On metaphors and their material implications:

Thinking with Satoyama Landscapes

Bibi Calderaro

The Graduate Center, CUNY

Professor Melissa Checker

Politics and Poetics of Climate Change

December 24th, 2020

> To value is to make relational potential the subject of enquiry,
> rather than evaluating a stand-alone object as separate from
> the work-world nexus. A work's value depends on how it
> moves the relation.
>
> Erin Manning, 2008

Introduction: on boundaries and their shifting modes of existence

This paper responds to my query stemming from a deep concern with the state of certain anthropogenic drives with destructive force at work today. In particular, I have been interested from within and outside the academy in the object of inquiry bundled under the name of "Climate Change." From a diversity of angles and disciplines, I have particularly focused on the human affective and emotional elements that both help to dilute the object of study and also to enhance it. In fact, I am interested in this paradoxical disposition, both as an element within the subject matter and as an element with which to respond to complex situations creatively. For paradoxes create cognitive dissonance and in so doing carry the potential to generate multiplicities and differentiation. Although today's inquiry comes alongside anthropology's framework to which I turned in order to help me elucidate ways of understanding and foreseeing possibilities to the entanglement human+more-than-human at local and planetary scales, my interest stems from and returns to my field of research—education— as possible vehicle from which to engage this entanglement. I see education as a creative medium for research and practice in part due to its constitutive interdisciplinarity, which can thus render pedagogies that engage paradox and complexity in creative ways. I turned to education seeking for provisional answers that might orient me to how curiosity, care, and certain habits can be sustained, while shifting others in the ways we produce, consume, discard, but also in the ways we exchange, give and take, and understand the deep contexts in which these take place. After two and a half years of classes in pedagogy, history of the US public education system, policy and methodology I can confidently state the following: historically and currently education worldwide and particularly in the USA functions as a tool of the economic system, which is based in oppressive, alienating and extractive methods toward humans and non-humans alike. Education and its particular ancillary, schooling, are indoctrinating social institutions in terms of their disciplinary and controlling design and strategy and in terms of their capacity to form specific subjectivities that respond to these parameters (Foucault, 2001; Deleuze, 1997). My query follows a curiosity to find out how the mode of existence of education as social institution can be inverted to generate

a radical shift in its theoretical and practical scopes, and transform it into a driving force for new economic ways of being. This latter in fact would respond to new ways of being in general[1] given that being human necessitates a way of relating that can be called economic *and* ecologic at once (hence the sharing of the suffix eco- in both words). This shift entails transitioning to different energy regimes altogether, something that is of pressing importance with regard to environmental and social crises due to the direct relationship to fossil fuel burning and the speed at which capitalist entanglements work in the degradation of the whole of the environment, endangering all of life via these anthropogenic means while reproducing oppressive social relations. Whereas a transition to new energy regimes is already underway albeit at a slow pace, the parameters by which this transition is taking place have not changed enough or at all (Howe, 2019; Boyer, 2019) to make a qualitative shift from oppressive to symbiopoietic processes of production and generation (Haraway, 2017). While it is important to focus on the sources of the energy needed to feed and give shelter to the human species, thus moving from non-renewables to renewables, it is also of paramount importance that as Westerners we come to understand these sources as existing not just for humanity's sake (and naming them services and resources in traditional neo-classical economic parlance) but as agentic entities with inherent value with which the human species shares the planet. The question of energy is paramount and complex and there seems to be no universalizing answer. Current forms of renewable energy retain extractive and neo-colonial chains in terms of the materials necessary to fabricate the infrastructures as well as to the spatial arrangements needed to implement these, which typically follow top-down models of free-market economy instead of decentralized local models of distribution (Howe, 2019; Boyer, 2019). Thus, new ways of being in turn would necessitate different modes of production, consumption and discarding, and new distributed dispositions; in short, overall new subjectivities capable of new relationalities and perhaps of coming to terms with a lower consumption of energy altogether. In this sense, there is one key topic—that of population growth and the carrying capacity of the planet—that I cannot parse in this paper due to space allotment, but which strikes me as crucial and nonetheless somewhat of a taboo in the academy due to ethical difficulties that stem from certain neoliberal politics practiced and

---

[1] as in ways of belonging to the human species in the XXI Century in relation to world-making capacities that enable relating to the more-than-human in non-extractive/oppressive ways.

enacted in what used to be called the Third or Developing World in the 70s and 80s—now bundled under a generic 'Global South.'

I - Intuitive nonlinearity

I have chosen to focus on what is commonly known as 'the commons' as land tenure systems that date back to pre-capitalist Europe, but which could as much refer to indigenous land tenure systems dating back to pre-settler contact (Goeman, 2015; Sawadogo and Stamm, 2000). I encountered the notion of the commons and its practice as commoning throughout my research on land-based practices of education that are participatory, inclusive of the more-than-human, horizontal and distributed in terms of learning and teaching capacities that follow 'informal educational' patterns[2] (Tuck et al., 2014; Rogoff et al, 2016). This research sustains my hypothesis that such educational practices have the capacity to re-position 'the human,' decentering the Western *homo-economicus* and its individual egocentrism to create eco-centric, 'collectividual' habits of being (Stetsenko, 2017). Thus commons and commoning may serve as templates to inquire about land practices, governance, land use and tenure institutions, and the processes of formation that transpire and traverse these in their capacities to inspire new ways of being human (from the perspective of a Western subjectivity referenced above). I have conducted a literature search in attempting to shed light into some of these questions, and what I have been able to unearth is the small tip of a huge iceberg afloat in a sea of kin literature on the subject. The more I dig, the more artifacts come to my encounter—scholarly literature with increasing interdisciplinary characteristics and immaterial objects of study, non-fiction books, online platforms responding to a growing amount of organizations and institutions, and a myriad practices around the planet, all very much centered on boundaries of all sorts and natures, and the regulations and communications amongst these spaces. Scholarly interest on this topic has picked up speed in the new millennium as alternatives to capitalism have capsized as fast as they have appeared, leaving behind a trail of critiques after brief charismatic occurrences. It seems that because the commons and commoning are grounded in long-held practices with land and hence necessarily with generative practices of cultures, they sustain a resilience with respect to

---

[2] These are described as being characterized by Learning by observing and pitching in (LOPI) organization (Rogoff et al., 2016). LOPI has been identified in communities that are tightly woven together and where there are tasks to be accomplished, where trans-generational learning occurs without guidance or as a goal in itself, collaboration is strong and intellectual and emotional aspects of learning are blended together.

other (more abstract theories of) resistance and refusal that come and go in academic circles at an accelerated pace. I realize in hindsight that I intuitively approached the literature in a nonlinear fashion: first, concentrating on literature about Satoyama, the Japanese cultural and land-based practice; second, doing a research development stage, casting a wide net on the commons topic to then narrow down according to approximation to my query; third, following a non-comprehensive pattern (by chance in chronological order) of reading those papers considered 'top references' and those that follow behind but are somewhat more attuned to my inquiry in terms of methods, frameworks and paradigm. What follows is a weaving of some of this literature that is nowhere near exhaustive. In fact, it is expansive and expanding as some theories of the universe expound, perhaps pointing to the possibility that the pluriverse is more the shape of it—complex, divergent, topologically non-linear, constantly dynamic—and as such, following quasi-methodic modulations[3] that attempt and fail to quench my angst in terms of the knowable and the un-knowable of any given subject. Some questions I attempt to engage are: What tools and analytical concepts to use in order to prevent static understandings of what lies at either side of porous boundaries? Is Satoyama's revival an example of a thriving commons and can it be thought of as existing in between governance regimes, knowledge systems and land uses? Rather than analysing categorically or in spatially bounded objects, can thinking topologically help tackle 'spacetimemattering' and other issues of scale? (Barad, 2017).

II - Lost in outdated calculations

The platform called *The International Association for the Study of the Commons* (IASC)[4] is found fairly easily when conducting an online basic search on the commons. Unsurprisingly functional, they offer recommended literature about the topic. I 'landed' here when trying to place Satoyama within the landscape of existing research dedicated to the concept of commons. The IASC seems to be the headquarters of all institutions concerned with the commons, in particular because its lineage is directly related to Noble Prize winning economist Elinor Ostrom's work on the commons since the 1970s as well as due to its international scope. Their literature recommendation begins with a short text by Ostrom from 2010 called "Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems," where the title is

---

[3] Following anthropologists George Devereux and Ruth Behar who wrote about "methods" as tools for binding one's anxieties and expressing our vulnerabilities throughout one's inquiry (Spiro, 1969).
[4] https://iasc-commons.org/

more promising than its delivery. In sum the paper stresses that locally, situated, bottom-up involvement and decision-making that offers face-to-face communication opportunities amongst stakeholders from a community are best practices of commoning where trust is built. Outcomes are neo-darwinianly described as successful in relation to the duration these practices are sustained for or as failures when these practices cease to exist. Scale is definitely an element in the analysis although not emphasized enough. Ostrom extends a typology of rules by which common-pool resources (CPR) may be governed successfully and ways in which stakeholders come to agree on self-management of resources, monitor and make stakeholders accountable, as well as on sanctions applied if and when stakeholders go for a 'free-ride.' Ostrom blends economic jargon with social scientific (outdated) notions that in the long run do not successfully overcome certain attachments to the Sciences understood as Enlightenment categories. As much as she struggles to bring complexity to the fore, her justifications for this move override any actual analysis of complexity, situatedness or the promising concept of polycentrality. I found Ostrom's paper dedicated mostly to an audience of policy makers, lacking both politics and poetics, which in turn says a lot about the audience and indirectly extends the notion that understandings of the commons must be imparted in a top-down manner by international scholars and policymakers and that, following the liberal motto, economics is always already a separate praxis from politics. Perhaps the one takeaway notion of this paper is Ostrom's insistence that " "One size fits all" policies are not effective" (p.642). The backdrop and challenge to Ostrom's efforts are not just a positivist and dichotomous approach to economics and social behavior but the individualist ethos of neoclassical economics where the only regulator is the free market, the only operator is a White rational man (or women pretending to be them) and where individuals (also male and White) are presumed to compete against each other for limited resources and for the potential profit from these as only possible actions and engagements with 'nature'—a separate entity of 'services' and 'resources.' These are the Enlightenment ghosts of Western existence that still sit at the head of the negotiations table. A case in point is the 1968 paper titled "The Tragedy of the Commons" by human ecologist Garrett Hardin from UCSB. His 'tragic' account lingers in today's social unconscious and is the go-to argument when neoliberal privatizations are in need of justification even when, in 1998, Hardin himself extended that, "…the weightiest mistake in my synthesizing paper was the omission of the modifying adjective "unmanaged."" (Hardin, 1998, p. 683).

III - The tragic that resists ruination

In "The Tragedy of the Commons: Twenty-Two Years After" from 1990, David Feeny and an interdisciplinary team of scientists re-evaluate Hardin's argument, trying to counter the latter's greatly accepted solution for over-depletion of commonly-held resources in the mandate to privatize or make the government the sole regulatory institutions for the uses and users of any resource. Feeny et al. explain that Hardin's tragic misconception comes from applying the concepts of carrying capacity and overpopulation to a collapsed understanding of resources and property-rights regimes, while oversimplifying the latter—Hardin simply oversaw the distinction between commonly held resources and open access resources. According to the authors the key is "…to distinguish between the resource and the property-rights regime in which the resource is held" (p.3) and analyze according to two important characteristics—excludability and subtractability. The first pertains to access rights and control about who may physically enter and make use of the resource. The second characteristic describes how "each user is capable of subtracting from the welfare of other users" (p.3). Regarding property-rights regimes, Feeny et al. define a set of four: open access; private property; communal property; state property; where the second and fourth reinforce each other's rights. The authors echo Ostrom in insisting on the complexity of the subject matter, asserting that, "Knowledge of the property rights regime is necessary but not sufficient," adding that, "…one must understand a whole host of institutional arrangements governing access to and use of the resource" (p.5). Feeny et al. continue by applying ecological sustainability as the analytic tool by which to establish success or failure in the usage of resources within the four typologies, assessing "…whether the resource in question has been used "without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs"" (p.5). They state that in the case of communally held resources the key is in the power to exclude those who are not members of the specified community of users. Thus, they assert that, "Evidence suggests that successful exclusion under communal property is the rule rather than the exception" (p.7). The authors warn us that commons are fragile arrangements that depend on socio-political contexts. In particular they explain that, "Pressure on the resource because of human population growth, technological change, or economic change, including new market opportunities, may contribute to the breakdown of communal-property mechanisms for exclusion. The role of population growth is especially controversial" (p.7). All in all the authors conclude that "…exclusion is feasible, if not always successful, under private, state, *and*

communal-property regimes. Furthermore, private or state ownership is not always sufficient to provide for exclusion" (p.9). The analysis and understanding of the commons to this point remains centered on limited notions of 'the human'[5] expressed in a language of exploitation, rational subjects and collectives as sole agentic actors, and the underscoring of a capitalist mindset as the sustained mono-tone that serves as exclusive analytical tool for human~nature relationalities. All in all, a tragic dead-end from which very little escapes to ruination.

IV - Summoning encouraging openings

In "Commoning as a Transformative Social Paradigm" from 2015, David Bollier engages an attempt to open the discourse of the commons to go beyond the economic utilitarian language of resources and in particular to counter capitalist endeavors. Bollier points to necessary questions regarding governance and political-economic institutions such as capital, the re-evaluation of value, and ways in which commoning have created and sustained credit bearing alternatives, urban relationalities based on commons, the possibility to straighten wealth, income, racial and gender inequalities, and the expanding of the concept of commons to immaterial objects such as knowledge and open-access software. Despite his efforts to support commoning and the commons as a radical movement that demands acknowledging the intrinsic value in all living systems and the political, economic and ontological shifts this necessitates, his paper lacks real arguments to orient readers to the commons and commoning as other than faith-based, simplistic logics on post-capitalist alternatives that can indeed work. Whereas he claims that "The ontological variability of the commons is supremely maddening and incomprehensible to economists and others living within the modernist worldview…," his view remains anchored to an anthropocentric understanding and a simplistic one at that. In stating that, "There is no commons without *commoning*;" and "There are no commons without *commoners*,"[6] he extends the commons as a verb as one expanding strategy in the notion of commons as living relational system and its paramount value in the specific and radically different ontological parameters this proposes (p.7). Yet, the chosen distance from his object of study (throughout the essay referring to commoners as 'they') not only triggers mistrust but reifies the notion, reverting it back to the modernist frame he attempts to debunk. Nonetheless Bollier ends by ascribing to Colombian anthropologist Arturo Escobar's proposition that the commons point in the direction of the

---

[5] Again this limitation comes in the form of the tragic Western universalizing strategy
[6] Italics in original

pluriversal (p.8). This remark ushers in an education that pivots on shared aspects of immersive land-based pedagogies and what have been described as 'successful' instances of commoning involving the emotional, embodied, transgenerational, process-oriented, non-hierarchical capacities of socio-ecological relationalities. These shared aspects take up an activation of the senses and cognitive capacities with place as co-constitutive processes, pointing to the potential to transform by generating multi-valent, eco-centric subjectivities.

I find the above papers outdated as iterations at debunking the rational Western individual subject appear and reappear as ghosts and monsters (Tsing et al, 2017) in the rearview mirror of reified notions. In order to overcome the dead end of the modernist tragedy that resists ruination it seems necessary to engage analysis coming from an open interdisciplinarity that includes grassroots activism, aesthetic parameters, and those entities that might appear inert to Westerners but are definitely agentic if one 'listens' carefully (Cruikshank, 2010). Hybrid fields[7] are already engaged in attempting to understand 'the politics and poetics' of certain commons— in particular knowledges that come from lineages other than the Eurocentric Enlightenment. Whereas this is an established object of study mostly within decolonizing frameworks, asymmetries in the valuation of languages and cosmologies wager in as channels of communication evidence the need for translation.

At this point I was fortunate to encounter Peruvian and Argentinean anthropologists Marisol de la Cadena and Mario Blaser's "The Uncommons: An Introduction," the introductory text to a special edition of the journal *Anthropologica* from 2017. Here they problematize the concept from an onto-epistemological stance, bringing issues of epistemological domains and 'translation as controlled equivocation' (Viveiros de Castro) to generate an understanding of what exists as uncommon. In its dynamic tension with what exists as common, the uncommons helps to construct commoning practices based on difference and divergence. Instead of reducing to the common, these expand what is common to open to what can never be similar or equivalent. The introduction analyzes commoning through three axes seen in the commons literature as problematic: scale, scope and relations. On the first axis, they refer to STS scholar Casper Bruun Jensen's "domains" and the "yin-yang geography" of scholars Farquhar, Lai and Kramer in their re-theorization of the commons. These notions allow to open space to those 'things' that are unavailable to be understood as commons in terms of a clash of expectations in

---

[7] Geography, anthropology, some orientations of other social sciences and other

any given common practice as it is scaled up from local to global interests and in terms of what appears as knowable vis-à-vis the unknowable. Thus, the uncommons becomes "…that which exceeds [the commons] and cannot be articulated by it" (p.188) where the relation between one reach and the other "…is not one of exteriority but rather one of mutual interiority; the commons and the uncommons give meaning to each other and, as importantly, they incite each other as active principles, thus producing an oscillation that takes place in time" (p.188). The authors as well stress "…that the uncommons must not be conceptualized as an expression of pre-existing fossilized differences…"[] "…but rather as an ongoing and ever-changing process of divergence" (p188). Cutting through the axis of scope, where Western epistemological assumptions have assembled knowledge domains that then translate into a common practice and spatial ordering, the authors highlight the possibility of an "interstitial space, [a space] between various practices of knowing and managing the world" (p.189) where there occurs "…simultaneous connection and divergence." It is here that the authors bring Brazilian anthropologist Eduardo Viveiros de Castro's concept of 'equivocations' to indicate instances of unknowingly sharing terminology that refers to different phenomena. The authors foreground the discontinuous visibility of the uncommons as it flares up intermittently from under the surface of a commons, and ask what would be the political valence of 'uncommoning.' With regard to the axis of relations, de la Cadena and Blaser highlight geographer David Harvey's understanding of the commons as always already implicating some degree of enclosure, where the difference lies in the "…former's orientation toward a more democratic, egalitarian and just constitution of a domain for humans and non-humans" (p. 190). But, because fields of equivocation are often asymmetrical, it is of key importance that uncommoning is not made equivalent to commoning. Referencing Isabelle Stenger's notion of 'divergence,' the authors state that, "…the practices that interest us are constituted by their own *positive* divergence as they symbiotically come together—like in an ecological system—while also remaining distinct: what brings them together *is an interest in common that is not the same interest*"[8] (p.191). This resulting practice, as portrayed by de la Cadena and Blaser, bears more chances of sustaining a democratic, egalitarian and just tone than the commons as enunciation that opposes to enclosures (seen from the framework of a more neoclassical economics or a straight up political economy) due to the newly re-conceptualized practice of becoming open to be transformed in the iterative relation

---

[8] Italics in original

with uncommons. This commoning~uncommoning process seems to be able to withstand 'staying with the trouble' (Haraway, 2017) of paradoxical co-existences and become a regenerative dynamics of divergent but symbiotic entities.

<div align="center">Becoming as emergent depletion of duality and monoculture</div>

It is important to note that the first wave of commons enclosure during the late 1800s and as it re-occurs today at the scale of global neoliberal privatizations and land grabs differs with the second wave of enclosures that concerns itself with the study of knowledge and information/communication as a commons, dating back to the 90s. The first wave is concerned with material elements, 'natural,' physical resources that, despite their potential to regenerate and maintain a level of fluidity, are considered depletable or 'subtractable' (Ostrom, 2010; Bollier, ND). The second wave of enclosures to knowledge and information distribution works in a different direction—it seems the more it is used by the most people, the better chances to regenerate and function as creative force. In the words of knowledge and information commons scholar Charlotte Hess from Syracuse University, "Knowledge is cumulative. With ideas, the cumulative effect is a public good, so long as people have access to the vast storehouse. Maintaining knowledge as a public good by maintaining access and preservation were challenges long before the advent of digital technologies;" adding that, "Knowledge as a public good in digital format is fragile and increasingly vulnerable…" (Hess, 2012; p. 15). This puts the second wave of enclosures in a different category altogether—because knowledge is not subtractable but cumulative, it should benefit from 'open access rights' *and* from pluriversal reservoir pools.

"Becoming a Commoner: The Commons as Sites for Affective Socio-Nature Encounters and Co-Becomings" from 2017, is another happy encounter with commons literature that goes beyond toxic residues from modernist enclosures. Here, Indian geographer Neera Singh[9] makes use of affect theory and new materialisms to move the needle past binaries such as nature-culture and structure-individual agency in ways that accommodate agency beyond rational, anthropocentric frameworks. She argues that commoning, the process of spending time in/with a commons in community practices of care, re-values value in that it enables the process of subjectivity formation to go in a different direction. Singh utilizes French philosopher Gilbert Simondon's concept of 'individuation' to ground her argument to shift from the individualistic

---

[9] currently at The University of Toronto, Canada.

and presumed stabilized subject of a modern Western ethos to one that is never settled, constantly in-formation in an irreducibly implicated co-constitution with the environment. Thus, commoning is a practice that can be thought of as both forming of the commons *and* habit changing—from individual to 'collectividual' (Stetsenko, 2017), from anthropocentric to eco-centric—and one that can be the pivot for educational purposes toward building subjectivities alternative to a capitalist ethos. Singh resorts to affective relationality where 'thinking-feeling with' others engaged in caring practices enable the emergence of "different ways of understanding the world" (p.759). This onto-epistemological move helps her shift commoning to a process of becoming with others (human and non-humans alike), asserting that, "The self that emerges through these affective socio-natural interactions differs from the atomized individual subject of western thought" (p. 760). Singh highlights that "Reinventing a different mode of being human is thus one of the most critical challenges of our time, which compels attention to the conditions of subjectivity formation" (p.761). She works transversally to avoid static understandings of subjectivity stemming from Foucauldian and Agrawalian governmentality and environmentality. Key questions can be extrapolated to the educational field I am interested in cultivating, as she crucially asks, "What are the conditions that foster affective relations between the commons and commoners? How do people become commoners and imbibe norms that foster other-regarding behavior and support collective action to govern the commons?" (p. 754).

<p style="text-align:center">Becomings: opening to the indeterminacy of liminality</p>

Due to my interest in pedagogy I have been attracted to the practice of Satoyama for some time. It was first introduced to me via the Japanese practice of Forest Bathing (*Shinrin Yoku*) of which I became a facilitator in 2015 and which proposes (via medicinal scientific research published in peer-reviewed journals) that walking in forests is restorative and strengthening of human health. Satoyama was at that time presented to me as a liminal space between the rural and the urban, a space that humans create, honor and pass through in order to transition smoothly, intentionally and frequently from 'wild' to 'domesticated' landscapes. As such, it always intrigued me due to my interest in hybrid spaces, boundaries, and the rituals and performative actions that enable passing through them. Anthropologist Anna Tsing mentions translations as one such tool that reaches beyond the linguistic, and Satoyama as one of its practices. Through it, complex processes of 'partial attunement' between different knowledge systems seem to be facilitated, both bridging and maintaining difference. Tsing describes the

restorative practice of Satoyama as a paradoxical process, "Restoration requires disturbance—but disturbance to enhance diversity and the healthy functioning of ecosystems. Some kinds of ecosystems, advocates argue, flourish with human activities;" adding that, "What distinguishes satoyama revitalization, for me, is the idea that human activities should be part of the forest in the same way as nonhuman activities. Humans, pines, matsutake, and other species should all make the landscape together, in this project" (Tsing, 2015, p. 152). The paradox lies in that in order to restore, some disturbance needs to occur, as if the pharmakon that is the toxin becomes the remedy not only through homeopathic doses but also in that portions of the restoration need to be left to non-human agency and indeterminacy.

As I have further learned through this literature review, Satoyama implicates communities of humans and more-than-humans in the former's attempts at managing biodiversity for a certain kind of 'prosperity.' Currently its revival focuses on bringing biodiversity back to abandoned plots of land in Japan, which serves me as a case study for what is possible and doable in symbiopoietic entanglements of 'reciprocal capture' (I. Stengers via D. Bird Rose, 2017)[10]. I understand these as processes where value is created by the beneficial relationships of entities that co-create their identities by and through these co-constitutive relationships. Here a variety of transformations occur within human and more-than-human realms where processes of regeneration of multiplicity and diversity occur at all scales and levels. In particular from the human side of receptivity, I am interested in processes that begin with the noticing of a diversity of temporal domains through abandoning monolithic temporal lenses and notions of bounded units such as individuals, organisms, bodies (Gilbert, 2007; Haraway, 2017) through distributed and 'embodied' actions of caring for others. This view of Satoyama as an expanded discursive metaphor is unfortunately not found in the literature that I have encountered on the topic.

The latter is derivative of the biological and environmental sciences with a heavy emphasis on the physical-natural approach to the sciences understood from a Western traditional framework. Thus, there is a focus on the conservation and preservation of biodiversity as main

---

[10] Bird Rose states that, "For philosopher Isabelle Stengers, "reciprocal capture" is "an event, the production of new, immanent modes of existence" in which neither entity transcends the other or forces the other to bow down.[] It is a process of encounter and transformation, not absorption, in which different ways of being and doing find interesting things to do together."

goal for the revival of Satoyama, with an anthropocentric view of nature as resource for humans, a linear language of biotic systems where inputs and outputs need final equilibrium, and a sustainable-development framework that analyses in terms of manageability (Takeuchi et al., 2003; Fukamachi, 2020; Indrawan et al., 2014; Kobori, 2009). These analyses are based on deterministic understandings of land use implying that certain stages follow others, where conservation of the landscape and the cultural heritage that sustains these practices could be recovered from the ruins of late capitalism. This view is somewhat nostalgic of a past in which Japanese traditions are portrayed as 'harmonious' and untouched by Western modernism, a pre-WWII era to which the current revival attempts to go back to as if Japan's 'pure' past could come back to life via the infusion of once-abandoned practices, as if time were indeed reversible. Tsing's ruins in this sense are generative, indicating that the traces of contaminations left behind by modernisms are, in short, irreducible and irreversible to any past—the only path ahead is one of co-existence with the contaminated praxes and landscapes of the Capitalocene (Tsing, 2015). The former framework seems to be central to the myriad research endeavors found online, stemming from several universities' environmental and forestry departments with Satoyama initiatives of international scope. Somewhat of a goal for these teams of researchers is to understand what elements of Satoyama may be 'modeled' elsewhere as sustainable land-use practices (Berglund et al., 2013). Thus, local Satoyama revival is brought to the fore as case studies to illuminate certain shared commonalities: community and transgenerational engagement, volunteerism, the diversity of property land rights under which Satoyama is and was practiced (private, state and commons lands are indiscriminately used), and a revival at both urban and rural levels (Fukamachi, 2020). Moving Satoyama as practice and theory past the boundaries of the nation-state of Japan might have benefits and drawbacks, as any interdisciplinary and multi-scalar work indicates. Yet attempting to make certain local practices a 'model' for transplanting is dangerous, as pointed out time and time again by arguments about the situatedness of knowledge and its practices (Latour, 2012; Ingold, 2004). I believe the concept of Satoyama could be better utilized in non-Japanese contexts in the value it affords as social-ecological relationality in that it not only emphasizes both terms' inherent values but it highlights the value of the relationship as co-implicating third term. Singh's analysis is important here as it affords a modality not often emphasized in Satoyama as commoning. She states, "Revival of the commons, then, becomes critical not simply from the perspective of restoration

of access and control over physical resources, but from the perspective of countering this alienation and finding a way to produce alternate subjectivities and alternate worlds" (Singh, 2017 p.762).

At the level of land-practice as such, traditional Satoyama stems from a topography that is specific to Japan—an island with a mountainous central core with a diversity of watersheds that slope down to the ocean or another body of water in somewhat short distances. This renders villages with a proximity of high woodland in the background and a surrounding meadow/marshland. Satoyama thus entails the uses of the 'wild' forests that back the villagers for composting, fuel and foraging material, the wet-rice paddies, the orchard-like growth of vegetables, and the use of canals and other irrigation systems leading to a lake or sea, all in small scales that render the typical mosaic pattern for which Satoyama is well known for (Takeuchi et al, 2003). This mosaic pattern is also what is central to the promotion and sustenance of biodiversity, lost to urbanization and development post-WWII along with the use of pesticides and fossil fuels. Revivalists claim that the latter, along with the loss of farmer population to newer generations of urbanites and the sprawl of suburban life, is what put the traditional practice in the extinction path (Indrawan et al., 2014). I am attracted to Satoyama's mosaic pattern as it seems this is what enhances the most biodiversity. Mosaics manifest specific border-habitat ratios with a diversity of temporalities reflecting the biodiversity within each micro-habitat, where their symbiotic relationalities maintain internal coherence while externally differentiating from the neighbors' temporalities. Perhaps this is where a delineation of boundaries can be said to occur—where one temporality turns into another, where one and its neighboring mosaic touch, mingle, become threshold. Instead of the erasure of borders or reductions to what is shared, it is necessary to investigate the phenomena that occur at these thresholds. Analysing thresholds through topology may offer an understanding of the paradoxical processes by which both internal coherence and external differentiation are sustained and biodiversity enhanced. These spaces can become generative objects of study for the understanding of mosaic patterns both in land formations as in knowledge systems. At the edges of Satoyama mosaics we find manifestations that counter 'edge effects' occurring in the fragmentation of habitats. In Satoyama there is such a richness of temporalities that vitality is exuberant, regenerative in its excess, nurturing of biodiversity; whereas in habitat fragmentation the edge has less resilience and is more vulnerable to outside forces of degradation (Smith et al,

2018). This indicates that context and scale are indeed important, even when quantum topologies of 'spacetimemattering' are at play (Barad, 2017) and when the entanglements produced amongst such spaces can be said to respond to 'intimacies without proximity' (Haraway, 2017). Perhaps the rubbings of difference against each other create generative fields, collaborative and interdisciplinary fields of co-creation, zones of deep relationality? Perhaps these human+more-than-human intentional relationalities of care create conditions of possibility for the excess called life? Singh highlights the in-between spaces (in her case of structure-individual agency) as affording of subjectivities that are collective, processual and emergent, characteristics that are elements in Satoyama as in-between liminal space with emergent co-constitution between community members and land. As Singh puts it with regard to forest caregivers in India, "Through the process of taking care of their local forests and creating conditions for the forest's enrichment, villagers have not only regenerated forests but have cultivated or strengthened subjectivities of being conservation-oriented and of being commoners. The subjectivity of being forest caregivers emerges from their everyday actions of caring for the forest." (Singh, 2017, p. 765)

Conclusion, or politico-poetic iterative stances for more questions

This study of the commons partially answers my longtime and interdisciplinary search for ways to shift the modernist individual subject while foregrounding potential onto-epistemological and practical spaces in which to embed eco-centric 'collectividual' praxes. This study has focused on understanding the notion of the commons as it occurs in Western capitalist nation-states and the crucial question of its governance (Ostrom, Bollier, Feeney, Hardin). From this first literature review to understand the commons, its reception, inception and practice as political institution of land tenure (and the new wave as immaterial resource sharing), I observe the Japanese practice of Satoyama as case study and metaphor for these relational notions. While Satoyama is not necessarily understood as grounded in land or resources as commons, I do believe that its praxis today can be understood as a knowledge commons, as it is studied and researched by several interdisciplinary researchers and universities globally. Currently both concepts are often analyzed through the lens of ecological or natural services, offering an analytical tool that is limited and missing great part of the potential richness and diversity inherent in these notions. I believe the concern when talking about disciplinary boundaries and their collapse is the possibility of entering a space of no differentiation, of an absolute or universalizing totality as

capturing force to which all else is reduced or gravitates. Scholars currently working on difference as pivot point respond to this collapsing by expanding the terms, opening to third terms that dislodge dualities, focusing on processes of becoming that in their continuous iterative dynamics as implicating co-creation of terms do not prioritize one final unifying term over the two initial ones but instead hover in the tensions as regenerative force. While these questions belong to complex landscapes of 'equivocations' and Tsing claims that, "…not just any translation can be accepted into capitalism. The gathering it sponsors is not open-ended" (Tsing, 2015, p. 133), I wonder whether commoning~uncommoning should become ethnographic method—as in following commodity chains—and whether other intensities of the Capitalocene troubling and travailing at the edges may be valued as topological methodologies in the making.

References

Barad, K., 2017. No Small Matter: Mushroom Clouds, Ecologies of Nothingness, and Strange
Topologies of Spacetimemattering. In *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet: Ghosts and
Monsters of the Anthropocene*; Eds. Tsing, Lowenhaupt, Bubandt, Gan, & Swanson, U. of
Minnesota Press.

Berglund, B. E., Kitagawa, J., Lagerås, P., Nakamura, K., Sasaki, N., & Yasuda, Y., 2014.
Traditional farming landscapes for sustainable living in Scandinavia and japan: Global
revival through the satoyama initiative. *Ambio, 43*(5), 559-78.
doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13280-014-0499-6

Bird Rose, D., 2017. Shimmer: When All You Love is Being Trashed. In *Arts of Living on a
Damaged Planet: Ghosts and Monsters of the Anthropocene*; Eds. Tsing, Lowenhaupt,
Bubandt, Gan, & Swanson, U. of Minnesota Press.

Blaser, M. and de la Cadena, M., 2017. The uncommons: An introduction. *Anthropologica* 59(2):
185–193.

Boyer, D., 2019. *Energopolitics: Wind and Power in the Anthropocene*. Duke University Press.

Bollier, D., 2015. Commoning as a Transformative Social Paradigm. Retrieved from
thenextsystem.org; accessed 12-9-2020

Cruikshank, J., 2010. *Do Glaciers Listen?: Local Knowledge, Colonial Encounters, and Social
Imagination*. UBC Press.

Deleuze, G., 1997. Postscript on control societies, in *Negotiations 1972-1990*, Columbia
University Press, New York.

Feeny, B., et al, 1990. The Tragedy of the Commons: Twenty-two years later. *Human Ecology:
an Interdisciplinary Journal, 18*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00889070

Foucault, M., 2001. *Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, Volume 3: Power*. Ed. J. Faubion,
New York: New Press

Fukamachi, K., 2020. Building resilient socio-ecological systems in Japan: Satoyama examples from
Shiga Prefecture. *Ecosystem services, 46*, doi: 10.1016/j.ecoser.2020.101187

Gilbert, K. W., 2007. Slowness: Notes towards an Economy of Différancial Rates of Being. *The Affective Turn: Theorizing the Social*, 77-105. Duke University Press.

Goeman, M., 2015. Land as Life: Unsettling the Logics of Containment. In *Native Studies Keywords,* Eds. Teves, S.N., Smith, A. and Raheka, M.H., University of Arizona Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt183gxzb.9

Haraway, D., 2017. Symbiogenesis, Sympoiesis, and Art Science Activisms for Staying with the Trouble. In *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet: Ghosts and Monsters of the Anthropocene*; Eds. Tsing, Lowenhaupt, Bubandt, Gan, & Swanson, U. of Minnesota Press.

Hardin, G. 1998. Extensions of "The Tragedy of the Commons". *Science,* New Series, Vol. 280, No. 5364 (May 1, 1998), 683-683.

Hess, C., 2012. The Unfolding of the Knowledge Commons. *St. Anthony's International Review* 8(1): 13-24.

Howe, C., 2019. *Ecologics: Wind and Power in the Anthropocene*. Duke University Press.

Indrawan, M., Yabe, M., Nomura, H. and Harrison, R., 2014. Deconstructing satoyama— The socio-ecological landscape in Japan. *Ecological Engineering* 64: 77-84. http://dx.doi. org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2013.12.038

Ingold, T., 2004. Culture on the ground: the world perceived through the feet. *Journal of Material Culture*, *9*(3), 315-340.

Kobori, H., 2009. Current trends in conservation education in Japan, *Biological Conservation*, Vol. 142, pp.1950-1957.

Latour, B., 2012. *We have never been modern*. Harvard University Press.

Manning, E., 2008. Creative Propositions for Thought in Motion. *Inflexions* 1.1 " How is Research-Creation ?" (May 2008) www.inflexions.org, accessed May 05, 2019.

Ostrom, E., 2010. Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems. *The American Economic Review*, *100*(3), 641–672. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.100.3.641

Rogoff, B., et al., 2016. The Organization of Informal Learning. *Review of Research in Education*, March 2016, Vol. 40, (pp.356–401).

Sawadogo, J-P., and Stramm, V., 2000. Local Perceptions of Indigenous Land Tenure Systems: Views of Peasants, Women and Dignitaries in a Rural Province of Burkina Faso. *Modern African Studies* 38 (2): 279–94.

Schaffter, M., Fall, J. and Debarbieux, B. 2009. Unbounded boundary studies and collapsed categories: rethinking spatial objects. *Progress in Human Geography*, DOI: 10.1177/0309132509105009

Singh, N., 2017. Becoming a commoner: The commons as sites for affective socio-nature encounters and co-becomings. *Ephemera: Theory and Politics in Organization* 17(4): 751–776.

Smith, I.A., Hutyra L.R., Reinmann, A.B., Marrs, J.K., Thompson, J.R., 2018. Piecing together the fragments: elucidating edge effects on forest carbon dynamics. *Front Ecol Environ* 16:213–221. https://doi.org/ 10.1002/fee.1793

Spiro, M.E., 1969. Book Reviews: General. *From Anxiety to method in the behavioral sciences,* by George Devereux. *American Anthropologist*, 71. 95-97.

Stetsenko, A., 2017. *The Transformative Mind: Expanding Vygotsky's Approach to Development and Education* . Cambridge Press

Takeuchi, K., R. D. Brown, I. Washitani, A. Tsunekawa, and M. Yokohari, editors. 2003. *Satoyama: The Traditional Rural Landscape of Japan*. Springer-Verlag, Tokyo, Japan.

Tsing, A., 2015. *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton University Press.

Tuck, E., McKenzie, M. & McCoy, K., 2014. Land education: Indigenous, post-colonial, and decolonizing perspectives on place and environmental education research, *Environmental Education Research*, Vol. 20:1, 2014.