) Radical municipalism: Demanding the future. *Open Democracy*. Available at: https://www.opendemocracy.net/plan-c/radical-municipalism-demanding-future (accessed 23 June 2018).

Prudham S (2007) The fictions of autonomous invention: Accumulation by dispossession, commodification and life patents in Canada. *Antipode* 39(3): 406–429.

Pusey A (2010) Social centres and the new cooperativism of the common. *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture and Action* 4(1): 20–25.

Pusey A (2017) A cartography of the possible: Reflections on militant ethnography in and against the edu-factory. *Area*. https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12386.

Pusey A, Russell B and Sealey-Huggins L (2012) Movements and moments for climate justice: From Copenhagen to Cancun via Cochabamba. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* 113: 15–32.

QQ (2018) The poverty of luxury communism. Available at: https://libcom.org/blog/poverty-luxury-communism-05042018 (accessed 23 July 2018).

Radice H (2013) How we got here: UK higher education under neoliberalism. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 12(3).

Raworth K (2017) *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-century Economist*. Hartford, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Routledge P (2008) Acting in the network: ANT and the politics of generating associations. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26: 199–217.

Routledge P (2009) Transnational resistance: Global justice networks and spaces of convergence. *Geography Compass* 3: 1881–1901.

Routledge P (2015) Engendering Gramsci: Gender, the philosophy of praxis and spaces of encounter in the climate caravan Bangladesh, *Antipode* 47: 1321–1345.

Routledge P and Derickson K D (2015) Situated solidarities and the practice of scholar-activism. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 33: 391–407.

Routledge P, Cumbers A and Driscoll Derickson K (2018) States of just transition: Realizing climate justice through and against the state. *Geoforum* 88: 78–86.

Russell B (2014) Beyond activism/academia: Militant research and the radical climate and climate justice movements. *Area* 47(3): 222–229.

Scholz T (2016) *Platform Cooperativism: Challenging the Sharing Economy*. New York: Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung.

Scholz T and Schneider N (2016) *Ours to Hack and Own: The Rise of Platform Cooperatives*. London: OR Books.

Sealey-Huggins L and Pusey A (2013) Neoliberalism and depoliticisation in the academy: Understanding the 'new student rebellions'. *Graduate Journal of Social Science* 10(3).

Sevilla-Buitrago A (2015) Capitalist formations of enclosure: Space and the extinction of the commons. *Antipode* 47: 999–1020

Shaw KS and Hagemans IW (2015) 'Gentrification without displacement' and the consequent loss of place: The effects of class transition on low-income residents of secure housing in gentrifying areas. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39: 323–341.

Solnit R (2004) *Hope in the Dark*. New York: Nation Books.

Springer S (2011) Public space as emancipation: Meditations on anarchism, radical democracy, neoliberalism and violence. *Antipode* 43: 525–562.

Springer S (2014) Human geography without hierarchy. *Progress in Human Geography* 8(3): 402–419.

Srnicek N and Williams A (2015) *Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World Without Work*. London: Verso.

Stavrides S (2014) Emerging common spaces as a challenge to the city of crisis. *City* 18(4-5): 546–550.

Sundberg J (2007) Reconfiguring north–south solidarity: Critical reflections on experiences of transnational resistance *Antipode* 39(1): 144–166.

Taylor M (2014) 'Being useful' after the Ivory Tower: Combining research and activism with the Brixton Pound. *Area* 46: 305–312.

Thompson M (2015) Between boundaries: From commoning and guerrilla gardening to community land trust development in Liverpool. *Antipode* 47: 1021–1042.

Tornaghi C (2014) Critical geography of urban agriculture. *Progress in Human Geography* 38(4): 551–567.

Tronti M (1966) *Operai e capitale (Workers and capital)*. Turin: Einaudi.

Vasudevan A (2017) *The Autonomous City: A History of Urban Squatting*. London: Verso.

Vieta M (2016) Autogestio´n: Prefiguring a 'new cooperativism' and the 'labour commons'. In: DuRand C (ed.) *Moving Beyond Capitalism*. London: Routledge, 77–85.

Wainwright H (2018) *A New Politics from the Left*. London: Polity.

Wainwright J and Kim S-J (2003) Battles in Seattle redux: Transnational resistance to a neoliberal trade agreement. *Antipode* 40: 513–534.

Wall D (2015) *Economics After Capitalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wallace A (2014) Gentrification interrupted in Salford, UK: From New Deal to 'limbo-land' in a contemporary urban periphery. *Antipode* 47: 517–538.

Weeks K (2011) *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Williams A and Srnicek N (2013) # Accelerate: Manifesto for an accelerationist politics.In: Mackay R and Avanessian A (eds) *# Accelerate: The Accelerationist Reader*. London: Lulu Press.

Wills J (2000) Political economy II: The politics and geography of capitalism. *Progress in Human Geography* 24(4): 641–652.

Wright EO (2010) *Envisioning Real Utopias*. London: Verso.