

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Gibbons, Andrea, Cociña, Cociña, Berryessa-Erich, Melissa, García-Lamarca, Melissa, Tallis Milligan, Rowan and Ferreri, Mara (2020) Radical housing (dis)encounters: reframing housing research and praxis. *Radical Housing Journal*, 2 (2). pp. 1-11. ISSN 2632-2870

Published by: Radical Housing Journal

URL: <https://radicalhousingjournal.org/2020/radical-hou...>
<<https://radicalhousingjournal.org/2020/radical-housing-disencounters/>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/45492/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



Editorial: Radical housing (dis)encounters: Reframing housing research and praxis

Edited by

Andrea Gibbons

Camila Cociña

Felicia Berryessa-Erich

Melissa Fernández Arrigoitia

Melissa García-Lamarca

Rowan Tallis Milligan

with Mara Ferreri

We came to this issue before the outbreak of Covid-19, and we release it amidst what feels like an entirely new, and yet also entirely known world-order—a place of multiple and multiplying crises that existed before the pandemic and continue, relentlessly, to render certain people, bodies and homes disposable. It is against this cruelty, but also with a renewed sense of radical hope in justice everywhere, that RHJ first came to be. And so we are tasked now, more than ever, to pay attention to practices that centre and foreground care in the ways we approach our work. This was always true to the foundations of the RHJ collectivity and ethos, but we recognise the need to speak to it now, and recentre it, as a focal point of our editorial project.

The majority of contributions to Issue 2.2 emerge from a long process of designing and selecting participants for the event *Radical Housing Encounters: translocal conversations on knowledge and praxis*. This event was meant to take place in person, in three separate locations simultaneously, at the end of May 2020. Through it, we sought to define and re-define radical housing knowledge and practice, paying particular attention to diverse methodological, theoretical and ethical approaches deployed in both research and militant practice around the globe. A key objective of the *Radical Housing Encounters* workshop was to facilitate the sharing of transnational experiences among radical housing scholars and activists, in order to both deepen and expand our understandings of the geographies of contemporary radical

housing, particularly beyond the typically-centered Anglo-American North. We felt that decentring knowledge production and challenging existing conceptualisations was a fundamental step in building translocal, feminist, decolonial, intersectional and multi-issue approaches to housing diagnostics and activism.

While disappointed that the event could not take place as originally planned, its rationale and ethos are central to the making of this issue and are reflected in the texts of its contributors as well as the process of organising the issue.

Through this process, which took place in the context of winning an Antipode International Workshop Award in 2019 and planning for the in-person workshops in the six months up to March 2020, *translocal decentring* emerged as a name for what the four organisers were attempting to put into practice. In our intentions, *translocal decentring* was as much about bringing together international scholar-activists from diverse geographical locations and struggles, as it was about materially bypassing and purposefully challenging the customary global place hierarchies and geographies of transnational knowledge production.

The planned convivial encounters with local non-academic groups in Barcelona (Catalunya/Spain), Lancaster (UK) and San Cristóbal de Las Casas (Mexico) were to act as embodied ways of sharing learning and knowledge production. We sought to move beyond the strictures of academic language and settings, and pause the hectic and exhausting temporalities of housing activism that rarely allow time and space for reflection. In bringing together what we hope is an emerging *Radical Housing Encounters* network, we looked critically at our own limitations as individual researchers and activists, and as a part of the larger Radical Housing Journal collective, and reached out on academic and activist lists beyond traditional disciplinary divides. We actively used social media to disseminate the call in both English and Spanish. In fact, we maintained a bilingual correspondence throughout the process, among the organisers in our meetings, in communication with participants, and in accepting submissions in both languages.¹

In the end, from the over 70 responses to our call, we selected 36 contributions by activist-researchers working in 18 different locations around the world. These include Bangladesh, Canada, Denmark, England, Germany, Greece, India, Italy, Mexico, Pakistan, Romania, Salvador, Scotland, Spain, Sweden, Turkey and the United States.

With the onset of 'Covid-austerity' (RHJ Editorial Collective, 2020) in March of 2020, our careful planning for a *decentred* physical encounter imploded into the scattered, placeless digital immediacy of online communication, imposed as a reality for both work and organising. For many who continue to navigate the world of academia and more white-collar work, virtual connectivity has replaced real life connections and encounters. While we remain highly critical of ideas that digital connectivity tears down barriers to participation and flattens hierarchies, after cancelling the event we too explored the possibilities for maintaining this (*dis*)encounter as a platform for longer-term connectivity.

¹ We also asked contributors to state the languages spoken to plan ahead for simultaneous translations during the workshops. This gave us quite an insight into the wealth of experiences and linguistic openness, raising questions for how to embrace and encourage this richness into the framing and facilitating of the programme.

On 3rd June 2020 we held our first ‘virtual encounter’ as a conversation between 17 participants, across ten time zones. In the unsettling uncertainty of lockdown, seeing and hearing the voices and faces of formerly faceless names, which for several months had been a promise of future embodiment, created a moving encounter, made slightly awkward by the digital platform. In this scattered decentring, we had a rare moment of deep listening, in the often intimate settings of people’s homes and bedrooms, in the painful reckoning of the ‘what is to be done’ to resist Covid-austerity and sustain housing movements in our locales, and beyond. The sense of a *Radical Housing Encounters* network of like-minded scholar-activists became more real.

Moving on from this event, and in the same spirit of fostering translocal conversations, the editors of Issue 2.2 took on the task of developing a blind and non-blind peer review process for those workshop contributors who were interested in turning their interventions into texts for publication. To encourage peer support, we put together a horizontal, online platform so that prior to external blind peer review, each contribution was read and reviewed by someone from the *Radical Housing Encounters* group. This process gave participants the opportunity to get to know the thoughts and work of those they would have met in the workshops. Based on this connective experimental process, we are now working towards a series of Network events, but in the meantime we are thrilled to be launching Issue 2.2. We are furthermore deeply grateful for everyone’s hard work and commitment at such an unprecedented historical moment.

We consider *all* the words printed in this Issue 2.2 to be a product, however imperfect, of an ethics and practice of care from all corners of the world. Every individual involved in this edited labour of love—authors, editors, translators, copy-editors, blind and non-blind reviewers—had to grapple with the enormity of what has transpired globally these past months/year. Our lives, politics and commitments—all tangled up as they are—were destabilised and often reaffirmed by the new struggles we face individually and collectively. This meant establishing slower, patient processes that were open and flexible to the social, emotional and material irruptions of these months. It meant accepting the ways in which pain, powerlessness and exhaustion have been integrally bound to the atmosphere of this project and the uneven realities of those involved.

Our hope is that the pieces of this issue—and the labour of care that went into producing it—provide further layers of insight into the powerful and radical politics of hope that show us how different, more caring housing futures are possible. Specifically, we would argue that dwelling on the challenges and joys of translocal housing methodologies can contribute to the ongoing and necessary process of reflection amongst a growing and diverse community of activist-scholars, intent on considering housing through a lens of multiplicity.

**Challenging knowledge production:
pushing methodologies, positionalities and theoretical boundaries**

The articles that form part of this issue all emerged from a process that positioned translocal conversations on housing knowledge and praxis as a central concern. It is not

surprising, then, that, challenging and problematising the ways in which knowledge is produced, understood, valued and mobilised by dominant housing discourses cut across the whole issue. Each article shares this overarching concern, by questioning different domains which we have organised in this Editorial piece around three main themes: the first set of articles explicitly reflect on praxis, pedagogies and methodologies of knowledge production, and their implication for radical housing; the second theme refers to articles that interrogate questions of positionality in the knowledge production processes, particularly regarding the relationship between researchers, activists and dwellers; and the third refers to articles that, through their engaged reflections, seek to push theoretical boundaries, proposing new concepts and reframing approaches to housing issues.

Reframing praxis, pedagogies and methodologies

The range of translocal housing methodologies of the articles in this issue enables us to challenge the very notion of how housing knowledge is produced, shared and valued. Some articles bring to the surface explicit questions about praxis, pedagogies and methodologies, through experiences that draw on a variety of means—such as art, critical cartographies or grassroots *schools*—to produce and release knowledges mobilised by practices of care and articulated towards housing struggles. This is the case of **Sadia Sharmin** and **Louisa Scherer**'s Conversation, *'Mapping radical communities for a new dialogue'*. Dhaka's largest self-organised settlement is called Karail Basti, and despite its approximately 120,000 residents and thirty year struggle for recognition, it still appears as blank space vulnerable to development and mass eviction on many official maps. We know this is the case for many informal settlements across the globe, and that organised communities have struggled for years using methodologies to produce local knowledge that can fill those gaps. This is a conversation between Sadia Sharmin, an academic based in Bangladesh, and Louisa Scherer, an academic based in Germany, on their joint radical counter-mapping work under the auspices of Habitat Forum Berlin. This is not simply a conversation about filling in blank spaces on the map to challenge the hegemony of those in power, though the struggle for this kind of visibility is an important one. It is a lyrical and ethnographic description of Karail Basti, of everyday life there, of action research that grapples with more fundamental transformations of how space is understood and represented in ways that honour the vibrance and strength of the people who live in and shape it. It is a conversation about the tools of critical cartography, the potentials of participatory planning, and a community that will not be made invisible.

Methodologies and pedagogies for housing activism are also discussed by **Adriana Allen**, **Camila Cociña** and **Julia Wesely** in the Conversation *'Habitat International Coalition: Networked practices, knowledges and pedagogies for translocal housing activism'* at an international scale. For decades, translocal networks and coalitions of civil society organisations, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and grassroots organisations have created spaces to interrogate the ways in which knowledges and praxes are mobilised to respond to housing struggles at different scales. In this piece, the current President of the Habitat International Coalition (HIC), Adriana Allen, discusses HIC's perspectives on the practices, knowledges

and pedagogies for translocal housing activism, and the ways in which HIC has pushed housing rights for more than 40 years. The conversation examines the ways in which the Coalition is organised through horizontal democratic practices of working as a ‘network of networks’, discussing issues of translocality, recognition, epistemic justice and knowledge co-production. The conversation also reflects on questions about co-learning, and the notion of HIC as a ‘school’, discussing how multiple understandings of housing are nurtured and reconciled within the Coalition, while positioning an explicit rights-based housing agenda on the social production of habitat.

A third piece that engages with questions of praxis and methodologies is the Long Read ‘*Radical housing and socially-engaged art—Reflections from a tenement town in Delhi’s extensive urbanisation*’, in which **Nitin Bathla** and **Sumedha Garg** explore the use of art, and particularly of collectively produced tapestry, as a fluid research-activist methodology to create encounters between activism and praxis. What is the role of socially-engaged art in unveiling latent possibilities of radical politics, and to deal with the challenges of housing and urban change? These are some of the questions the article addresses by giving a detailed account of an experience with migrant women labourers from Kapashera, a ‘tenement town’ in the outskirts of Delhi. Through the description and analysis of this project, the authors examine Oren Yiftachel’s (2009) notion of ‘permanently temporary’ workforce, and the ways in which socially-engaged art can create safe spaces for women’s collective emancipatory engagements. Importantly, the authors also reflect on their position as researchers and activists, and their interaction, exchanges and inclusion in the women’s process of knowledge (and art) production, which speaks directly to the second theme we want to discuss regarding positionality in the knowledge production processes.

Also providing reflections both about methodologies and positionality is the Update authored by **London Tenants Federation, Just Space** and **Loretta Lees**. Estate Watch is a collaborative virtual project, which also serves to disseminate research from a large UK government-funded Economic and Social Research Council (ERSC) project led by Loretta Lees, that provides an activist tool through which residents can access, or ‘watch’ real-time visual and textual evidence of the dispossession that has been taking place across London’s social housing estates due to “regeneration” and “refurbishment”. The authors call for others—in and beyond London—to follow the principles of collaboration their project enacted where academic knowledge was drawn upon but decentred by engaging in reflections over exploitation to ensure that tenants’ needs and voices came first. It provides an example of a campaign tool that our readers from across the world can potentially translate into their own housing justice contexts. These translations are, of course, not unproblematic and always involve questions of local capacities and resources available to build such projects.

Negotiating positionalities in housing knowledge production

The second theme of positionality—the connections between research and activism and the care that binds them together—are again reflected across all pieces, but take central place for a number of them. Whether explicitly or not, the connection seems to be negotiated best

when anchored to the centrality of care to both the material and immaterial constructions of home and to the winning of something beyond shelter, as well as to the activism and everyday conviviality that build new subjectivities, new ways of being in the world and new ways to relate to one another. While not as clearly developed in all of the contributions, this idea that human beings are remade through a role in collective struggle—whether as researcher, as activist or the imbrication of the two—seems always present at some level. Both care and collective emancipation develop through ever-improved understandings of the importance of always maintaining a relational view. Positionality is explored among ideas of interrelatedness, interconnection, interdependence, collectivity. All weave through each of these contributions even as contributors examine activism and movement at a wide array of scales that range from a single building squatted by migrants and activists, to the relationship between refugee camps and cities enmeshed within a wider political economy of housing, to the relationship between entire squatted communities and cities as they articulate with citizenship and the state.

Perhaps to start most explicitly with care, **Matina Kapsali's** Long Read on political infrastructures of care immerses us in the world of refugee solidarity in Greek cities. As a counterpoint to official housing practices that seek to provide temporary accommodation to refugees, the author narrates the process of collective home making in the 'Orfanotrofio' housing squat for migrants in the city of Thessaloniki. The article explains how refugee solidarity squats have been organised in Greek cities through common struggles among local activists and people on the move. She turns to a rich theoretical discussion bringing together Rancière and feminist theories of care that complement those that Alex Nelson's Long Read draws upon, as outlined below. Here it is Rancière who explicitly theorises the ways that such shared spaces of home and politics of care can give birth to political subjects. Kapsali explores in a very different form than Paulo Freire the idea that through such shared experience we become new kinds of subjects, are remade through our collective living, our collective action, our collective discourse. But Kapsali ensures that this is embodied, that Rancière's abstract notions of universal equality should be held accountable to feminist theorisations of the practice of human interdependence and the intersections of the world's very real inequalities including race, class, gender and immigration status. Thus, it is a kind of care as Nira Yuval Davis argues, where 'notions of difference should encompass, rather than replace, notions of equality' (Yuval-Davis, 1999, p. 95). Such transversal equality, Kapsali argues, was 'not a goal to be achieved but a presupposition that was verified and enacted in praxis...' The materiality of different uses of space and the very different trajectories and goals of residents quite briefly described by Kapsali sit at the core of Laura Ferrero's Retrospective, outlined in the next subsection.

Such a need for the remaking of new subjectivities—and the call for new forms of long-term and meaningful commitment by scholars to struggle—is central to **Stefano Portelli** and **Aylin Yildirim Tschoepe's** Conversation as well. Their contribution is an engaged summary that contextualises a scholar-activist conference held in Boston, USA, in autumn 2019, a time steeped in turmoil, struggle *and* great hope, when revolt and protest were erupting worldwide, from Chile and Lebanon, to Puerto Rico, Catalonia and Hong Kong.

Central to their critique is a non-dualist approach to the concepts of scholar-activist and of urban activism able to sustain a reimagining of a new form of bottom-up politics in which communities and not their elected officials or developers hold the power over their environment and their futures. The piece explores the various contributions from engaged scholars, pulling out the threads of political economy and displacement that unite a multitude of struggles for land and home as well as for a radical and critical place in the academy. Universities must play a role in support of struggle, working to monitor development and all of its multifarious impacts and supporting a new social contract. Such long-term engagement leads not just to new knowledge but to new roles, capacities, networks, and new human beings within struggle.

As within many of the contributions to Boston's scholar-activist conference, other pieces focus on the wider political and economic context within which activism, particularly migrant activism, takes place to think about how scholarship and activism work and connect at different scales. One example is **Erin Goodling's** Update on the Western Regional Advocacy Project (WRAP)'s campaign to *Stop the Sweeps* of unhoused people across various cities in the USA. This examines both the devastating impact of the sweeps upon the unhoused as well as the cynical driving force behind the sweeps through her analysis of the Business Improvement District (BID) model for the privatisation of public space. Goodling shows how action research on the ground can be used to fight anti-homeless laws and the continued encroachment of the private sphere into public spaces. The connections that trans-local action research makes possible are vital in the struggle for public space as they draw out the value of its complexity and heterogeneity and the lived realities of its inhabitants.

Like Goodling, **Christian Sowa's** focus is also on interconnection, but at different scales – those of academic disciplines and housing markets. Rather than theorising the camp as exception, as something set apart, he starts to unpick how in fact their continued existence after five years connects directly to the capitalist housing crisis in Berlin. Both articulate within the wider political economy of housing, and an end to the camps cannot even be imagined as long as housing is seen only in terms of its market value rather than as a home. Here he bridges housing and migrant studies to examine the mutual crisis of housing, and therein finding immense room for solidarity. The solution to both thus lies in the struggle to decommodify housing, the expropriation of empty homes and holiday lets, the reclaiming of a right to the city for all, as argued by Lefebvre and Harvey. In looking to those places where this is happening, Sowa also implicitly describes a developing politics of care particularly in how housing activists in Berlin are supporting those seeking to move out of the camps, helping them into homes and in some cases collectively reimagining how homes might work differently. How might this kind of activism—and the ways it fits within a struggle to decommodify housing in Berlin—be deepened in drawing on the concept of care put forward by Nelson and Kapsali? How does it challenge neoliberalism's subjectivities briefly looked at here? These themes are also picked up in similar ways within **Irene Molina's** review of *Squatters in the Capitalist City: Housing, Justice and Urban Politics* by Miguel A. Martínez,

and its look at squatting as a social movement and the intersectionalities of squats within capitalist European cities.

Öznur Yardımcı's Update offers an account of neoliberal development pressures at a similar scale, looking at the shifting relationships between activists, municipal actors and national directives to ask whether we can reframe notions of citizenship in relation to participation in housing struggles. Here the author examines the connection between the form and legal title of housing, collective struggle and the state in forming the creation of a political subject. It is an interesting counterpoint to the more intimate creations described by Kapsalli and Nelson, connected as it is to a wider view of the political economy of development, machine politics and embodied struggle that is grappling with complexity. Yardımcı argues that far from a binary *state vs. activist* framework, such activist movements, particularly in Turkey, should be understood as an amalgamation of forces, actors and temporalities. In this case, the power of municipally ordained urban redevelopment processes and the imposed neoliberal values of the state served to uproot citizens, as well as to remake them in new 'modern' ways. How groups like the squatter settlers of this story get together—and separate—over the course of a housing struggle can challenge state strategies, while also being subject to the danger that their actions might reinforce the disciplining and ordering of citizens in urban space.

Finally, in **Alize Arıcan's** powerful Update '*Care in Tarlabası amidst Heightened Inequalities, Urban Transformation, and Coronavirus*', we also find ourselves exploring activism at the neighbourhood scale in Turkey, but with a full return to questions of care. Focusing on the horizontal networks of care organised through the Tarlabası Solidarity Group, it explores the reconfigurations around networks of care and housing precarity during the Covid-19 pandemic in a neighborhood of Istanbul known for being home to some of the city's most marginalized populations (Kurdish, Roma, trans, migrant, sex-workers, etc.) For neighbourhoods already beset by processes of displacement and housing injustice, the author notes that the pandemic has meant an acceleration, or a densification, of these harsh realities for residents. In the context of Turkey's current authoritarian government and the use of refugees as political leverage in negotiations with the European Union, the article follows the Tarlabası Solidarity Group and their continued work at the local level as a mutual aid hub to provide food, shelter, legal aid and other vital services to people caught in the intersections of forced migration, housing insecurity and the global pandemic. The article serves as a call to action, to nurture the kinds of "repertoires of care" that unite the everyday and the political, and are able to sustain at-risk communities in times of crisis when governments fail them (for more on this, see recent work by Spade 2020; Rodriguez Soto 2020; Ticktin 2020).

Pushing theoretical boundaries and reframing approaches to housing

Within the third theme, several articles included in this issue actively work to propose new concepts and ways of thinking about housing, in this way forming an intimate part of the Radical Housing Journal's core goals to push the boundaries of how we conceptualise existing housing conditions, struggles and processes. We feel that building new vocabularies

and terms is a fundamental step towards better articulating deep rooted problems and solutions related to housing justice and transformation. Several articles in Issue 2.2 do exactly this by developing deeper languages particularly around racial capitalism and care.

Joshua Poe and **Jessica Bellamy**'s Retrospective titled '*Plantation urbanism: Legacy, property and policing in Louisville, Kentucky*' documents the legacy and consequences of urban redevelopment by plantation dynasties in the Russell neighborhood of Louisville, and the connections between investment, surveillance and policing in the murder of 26-year-old medical worker Breonna Taylor in March 2020. The authors propose the powerful concept of *plantation urbanism* to make clear how processes of racial capitalism, plantation culture and neoliberal capitalist urbanisation fuse together to create wealth through the policing, dispossession and racial banishment of Black residents. The concept digs deeper underneath gentrification and housing inequities/injustice through a racially-focused historization of a particular urban space. With the support of didactic illustrations, Poe and Bellamy show how legacies of settler colonialism and slavery live on through the land ownership and urban development strategies of white wealthy families and the support of this process by the state and the police. In this way, the authors show a bigger picture in terms of what is at stake in struggles over urban space (police killings, real lives), as well as what must be fought against, dismantled, undermined, undone in order to bring about housing justice in this space (racist government structures inseparable from wealthy local families).

In their Long Read, **Glória Cecília dos Santos Figueiredo**, **Brais Estévez** and **Thais Troncon Rosa** reflect on urban conflict bearing the stamp of the Black city in Salvador, Brazil. The authors illustrate how the state of Bahia is profoundly transforming Black neighbourhoods through a discourse of development and modernisation through recovering Salvador's historic city centre and a new Public-Private-Partnership (PPP) financialised monorail project. Despite the fact that Salvador has been largely built and inhabited by Black people, the state has used urban interventions as a socio-spatial "whitening" strategy that negatively impacts the lives and livelihoods of Black residents. Yet these whitening processes always become embroiled in conflicts with divergent socio-spatial dynamics embodied by residents who do not subordinate themselves to the supposedly consensual dynamics of these interventions. Building on Black scholars in Brazil and beyond, Figueiredo, Estévez and Rosa explore the city centre and monorail cases through two powerful concepts. The *Black city* is deployed as a way to underscore how new systems of racialized urban accumulation operate as Black lives are rebranded as unrooted. *Black fugitivities* underlines the different modes of Black inhabitation and re-existences (*re-existências* in Portuguese) that remake and affirm Black urban life within sites racial violence. Through an engaged scholar-activist process that challenges the historically white and elite Brazilian university system's positionality, Figueiredo, Estévez and Rosa powerfully illustrate how urban struggles unfold from histories of racial banishment as a form of jurisdictional violence to contemporary modes of financial extractivism.

Connecting back to notions of care that run throughout the articles in this issue, we want to highlight the idea of *revolutionary care* put forward by **Alex Nelson** in their Long Read titled '*Nothing about us without us: Centering lived experience and revolutionary care in efforts to end*

and prevent homelessness in Canada. This is a kind of care which names systems of oppression and establishes relationships of mutual respect and trust with lived experts in collective processes. In drawing on feminist and disability justice scholars, revolutionary care is a concept that resonates remarkably with that of Matina Kapsali's descriptions of the solidarity developed in shared spaces and everyday experiences to support vulnerability and difference, and thereby create new political subjects. In Nelson's piece, grounded in the pedagogies and practices of Paulo Freire, is the argument that we have to name our reality and collectively work to change it before we can become truly human. This collective process must be centred in our lived experience, and Nelson places homelessness and disability justice movements in dialogue to unpack the critical importance of integrating lived experience into practice and theorising. In an approach where knowledge(s) and truth(s) are rooted in bodily experience, Nelson underlines the fundamental role that care plays in radical and justice-oriented work. Revolutionary care stands in stark contrast to neoliberal capitalism's forms of hierarchical, abstract and "anonymous" care alluded to in other papers. Nelson's work in itself straddles personally lived experiences of homelessness and expanding thinking and practice about the issue in academia, advocacy and policy-making.

Laura Ferrero's Retrospective titled '*Gaining/regaining housing stability through collective action: Individual uses and social functions of a migrants' collective residence*' asks a number of critical questions. What kinds of spaces do migrants create when activism opens up the possibilities for the creation of place? What does this tell us about the kinds of spaces needed to achieve a multitude of goals and desires as diverse as the migrant experience itself? What do they tell us about the different definitions, needs and hopes for a place that might be called home by those seeking stability, others seeking temporary affordable shelter and still others cycling through year upon year as they follow harvests within Italy and beyond? Ferrero's politically and socially engaged ethnographic study of the uses of space within La Salette begins to answer some of these questions. Initially squatted and now legally run as a collective, La Salette in Turin, Italy, stands in sharp contrast to the other much more controlled and regulated spaces provided by the state, charity and private landlords. It is a flexible, self-governing space without set time limits on residency, and Ferrero explores the very different ways the same spaces support those linked to them. La Salette's spaces can serve as home or shelter and a path towards security in a new country or the opportunity to save and return to another, a base from which to achieve personal goals, a flexible space able to support transient workers, a resource to develop informal economic strategies and businesses, or a place to develop social strategies, to learn skills and develop networks. Opening up new ways to think about the needs of precarious communities for various kinds of spaces and the ways that collectively owned and managed spaces can fulfil these changes can challenge us to rethink traditional ideas of home and housing itself, centring their innovations in rethinking what just housing might look like.

Moving forward: deepening and broadening *translocal decentring*

The idea of *translocal decentring* we advocate for in this issue is not just a movement within the realm of academic critique: it is a substantive move grounded in praxis, produced and

sustained through the work of long-term engagement with difference, translation and negotiations. We understand this work as translocal not just in geographical terms, through the conversations and resonances between the authors, but also in challenging preconceived definitions and subjects of 'local' housing struggles. Rather than fully realised, this Issue and the trajectories it presents raise questions that remain an open invitation for other, future discussions. How to build explicitly and actively intersectional understandings and struggles? How can the building of power acknowledge the practices of care behind housing struggles and knowledge production? How to build meaningful links between and across movements and borders, while centering critical concepts of care and anti-racism?

We hope that the articles of this issue—as well as the process behind their production built around the possibilities of (dis)encounters—shed some light in building pathways to answer some of these questions. They emphasise a translocal decentring that is based on placing practices of care at the core of research and praxes—methodologies in the broadest sense of the term—of the fight for home.

Note from Issue 2.2 editors:

“...the work of editing [...] is less concerned with meaning and its exhaustion than with relationships and proximities” (Eichhorn and Milne 2016: 190). The Issue 2.2 Editorial team would like to extend special thanks: to Mara Ferreri for the work behind the organisation of multiple activities related to the planning, grant application and management of the workshop *Radical Housing Encounters: translocal conversations on knowledge and praxis*, and for co-writing this editorial piece with the Issue 2.2 team; to Hung-Yin Chen for co-editing one article included in this Issue; to Ulises Moreno for enacting a care-driven approach to the internal peer review process; to the RHJ copy-editing team (in particular Claire Bowman, Tina Grandinetti, Andrea Gibbons, Rowan Tallis Milligan and Melissa García-Lamarca); and to the RHJ communication team (in particular Felicia Berryessa-Erich and Mara Ferreri for setting up the website and Camila Cociña for the article layout), for their fundamental support in the making of this issue.

References

- Eichhorn, K. and Milne, H. (2016) Labours of love and cutting remarks: the affective economies of editing. In D. Irvine and S. Kamboureli, eds. *Editing as Cultural Practice in Canada*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier Press, pp. 189–98.
- RHJ Editorial Collective (2020) Covid-19 and housing struggles: The (re)makings of austerity, disaster capitalism, and the no return to normal. *Radical Housing Journal*, 2(1), 9-28.
- Rodríguez Soto, I. (2020) Mutual Aid and Survival as Resistance in Puerto Rico, *NACLA Report on the Americas*, 52:3, 303-308.
- Spade, D. (2020) *Mutual Aid: Building Solidarity During This Crisis (and the Next)*. Verso Books.
- Ticktin, M. (2020) Building a Feminist Commons in the Time of COVID-19. *Signs*. Available online: <http://signsjournal.org/covid/ticktin/>
- Yiftachel, O. (2009) Theoretical Notes On 'Gray Cities': The Coming of Urban Apartheid? *Planning Theory*, 8(1), pp. 88–100.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1999) What is Transversal Politics? *Soundings* (12), pp. 88-93.