



## Climate crisis, neoliberal environmentalism and the self: the case of 'inner transition'

António Carvalho & Vera Ferreira

To cite this article: António Carvalho & Vera Ferreira (2024) Climate crisis, neoliberal environmentalism and the self: the case of 'inner transition', *Social Movement Studies*, 23:1, 1-18, DOI: [10.1080/14742837.2022.2070740](https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2022.2070740)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2022.2070740>



Published online: 02 May 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1122



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 2 View citing articles [↗](#)



# Climate crisis, neoliberal environmentalism and the self: the case of ‘inner transition’

António Carvalho<sup>a</sup> and Vera Ferreira<sup>a,b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal; <sup>b</sup>Institute of Social Sciences, University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal

## Abstract

This article delves into “inner transition”, a set of subjective changes mobilized by the Transition Network (TN) that emphasize the role of the self to tackle the climate crisis. Its scholarly contribution is twofold: on the one hand, it engages with current literature on neoliberal environmentalism, empirically analyzing how “inner transition” is entwined with the emergence of a specific environmentality through a set of practices, habits, lifestyle changes and webs of associations with non-humans; on the other hand, it contributes to existing research on the TN and in particular to literature on the understudied phenomenon of “inner transition”, presenting it as an emblematic case study to unpack the biopolitics of neoliberal environmentalism. We carried out 20 semi-structured interviews with members of the TN in Portugal, following a post-phenomenological approach that recognizes the deeply mediated character of inner transition. Through the support of interview excerpts, our analysis delves into three main topics: perceptions of inner transition; transition and self-transformation; habits and lifestyle changes. Informed by this data, our paper presents a characterization of a specific environmentality entwined with “inner transition”, exploring how selves are reconfigured in order to address the challenges of climate change and the environmental crisis.

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 6 July 2021  
Accepted 20 April 2022

## Keywords

Climate Crisis; Environmental Activism; Neoliberal Environmentalism; Subjectivity; Inner Transition

## 1. Introduction

This article examines how the Transition Network (TN) produces a specific type of environmentality that aims to reconfigure subjectivities to tackle the environmental and climate crisis. It draws on semi-structured interviews with members of the TN in Portugal – a grassroots movement emphasizing the power of local communities and individuals to face the challenges of climate change. The politics of the TN are controversial: on the one hand, some authors argue that it constitutes an alternative to capitalism, favoring degrowth, localization and direct democracy; on the other hand, it has been considered an emblematic example of neoliberal environmentalism. The TN frames individuals as directly responsible for tackling environmental and climate issues – through lifestyle changes, habits and particular consumption patterns -, highlighting the couplings of environmental concerns and the self.

**CONTACT** António Carvalho ✉ [antoniomanuelcarvalho@gmail.com](mailto:antoniomanuelcarvalho@gmail.com) 📍 Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra, Colégio de S. Jerónimo, Praça Dom Dinis, Apartado 3087, Coimbra 3000-995, Portugal

© 2022 Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

Recycling, buying sustainable products, reducing individual ecological footprints and plastic consumption are tenets of a new device of power and control – ‘environmentality’. This concept stems from the Foucauldian notion of governmentality (Foucault, 2007), an art of government focused on managing conduct that ‘includes a wide range of control techniques that makes subjects governable’ (Madsen, 2014, p. 814). Environmentality, instead of exclusively targeting individual human bodies, ‘is a logic that functions on a far-from-equilibrium environment by modulating the aleatory human and non-human processes that make up that environment’ (Anderson, 2011, p. 232). This means that contemporary biopolitics aims to regulate couplings between humans and the environment, relying on the climate and environmental crisis as devices of control that reshape subjectification, consumption patterns and emerging practices of the self (Carvalho, 2017).

Within neoliberal environmentalism, the environment mediates subjectification, ‘the way a human being turns himself into a subject’ (Foucault, 1982, p. 778). The TN underlines the emotional and subjective dimensions of sustainability transitions – characterized as ‘inner transition’ –, allowing us to explore how neoliberal environmentalism performs specific types of people, generating particular environmentalities, forms of government that reconfigure subjectivities in light of environmental and climate concerns.

Our article engages with two main bodies of scholarship: current research on neoliberal environmentalism and literature on the TN. Recognizing that research on the environmentalities produced by grassroots movements is still scarce, our article empirically studies how members of the TN mobilize a series of devices – practices of subjectivity; habits; lifestyle changes; couplings with non-humans – to transform their selves. Our work also expands current research on ‘inner transition’, examining an original case study – the TN in Portugal.

The main research question addressed in the article is the following: what kind of environmentality is produced by the TN, particularly by ‘inner transition’? Complementary research questions are also addressed: how do members of the TN conceptualize inner transition? How does the TN articulate environmentalism and self-transformation? What are the devices recruited to enforce inner transition? How do certain practices of subjectivity support the enactment of neoliberal environmentalism?

We understand the biopolitics of neoliberal environmentalism as the ways in which human life is targeted by technologies of the self and power (Foucault, 1988) to attain particular political goals – in the case of the TN, ‘sustainability transitions’. We contend that inner transition is supported by specific technologies of the self, habits, lifestyle changes and non-humans, functioning as subjectification devices that reshape citizens, their bodies and practices, coupling the neoliberal control of the self with broader concerns with the ‘environment’ and the ‘climate crisis’.

Inner transition mobilizes a plethora of devices – spiritualities, relational ontologies (emphasizing principles of interconnection and interdependence), technologies of the self, organic foods, solar panels and bicycles. Relying on a post-phenomenological methodology, we examine the production of these subjectivities, recognizing that their emergence is mediated by heterogenous subjectification assemblages.

This article is organized as follows: section two presents current discussions on neoliberal environmentalism, highlighting our contribution to this literature; section three delves into our case study – the TN in Portugal –, presenting its history, articulation with contemporary debates on neoliberalism and post-politics, and the role of inner transition; section four focuses on methodological aspects, including data collection; section five analyses the empirical data according to three main topics: Perceptions of Inner Transition, Transition and Self-Transformation, Habits and Lifestyle Changes; the discussion touches upon five aspects: a characterization of TN’s environmentalities; articulations of technologies of the self and environmentalities; the role of relationality; ethics, neoliberal environmentalism and inner transition; the bodies of inner transition.

## 2. Neoliberal environmentalism

As McCarthy and Prudham recognized, ‘neoliberalism and modern environmentalism have together emerged as the most serious political and ideological foundations of post-Fordist social regulation’ (2004, p. 275). Although neoliberalism contributes to multiple environmental and climate discourses (Swaffield, 2016, p. 120), neoliberal environmentalism often puts an emphasis on subjectivity, individual lifestyles and consumption patterns, overshadowing the responsibility of governments and corporations in the environmental and climate crisis (Machaqueiro, 2020). In fact, ‘neoliberal policies are now centered on “responsibilizing” citizens, enforcing moral values with discourses of community and self-help, and shifting responsibility for well-being and social justice away from the State to individuals’ (Argüelles et al., 2017, p. 32).

Neoliberal environmentalism contrasts with agonistic and confrontational social movements, as individuals, their habits, choices and ethics become a key target of environmental struggles and subjective control. Within neoliberal environmentalism, ‘technologies of self and power are involved in the creation of new subjects concerned about the environment’ (Agrawal, 2005, p. 166), turning environmental concerns into a ‘dispositive for social regulation and an ethical template of subjection’ (Brand, 2007, pp. 628–9). The environment, and the metanarrative of the climate crisis, plays a role in ethical formation, becoming a device of subjective – and social – control.

According to Fletcher (2017), nowadays there are multiple environmentalities at play, involving a wide range of actors – governments, NGOs, social movements, corporations – informed by numerous epistemological and ontological models. This article examines the environmentalities produced by the TN, exploring how they articulate environmental concerns and self-transformation, drawing on particular practices of subjectivity, habits, lifestyle changes and nonhumans to enact ‘inner transition’.

Neoliberal subjectivities are coupled with principles such as autonomy, individuality and choice (Rose, 1996), making individuals responsible for their health and well-being through various practices of self-regulation, linked to ‘an increasing emphasis on the responsibility of individuals to manage their own affairs, to secure their own security with a prudential eye on the future’ (Rose, 2007, p. 4), where ‘the self is not merely enabled to choose, but obliged to construe a life in terms of its choices, its powers, its values’ (Rose, 1999, p. 231).

As governmentality paved the way for environmentalism, individual and lifestyle choices, bodies and the care of the self became indexed to environmental, climate and planetary frameworks, indicating that contemporary biopolitics has been ‘environmentalized’. As put by Fletcher, ‘authority and prescriptions for appropriate behavior derive not from rules, norms, or even incentives but rather from the claim that such prescriptions accord with the fundamental nature of life and the universe’ (2010, p. 176). The environmental and climate crisis drive a series of individual changes, promoting responsabilization and depoliticization (Maxton-Lee, 2020) – the tenets of neoliberal environmentalism –, thus turning sustainability transitions into a subjective endeavor.

Neoliberal environmentalism is characterized by the emergence of social movements where communities directly implement their ‘desired changes’ (North, 2010), attempting to replace the State in the mitigation of environmental and climate issues at the local level (Brand, 2007). Neoliberal environmentalism also emphasizes embodiment, well-being, the care of the self and aesthetic experience (Carvalho, 2017); several environmental movements often recruit forms of spirituality and practices of the self as part of their critique of modernity and extractivism, frequently adopting systemic and holistic ontologies (Aiken, 2015; Esteves, 2020).

Although there is a growing body of scholarship on the merging of neoliberalism and environmentalism, there is still little research on the types of environmentalities produced by sustainability transitions, especially on the practical aspects of subject formation, and how environmentalities are articulated with particular habits, lifestyle changes, and non-humans. The notion of technologies of the self is useful to examine how sustainability transitions produce environmentalities through various subjectification devices. According to Foucault, technologies of the self

permit individuals to effect by their own means or with the help of others a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality. (Foucault, 1988, p. 18)

Even though there is a burgeoning literature on how neoliberal subjectivities are supported by technologies of the self – such as mindfulness – to enhance self-regulation, self-control, wellbeing and health (Purser, 2019), scholarly work on the biopolitics of neoliberal environmentalism is still scarce, and our article will contribute to this field of research through the case study of the Portuguese TN. Furthermore, it also attempts to understand how this social movement relies on technologies of the self to enact specific environmentalities.

### 3. The Transition Network

The TN is a social movement that emerged in Totnes, UK, in 2004, to address peak oil and climate change (Hopkins, 2008). It mobilizes a set of small-scale actions at the community level to foster sustainability transitions: local currencies, permaculture and transition courses, seed banks, reforestation actions, cultural events and various workshops on topics related to climate change mitigation and adaptation (Smith, 2011). The Portuguese TN emerged in 2009 and, in January 2021, the TN website comprised 22 initiatives in this country.<sup>1</sup>

The politics of the TN are controversial. On the one hand, it has been argued that the TN is counter-hegemonic, contributing to alternatives to capitalism and globalization, fostering degrowth, localization and translocal empowerment (Avelino et al., 2020; D'Alisa et al., 2013; Mason & Whitehead, 2012); on the other hand, it has been considered an emblematic example of neoliberal environmentalism (Maxton-Lee, 2020) due to its alignment with the 'neoliberal program in which responsibilities are shifting downwards towards civil society, favoring multi-level governance over government intervention' (Argüelles et al., 2017, p. 30). The TN is an illustration of do-it-yourself (DIY) politics (Barry & Quilley, 2008), as participants actively engage in sustainability transitions at the community level to tackle climate change and environmental degradation, involving specific ways of transforming individual subjectivities and collective behaviors. We take side with the neoliberal critique of the TN, assuming that it is an emblematic social movement to examine the emergence of neoliberal environmentalities in practice, entwined with particular subjectification devices.

Since it avoids confrontational and agonistic approaches, rather aiming to engage relevant local and national stakeholders in sustainability transitions (Feola, 2014), the TN has also been considered post-political (Kenis & Mathijs, 2014; De Moor et al., 2021). The post-political condition assents on a 'neo-liberal governmentality that has replaced debate, disagreement and dissensus with a series of technologies of governing that fuse around consensus, agreement, and technocratic management' (Swyngedouw, 2007, p. 59). Regarding the TN, the post-political consensus is driven by the metanarrative of the climate crisis, attempting to enact a socioeconomic and subjective paradigm informed by permaculture, the field of addiction, deep ecology, and systems theory (Hopkins, 2008). Due to the emphasis on systemic and relational thinking, the TN is deeply entwined with imaginaries of a 'Good Anthropocene', favoring a 'symmetrical relational ontology' (Swyngedouw & Ernstson, 2018, p. 11).

De Moor et al. (2021) recognized the limits of the post-political critique to account for the contradictions between diffusion and agonism pertaining to emerging sustainability transitions, calling for more nuanced analyses of these movements. We argue that the TN is an emblematic example of the couplings between environmentalism and subjective transformations, turning the 'self' into a key dimension of sustainability transitions, and our paper provides an empirical study of a specific environmentality mobilized by the TN coupling the individual and the planetary.

The TN emphasizes the self, feelings and emotions, constituting a particularly interesting case to analyze the subjective dimensions of sustainability transitions. As put by Feola and Jaworska, the TN fosters a 'process of space making for different subjectivities to [be] developed and expressed; [. . .] to give space to different, more complete and holistic ways of being human' (Feola & Jaworska, 2019, p. 1652). The TN underlines the 'emotional dimensions of change' (Barry & Quilley, 2008, p. 30), recognizing that 'emotions like fear and despair can be paralyzing', thus encouraging 'optimistic narratives rooted in the idea of community resilience rather than resistance' (McGregor & Crowther, 2018, p. 11).

In order to enhance emotional community resilience, a key dimension of the TN is inner transition:

an exploration of the processes and phenomena going on within ourselves that shape how we do Transition. The nature of our relationship with our inner life determines how able we are to make the practical lifestyle, relational and cultural changes needed for Transition – as well bringing precious depth, texture and meaning into our everyday lives.<sup>2</sup>

Inner transition aims to liberate participants from ‘habitual and addictive tendencies’, allowing them to experience ‘the inseparability and inter-dependence in the world’ (ibid), turning relationality and resilience into key aspects of sustainability transitions. The TN encompasses several aspects that are particularly relevant to analyze the articulations of subjective transformations, neoliberalism and environmental movements: it couples multiple theoretical influences, such as ecopsychology, the psychology of addiction and deep ecology’s work on environmentalism and spirituality; it is informed by relational and interdependent ontologies, often entwined with visions of a virtuous and ‘Good Anthropocene’; it includes some of the classic tenets of neoliberal environmentalism, highlighting individual responsibility, lifestyle choices and consumption as drivers of sustainability transitions; it emphasizes the role of emotions, feelings, the body and technologies of the self to attain resilience and social change. However, it should be noted that everyday change and inner transformations – including forms of conversion – are not exclusive to the TN. As Pellizzoni (2021) recognized, ‘the anarchist tradition has consistently fostered a micropolitics of change at individual and interpersonal level’ (p. 7), and Foucault argued that conversion was a key dimension to the revolutionary individual of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Foucault, 2006, p. 208). This suggests that inner transition is not necessarily a device of depoliticization but can be recruited by a multitude of political and ideological projects, as even confrontational mobilizations may require subjective changes. In the case of environmental action, it has been argued that inner transition can also offer alternatives to the ‘modern self’, allowing subjects to engage with more-than-human agency, reconfiguring how they enact their bodies and subjectivities (Carvalho, 2017; Schmid & Aiken, 2020).

Research on inner transition is still scarce (Barr & Pollard, 2017; Biddau et al., 2016; Målgand et al., 2014); however, recently Schmid and Taylor-Aiken published an important article on the role of body-mind practices, drawing on interviews with members of a TN initiative in the UK and a Germany community of social entrepreneurs. They argue that ‘both the political and spiritual aspects of activism are integral parts of social change’ (Schmid & Aiken, 2020, p. 1), and ‘call for greater appreciation of, and studies into, the role spiritual practices such as mindfulness play within social movements’ (ibid: 12). Our article examines ‘inner transition’ as an emblematic example to analyze the production of specific environmentalities mediated by technologies of the self, habits, lifestyle changes and non-humans, exploring the role of subjectification devices and specific practices within environmental movements.

#### 4. Methodology

Between March and September 2019, we carried out semi-structured interviews with 20 past and present members of the TN in Portugal. In order to select prospective interviewees, we started by mapping transition initiatives through the website ‘*Rede Convergir*’ (‘Convergence Network’) – an online repository of sustainability initiatives in Portugal. We then created a preliminary list of potential participants from the names and contacts

publicly available on local transition initiatives' websites, blogs and/or social media profiles. All interviewees were contacted via email. The list was updated after the first interview, resorting to snowball sampling; in total, 45 people were identified, 37 were contacted and 20 were interviewed – ten men and ten women aged between 31 and 68, with university level education and white. 13 belonged to transition initiatives in Southern Portugal and seven to groups in Northern and Centre Portugal. Overall, 14 people still attended local TN initiatives.

The interviews lasted between 60 and 90 minutes and the majority (14) took place online. All participants signed an informed consent form. The interview script focused on five main aspects: a) interviewees' engagement with the TN; b) the various activities put in place and their social impact; c) the subjective dimensions of transition, specifically inner transition; d) the everyday life impacts of transition; e) their vision of a 'post-transition' world. All interviews were fully transcribed, anonymized and analyzed following a process of thematic analysis conducted by the two co-authors. The material was coded according to three main dimensions: a) motivations, characteristics and narratives of transition; b) inner transition; c) material participation. This article focuses on the second dimension, including the following categories: perceptions of inner transition; transition and self-transformation; habits and lifestyle changes. According to our argument, these three aspects are entwined with how these environmentalities unfold.

It should be noted that neoliberal environmentality is just one strand of environmentalism within the TN in Portugal. As our previous research has shown (Ferreira & Carvalho, 2021), the TN encompasses a wide range of political ecologies, and, in some cases, it might even favor the emergence of agonistic/confrontational politics. While this article draws on data from interviews that were mainly focused on 'inner transition', it is possible that multiple strands of environmentalism may coexist within the same movement, and that 'inner transition' itself may be mobilized by distinct political projects.

This article follows a post-phenomenological approach (Verbeek, 2011), assuming that environmentalities are mediated by heterogenous assemblages entailing technologies of the self, habits, lifestyles changes, and ways of engaging with non-humans to enact specific subjectivities. Our own situationality also reflects some of the tensions and contradictions related to 'inner transition' and to the argument developed in this article. Author 1 is a sociologist and a long-term meditator interested in the articulations of subjectivity and environmentalism, while author 2 is a political scientist studying climate change mitigation from a critical perspective.

## **5. Inner transition in practice**

This section examines perceptions of inner transition, the articulation of sustainability transitions and self-transformation, habits and lifestyle changes. These subsections analyze the role of inner transition for TN participants, the articulations of sustainability transitions and individual transformation and how these are enacted in practice (please see Table 1 for a summary of section 5). As the empirical data suggest, inner transition is entwined with heterogenous assemblages entailing technologies of the self, habits, lifestyle changes and webs of associations with nonhumans. As previously mentioned, neoliberal environmentality is just one strand of environmentalism within the TN in

**Table 1.** Summary of section five (inner transition in practice).

Perceptions of Inner Transition	Importance of inner work to face the challenges of climate change Couplings of individual and collective change Focus on self-care to cultivate resilience, avoid burnout and enhance individual and environmental sustainability Subjectivity and the self as a microcosmos of sustainability transitions
Transition and Self-Transformation	Articulation between environmental action and the self Role of technologies of the self to undertake inner work Entwinement between relational ontologies and technologies of the self
Habits and Lifestyle Changes	Role of individual responsabilization, habits and behaviors in the climate crisis Changes in food consumption Engagements with sustainable practices and non-humans

Portugal, and in this section we specifically focus on interviews with participants who were particularly invested in inner transition and in the role of the ‘self’ to tackle the climate and environmental crises.

### 5.1. Perceptions of inner transition

According to interviewees, inner transition is key to achieving socioenvironmental change, recognizing that without ‘inner work’ it is not possible to tackle the climate crisis. Moreover, participants asserted that inner transition is imminently collective, fostering group cohesion. Interviewees also stressed that ‘self-care’ is fundamental to cultivate resilience and avoid burnout, assuming that environmental action requires the reshaping of the ‘self’. The following interview excerpts allude to the centrality of inner transition for socioenvironmental change:

I would say that inner transition *is* the process ... everything else is accessory (LC, April 2019).

The role of inner transition is key ... if we’re not able to achieve that inner transition, everything else will be quite superficial ... inner transition requires a much more integral understanding of what’s happening and of ourselves (AM, June 2019).

For me, it doesn’t make sense to talk about inner and outer transition, they’re both the same! (SN, March 2019).

Inner transition is becoming increasingly important ... the sense that, more than external problems, we have a set of inner problems that we need to fix before we start dealing with everything else (MP, May 2019).

These quotes emphasize the subjective dimensions of sustainability transitions – the final excerpt is particularly emblematic, suggesting that, to attain socioenvironmental change, participants must do the ‘inner work’, highlighting the importance of emotional, psychological and spiritual aspects. The second quote stresses ‘understanding’, linked to an important tenet of neoliberal selfhood – reflexivity –, indicating that transition is a process of socioenvironmental and self-reflexivity.

Interviewees also alluded to the collective dimension of inner work – although participants often carry out several forms of individual self-care and healing, this ‘shared emotional work’ is thought to have a wider impact beyond the ‘self’:

Inner transition is a collective process that involves having guardians of relationships . . . it's a way for us, together, to take care of each one of us . . . it's more than a meditation, that is isolated, where we take care of our internal processes . . . how do we change ourselves? How do we change our posture towards the community? How can we shift our vision towards climate change? (OF, March 2019).

We are inside the system . . . we co-create the system we live in. So, when you do that inner work of looking at yourself and what you must change so you can say . . . ok . . . What's my role? Where can I change things? And then, collectively, how can we operate as a group, to ensure that we take care of ourselves in a way that reflects the change we want to see in the world? (SN, March 2019).

These quotes suggest that the care of the self is geared towards sustainability transitions. Inner work is 'environmentalized', allowing participants to become aware of and to face environmental degradation and climate change. Self-care becomes indexed to wider environmental and planetary issues, coupling personal conduct with broader planetary transformations. Inner transition is understood as allowing participants to cultivate resilience and avoid burnout, enhancing individual and environmental sustainability:

Inner transition is about inner sustainability, i.e., how can we have a more sustainable life from the emotional and relational points of view . . . we can't change our consumption patterns if we, internally, reproduce scarcity dynamics, unbalanced dynamics, if we're not nourished [. . .]. Nourishment at the relational level and regarding the care of our bodies, minds . . . (LC, April 2019).

The great problem right now, with many transition groups, is the so-called 'burnout', when those in charge of organizing and leading the group run out of energy, they have to deal with so many people and their egos . . . those who are in positions of leadership need to have a solid basis in inner transition, to be able to manage that energy (LM, May 2019).

According to the first quote, inner transition is a way of attaining 'inner sustainability', focusing on emotions, relationships and consumption choices, framing sustainability as a proxy to reshape the self, reinforcing the couplings of neoliberalism and environmentalism. The second excerpt indicates that those in charge of leading local groups are particularly prone to burnout, a phenomenon that, according to our research, often leads to the demise of TN initiatives. Practices of the self are recruited to support the emergence of new forms of leadership, generating ethical and relational virtue through inner work. This connects to another frequently mentioned topic – the need to reshape individual subjectivities to face the climate crisis:

Inner transition is extremely important. It's an invisible dimension . . . sometimes it's not expressed in spectacular ways, but that's what allows people to change their habits (LC, April 2019).

To talk about inner transition is to talk about the conditions, the tools that we, as individuals, need to stimulate and develop to bring to light the kind of society we would like to build together . . . it's highly problematic to say that I would like to have a participatory democracy if at home I'm a tyrant (SN, March 2019).

According to the first quote, inner transition is understood as the 'invisible' dimension of transition, supporting lifestyle changes favoring socioenvironmental transformations; the second excerpt reinforces the entwinements of inner and outer processes, emphasizing that certain 'conditions' and 'tools' should be stimulated to foster sustainability

transitions. The self is understood as a microcosmos articulating sustainability, bodies, emotions and affect, suggesting that self-regulation and inner work are key to dealing with climate change and environmental degradation.

## **5.2. Transition and Self-Transformation**

This section explores how interviewees frame transition as embedded in a path of social and environmental change supported by technologies of the self, relational ontologies and spiritualities. According to interviewees, environmental action and the self are deeply entwined:

There is no ecology without self-knowledge, because our daily behaviors are highly automatic. And if you . . . are not able to attain an awareness of why you do the things you do, then it is just another fad . . . people carry out their transition projects, but with a burnout attitude, of wanting to do more and more [. . .]. It may have some meaning, but you are draining yourself. You are not caring. Not being calm. You are stressed, anxious, detached from other people and yourself (RS, April 2019).

The revolution that we're talking about . . . all great transformations are first and foremost cognitive transformations, transformations of consciousness, and then you operate change when you become aware of something [. . .]. As soon as you have the deep realization that what I eat has an impact on my health . . . there is no going back. [. . .] Consciousness is the first step to change! Individually and then collectively (SN, March 2019).

Regarding activism, the problem is that most of those who tried to change the system were not ready to do the inner work themselves (SN, March 2019).

These quotes suggest that environmentalism cannot be detached from the self, i.e., environmental action requires self-reflexivity – socioenvironmental change is entwined with self-regulation strategies, turning inner transition into a key aspect of this social movement. These environmentalities are also characterized by medicalization, with participants resorting to concepts such as 'burnout', 'stress' and 'care' to highlight the articulations of environmental and individual health, justifying the importance of the care of the self. Participants rely on a wide range of technologies of the self to support inner transition:

I discovered meditation about seven years ago and I was so excited, I thought meditation would change the world! (SS, June 2019).

I experienced a deep transformation. I attended a 40-day fasting and meditation silent retreat where the healing aspects are emphasized . . . and I can say that meditation and fasting somehow saved my life (AA, March 2019).

I practice meditation and reiki . . . It is a way of calming and healing myself. Every time I feel agitated and anxious, I resort to those practices (AM, June 2019).

I have a Christian or catholic background, but nowadays I practice more Buddhism than Catholicism. My essential practice, even related to my work, always involves mindfulness and meditation (SN, March 2019).

Beyond these practices, participants also referred Yoga, Chi Kung and other forms of spirituality, considered key strategies of self-regulation and mentioned as supporting inner transition. Interviewees also associated their environmental engagement with the

relational ontologies entwined with these technologies of the self. Practices such as meditation may bring forward experiences of interdependence and interconnection, allowing relational affect to emerge, becoming an ontological framework underpinning sustainability transitions:

I see spirituality as a connection. Spirituality is lived through practices involving our body . . . it is highly experiential. It has to do with our connection with . . . all our dimensions, both the intuitive, our life philosophy and life purpose. Therefore, it is something very integral. And practices, such as meditation, Yoga and Chi Kung help in that connection between us and our humanity [. . .]. By connecting with our body, I believe we also connect with nature. It has to do with being aware and in communion with the environment, and with our internal experience (LC, April 2019).

I see that . . . those who are working on these processes of Transition, they often have some common characteristics that have to do with a very systemic vision, and also a very strong spirituality (MP, May 2019).

Meditation, the way I live it, is key, because it made me realize that I'm not different . . . intellectually, it's easy to see that I need this healthy environment to be here, and I don't just want to be here, I want to be here and be well, I want to have a good life, not just survive. But meditation takes things to a deeper and more integrative level, that is: I'm not different from the environment that I inhabit [. . .] I can't disentangle my well-being from the well-being of animals, air, trees. Meditation allows me to feel the pain, but I can fully respond to the challenges. (SS, June 2019).

Technologies of the self allow participants to embody relational ontologies, coupling inner work and environmental concerns, fostering resilience and well-being and reshaping their subjectivities, leaning towards relational forms of affect. Participants draw on relational ontologies to reinforce their environmental subjectivities, attempting to engage with more-than-human affect and with planetary suffering. When the interviewee mentions that 'meditation allows me to feel the pain', the articulations of sustainability transitions and relational ontologies are highlighted, suggesting that technologies of the self and self-care strategies are drivers of more-than-human/planetary affect.

### **5.3. Habits and lifestyle changes**

This section delves into the set of everyday life changes put in place to attain sustainability transitions. Interviewees consider individual behaviors – habits, consumption patterns, daily practices – as a key dimension to socioenvironmental change, emphasizing individual responsabilization – a tenet of neoliberal environmentalism. By articulating the climate crisis and 'individual habits', participants rely on their bodies, certain foods and associations with non-humans to enact inner transition, incorporating environmental concerns into their ethical frameworks. Interviewees often mentioned how the climate crisis stemmed from unbalanced individual habits and behaviors:

We are 100% responsible for this climate and economic crisis [. . .]. Much of that responsibility stems from our bad habits and vices (AA, March 2019).

Because we need to have virtues, you know? In order to enforce a positive social change (...) And, sometimes, we also need to be strong in certain situations (RA, April 2019).

[Habits] are of the utmost importance, because that's something we do every day, habits are important because they are expressed in everything we do (SA, May 2019).

By recognizing the articulations of climate change and individual behaviors, habits are invested with the capacity to foster sustainability transitions. The environmental and climate crises become the ethical and ontological substrate of technologies of the self, as subjects mobilize specific habits and lifestyle changes to address these issues, and notions such as 'responsibility', 'vices', 'virtues' and 'habits' indicate an intertwining of subjectification devices and environmental concerns. A particularly emblematic example concerns food. Several interviewees mentioned that they substantially reduced their meat intake, often adopting vegetarian or vegan diets, becoming more conscious of the food they buy and grow:

Before I buy any product, I want to know about all the ingredients and I try to buy locally, as much as possible ... I became vegetarian (AA, March 2019).

I'm vegan and I try to buy ecological shoes (RA, April 2019).

There are many things that I changed in my life, mostly regarding food. My diet is much more vegetarian, I consume a lot of probiotics, I'm careful with what and where I buy (LM, May 2019).

I stopped eating meat in 2012 (AM, June 2019).

I know my farmers; I try to contribute to the local economy as much as possible. I have a garden and a greenhouse and collect rainwater (HS, April 2019).

Inner transition relies on webs of associations with particular types of food and diets – vegetarian/vegan/organic/local/biological –, invested with specific ethicopolitical qualities. By indexing consumption patterns to climate and environmental impacts, participants incorporate food and dietary choices as key dimensions of environmentalities, indicating that certain nonhumans are embedded in subjectification devices. These webs of associations with nonhumans highlight how environmentalities are supported by particular materialities, as everyday life practices, domestic environments, material apparatuses and consumption patterns are reconfigured to support inner transition:

I try to cut down on waste, in particular plastic waste, and to decrease consumption in general (CL, June 2019).

I have been doing composting for years [...]. I have a network of friends and families, we share clothes, toys and other goods. I sell and buy used products ... I also barter (VM, September 2019).

I sold my car and only use a bike ... my life, in terms of habits, changed a lot. I try to live with the least amount of plastics possible, to save water ... it is not forced, it is part of a larger commitment (RS, April 2019).

The small, everyday life decisions matter ... we can decide ... not to buy a fossil fuel vehicle but an electric car. Or we can use a bike. If we cannot produce our own food, we can buy our fruits and vegetables from local farmers, in plastic free packages, to reduce our plastic usage and waste production (HS, April 2019).

I have been living in houses totally powered by solar energy. Right now, all the electric energy that I use comes from the wind, produced by EDP Renewables.<sup>3</sup> If I have to travel in Portugal, I usually travel by train (HS, April 2019).

These quotes indicate that inner transition is supported by nonhumans – solar panels and wind turbines, different means of transport, biological products and compost bins – invested with qualities supporting sustainability transitions, in contrast to plastic waste, fossil fuels and overconsumption. Domestic environments, consumption practices and material agents are recruited to enact TN's environmentalities, working as subjectification devices supporting sustainability transitions.

## 6. Discussion

How should we characterize the type of environmentality produced by the TN, particularly by 'inner transition'? This environmentality is geared towards the enactment of a specific version of selfhood aiming to tackle the environmental and climate crisis, managing individual behaviors, relationships, consumption, spiritualities and engagements with human and nonhuman bodies. It emphasizes principles such as responsabilization, well-being, health and relationality, turning the self into a microcosmos embodying broader planetary and socioenvironmental tensions. This environmentality emerges through a heterogenous assemblage entailing technologies of the self, habits, lifestyle changes and specific nonhumans, allowing participants to undergo 'inner transition'.

The scholarly contribution of our paper is twofold: on the one hand, it contributes to existing research on neoliberal environmentalism (Agrawal, 2005; Brand, 2007), empirically studying the emergence of a specific environmentality entwined with 'inner transition' through a pos-phenomenological approach, attending to associations with specific non-humans and technologies of the self; on the other hand, it expands current scholarship on the understudied phenomenon of 'inner transition' (Biddau et al., 2016; Målgand et al., 2014; Schmid & Aiken, 2020), considered a particularly emblematic case study to unpack the biopolitics of neoliberal environmentalism, attending to how it aims to produce certain subjectivities in practice. The following paragraphs articulate our empirical findings with scholarly work on neoliberal environmentalism and the TN, exploring the couplings of technologies of the self and environmentalities; the role of relationality; ethics, neoliberal environmentalism and inner transition; the bodies of inner transition.

Technologies of the self are key to bringing TN's environmentalities to the fore: they allow participants to reconfigure their relationships with their bodies and everyday life aesthetics; they trigger forms of relational affect, indexing subjective changes to wider environmental and sustainability aspirations; they foster wellbeing, reflexivity, resilience and 'positive' emotions; they support individual and collective ethics, turning environmental and climate concerns into subjectification devices. Technologies of the self play a decisive role in inner transition, reconfiguring the selves – and bodies – of participants, suggesting that the study of environmentalities in practice needs to attend to how certain practices of subjectivity and types of affect are mobilized to support subjectification devices.

In section five we included various excerpts implying that relationality is at the core of inner transition; however, how is relationality incorporated by environmentalities and enacted by TN's subjectification devices? First, participants often emphasize the articulations of the self – habits, everyday life, consumption patterns and practices of subjectivity – and the climate and environmental crises, turning the self into a mirror of wider issues to be tackled through micropolitical reconfigurations; second, the habits and practices deployed by participants have a deeply teleological and relational dimension, understood as displaying broader socioeconomic and environmental implications; third, the TN explicitly draws on relational ontologies, and some of the practices mentioned by participants are entwined with notions such as interdependence and interconnection; fourth, inner transition is frequently mobilized to enhance group cohesion and resilience, indicating that the care of the self aims to improve relationships between TN members, reinforcing the community and supporting their actions. This suggests that relationality is a key dimension of the environmentalities produced by inner transition – the self becomes 'relational', and inner and subjective work is framed as politics by other means.

Regarding the articulations of neoliberal environmentalism, ethics and inner transition, our data corroborate the findings in the literature examined in section two: the principles of responsabilization and depoliticization can be used to characterize individual stances towards the climate and environmental crisis. Interviewees emphasize a series of lifestyles changes, forms of consumption and technologies of the self, embracing systemic and relational views. Other principles linked to neoliberal selfhood – autonomy, individuality and choice – are also at play. Our analysis highlighted the deeply mediated character of inner transition, suggesting that it is entwined with various practices, habits and associations with non-humans that display sustainable characteristics, allowing participants to become 'virtuous' and 'responsible'. Following a post-phenomenological approach, inner transition cannot be decoupled from heterogenous assemblages that include a plethora of actors – practices of meditation, compost bins, solar panels, organic food and 'sustainable habits'. These assemblages are mobilized to enact a particular environmentality, creating sustainable juxtapositions between individuals and environments, articulating self-control and planetary concerns.

Furthermore, our research indicates that human and nonhuman bodies are at the core of this environmentality. First, it is through the human body that environmentalities are enacted – the body that eats, that engages in technologies of the self and whose habits are transformed; second, the feeling of the body is reshaped through technologies of the self such as Yoga, Reiki and Chi Kung, involving particular movements, kinesthetic reconfigurations, gestures and experiences; third, healthy bodies – in opposition to stress, burnout and fatigue – are entwined with a healthy planet, highlighting the couplings of medicalization, environmental sustainability and inner transition; fourth, non-human bodies, both organic and non-organic, are invested with particular ethicopolitical qualities supporting sustainability transitions; finally, these environmentalities are enacted through couplings between human and non-human bodies (bicycles, compost bins, organic food, solar panels, etc.). These heterogenous webs of associations intertwine 'inner work' with wider socioeconomic, environmental and planetary ambitions, illustrating the deeply material characteristics of inner transition.

This article suggests that inner transition mobilizes human and non-human bodies and the care of the self to tackle climate change and environmental degradation. Individual choices, spiritualities, emotions, relationships and domestic environments are understood as expressions of wider sociopolitical forces, and by working on themselves participants aspire to attain a positive impact at a broader – planetary – level. This represents a depoliticization of environmental and climate issues (now reframed as a manifestation of individual choices), and a responsabilization of individual citizens (moving away responsibility from corporations and governments). These environmentalities mobilize the metanarratives of the climate and environmental crisis as drivers of self-control, wellbeing and health, further submitting the environment to yet another layer of capitalist domination, now turned into a marker of green, virtuous and ethical capital that citizens can generate and display through a wide range of ‘sustainable’ practices.

## 7. Conclusion

This paper examined a type of environmentality entwined with ‘inner transition’, drawing on empirical data from 20 semi-structured interviews with members of the TN in Portugal. It argued that inner transition is entwined with heterogenous assemblages, including technologies of the self, particular habits and lifestyle changes and webs of associations with non-humans. This paper contributes to two fields of research: it expands current literature on neoliberal environmentalism, analyzing subjectification devices in practice and how these are enacted by grassroots movements, specifically the TN; it broadens recent scholarship on the TN, focusing on the understudied dimension of ‘inner transition’, resorting to a theoretical framework informed by concerns within neoliberal environmentalism. Additionally, this article contributes to research on the TN in Portugal and on the articulations of technologies of the self, environmentalities and social movements more broadly.

Some of the limitations of our article include the fact that the interviewees displayed distinct political ecologies, and only some were engaged in ‘inner transition’, indicating that not all participants consider inner work a key dimension of sustainability transitions; moreover, it should be noted that ‘inner transition’ does not necessarily exclude the possibility of engaging in activist or confrontational politics – as previously mentioned, the Portuguese TN displays heterogenous political stances, suggesting that multiple environmentalities may coexist within the same movement; our research stems from semi-structured interviews, and, with the support of ethnographic research, perhaps it would be possible to better attend to some of the practical subtleties of these environmentalities in everyday life; furthermore, interviews may also be insufficient to tackle more intimate and phenomenological aspects entwined with particular technologies of the self; our results also need to be put in context, as the dynamics of the Portuguese TN may contrast with other national settings, thus affecting subject formation; finally, as university educated white researchers from the Global North we should acknowledge the limitations inherent to our positionality, as it may mirror the lack of diversity and inclusivity evidenced by the sample of this study (as well as by members of the TN, as we have seen in [section 3](#)).

As directions for future research, we propose the following: to assess how environmentalities are shaped by particular environmental concerns and materialities, analyzing how certain issues (climate change, plastic pollution, deforestation) entail distinct

practices and processes of inner transition; to examine how neoliberal environmentalism is unpacked in distinct countries, and how different TN groups enact ‘inner transition’; to enquire how neoliberal environmentalism can coexist with confrontational and agonistic environmental politics, evaluating how the set of subjective reconfigurations coupled with neoliberal environmentalism are mobilized in contexts of activism and dissension; finally, we believe more research is needed on how technologies of the self – such as mindfulness – can be ‘environmentalized’ and support environmental movements, and on the methodologies that can be put in place to study these often elusive phenomena.

## Notes

1. <https://transitionnetwork.org/transition-near-me/>.
2. <https://transitionnetwork.org/about-the-movement/what-is-transition/inner/>
3. EDP Renewables is a Portuguese renewable energy company.

## Acknowledgement

An early draft of this paper was presented at the ongoing Technology and Social Change (TEMAT) seminar of the Department of Thematic Studies (TEMA) of Linköping University, and we are grateful for the feedback provided by Camilo Castillo, Steve Woolgar and Else Vogel.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## Funding

This work is funded by ERDF – European Regional Development Fund through the COMPETE 2020 – Operational Program for Competitiveness and Internationalization (POCI), and by Portuguese funds through FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, project TROPO, no. 028362 (POCI-01-0145-FEDER-028362).

## Notes on contributors

*António Carvalho* holds a PhD in Sociology from the University of Exeter. He currently works as a lecturer at the Faculty of Economics and as a research fellow at the Centre for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra, where he is the principal investigator of TROPO (2018-2022), a research project focused on the multiple ontologies of the Anthropocene in Portugal. His research interests include the Anthropocene, biopolitics, mindfulness and the ethics of emerging technologies.

*Vera Ferreira* is a junior researcher at the Centre for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra. She is currently in the research team of the Project TROPO – “Anthropogenic Ontologies in Portugal: social movements, public policies and emerging technologies”. Vera is also a PhD Candidate in Climate Change and Sustainable Development Policies at the University of Lisbon. She holds a bachelor’s and a master’s degree in International Relations from the Faculty of Economics of the University of Coimbra.

## References

- Agrawal, A. (2005). Environmentalism: Community, intimate government, and the making of environmental subjects in Kumaon, India. *Current Anthropology*, 46(2), 161–190. <https://doi.org/10.1086/427122>
- Aiken, G. T. (2015). (Local-) community for global challenges: Carbon conversations, transition towns and governmental elisions. *Local Environment*, 20(7), 764–781. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2013.870142>
- Anderson, B. (2011). Population and Affective Perception: Biopolitics and Anticipatory Action in US Counterinsurgency Doctrine. *Antipode*, 43(2), 205–236. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2010.00804.x>
- Argüelles, L., Anguelovski, I., & Dinnie, E. (2017). Power and privilege in alternative civic practices: Examining imaginaries of change and embedded rationalities in community economies. *Geoforum*, 86(November), 30–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.08.013>
- Avelino, F., Dumitru, A., Cipolla, C., Kunze, I., & Wittmayer, J. (2020). Translocal empowerment in transformative social innovation networks. *European Planning Studies*, 28(5), 955–977. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2019.1578339>
- Barr, S., & Pollard, J. (2017). Geographies of transition: Narrating environmental activism in an age of climate change and ‘Peak Oil’. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 49(1), 47–64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X16663205>
- Barry, J., & Quilley, S. (2008). Transition towns. In L. Leonard (Ed.), *Advances in ecopolitics* (pp. 14–37). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S2041-806X\(2008\)0000002003](https://doi.org/10.1108/S2041-806X(2008)0000002003)
- Biddau, F., Armenti, A., & Cottone, P. F. (2016). Socio-psychological aspects of grassroots participation in the transition movement: An Italian case study. *Journal of Social Political Psychology*, 4(1), 142–165. <https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v4i1.518>
- Brand, P. (2007). Green subjection: The politics of neoliberal urban environmental management. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 31(3), 616–632. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2007.00748.x>
- Carvalho, A. (2017). Ecologies of the self in practice—meditation, affect and ecosophy. *Geografiska annaler. Series B, Human geography*, 99(2), 207–222.
- D’Alisa, G., Demaria, F., & Cattaneo, C. (2013). Civil and uncivil actors for a degrowth society. *Journal of Civil Society*, 9(2), 212–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17448689.2013.788935>
- de Moor, J., Catney, P., & Doherty, B. (2021). What hampers ‘political’ action in environmental alternative action organizations? Exploring the scope for strategic agency under post-political conditions. *Social Movement Studies*, 20(3), 312–328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2019.1708311>
- Esteves, A. M. (2020). Systemic thinking’, ‘regenerative culture’, and new forms of prefigurative politics: Challenges for the global left. *Globalizations*, 17(2), 232–236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2019.1670954>
- Feola, G. (2014). Narratives of grassroots innovations: A comparison of voluntary simplicity and the transition movement in Italy. *International Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 8(3), 250–269. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJISD.2014.066612>
- Feola, G., & Jaworska, S. (2019). One transition, many transitions? A corpus-based study of societal sustainability transition discourses in four civil society’s proposals. *Sustainability Science*, 14(6), 1643–1656. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-018-0631-9>
- Ferreira, V., & Carvalho, A. (2021). Narratives of socioecological transition: The case of the transition network in Portugal. *Nature and Culture*, 16(2), 42–66. <https://doi.org/10.3167/nc.2020.160203>
- Fletcher, R. (2010). Neoliberal environmentalism: Towards a poststructuralist political ecology of the conservation debate. *Conservation and Society*, 8(3), 171–181. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.73806>
- Fletcher, R. (2017). Environmentalism unbound: Multiple governmentalities in environmental politics. *Geoforum*, 85(October), 311–315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.06.009>

- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777–795. <https://doi.org/10.1086/448181>
- Foucault, M. (1988). *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (2006). *The hermeneutics of the subject – lectures at the Collège de France 1981-1982*. Picador.
- Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hopkins, R. (2008). *The transition handbook. From oil dependency to local resilience*. Green Books.
- Kenis, A., & Mathijs, E. (2014). (De)politicising the local: The case of the transition towns movement in Flanders (Belgium). *Journal of Rural Studies*, 34(April), 172–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2014.01.013>
- Machaqueiro, R. R. (2020). Environmentalism by the United Nations framework convention for climate change: Neoliberal ethos and the production of environmental subjects in Acre and Mozambique. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 3(2), 442–461. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848619835134>
- Madsen, O. (2014). Governmentality. In T. Thomas (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of critical psychology* (pp. 814–816). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5583-7\\_126](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5583-7_126)
- Mälgand, M., Bay-Mortensen, N., Bedkowska, B., Hansen, F. N., Schow, M., Thomsen, A. M., & Hunka, A. D. (2014). Environmental awareness, the transition movement, and place: Den selvforsynende landsby, a Danish transition initiative. *Geoforum*, 57(November), 40–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.08.009>
- Mason, K., & Whitehead, M. (2012). Transition urbanism and the contested politics of ethical place making. *Antipode*, 44(2), 493–516. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2010.00868.x>
- Maxton-Lee, B. (2020). Activating responsible citizens: Depoliticized environmentalism in hegemonic neoliberalism. *Democratization*, 27(3), 443–460. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2019.1710489>
- McCarthy, J., & Prudham, S. (2004). Neoliberal nature and the nature of neoliberalism. *Geoforum*, 35(3), 275–283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2003.07.003>
- McGregor, C., & Crowther, J. (2018). The Transition movement as politics and pedagogy in communities. *Community Development Journal*, 53(1), 8–24. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsw024>
- North, P. (2010). Eco-localisation as a progressive response to peak oil and climate change – A sympathetic critique. *Geoforum*, 41(4), 585–594. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2009.04.013>
- Pellizzoni, L. (2021). A different kind of emancipation? From lifestyle to form-of-life. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 25(1), 155–171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684310211027331>
- Purser, R. (2019). *McMindfulness: how mindfulness became the new capitalist spirituality*. Repeater Books.
- Rose, N. (1996). *Inventing our selves: Psychology, power, and personhood*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511752179>
- Rose, N. (1999). *Governing the soul. The shaping of the private self*. Free Association Books.
- Rose, N. (2007). *The politics of life itself: Biomedicine, power, and subjectivity in the twenty-first century*. Princeton University Press.
- Schmid, B., & Aiken, G. T. (2020). Transformative mindfulness: The role of mind-body practices in community-based activism. *Cultural Geographies*, 28(1), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474020918888>
- Smith, A. (2011). The transition town network: A review of current evolutions and renaissance. *Social Movement Studies*, 10(1), 99–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2011.545229>
- Swaffield, J. (2016). After a decade of critique: Neoliberal environmentalism, discourse analysis and the promotion of climate-protecting behaviour in the workplace. *Geoforum*, 70(March), 119–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.02.014>
- Swyngedouw, E. (2007). The Post-Political City. In BAVO (Eds.), *Urban politics now: Re-imagining democracy in the neo-liberal city* (pp. 58–76). NAI Publishers.
- Swyngedouw, E., & Ernstson, H. (2018). Interrupting the Anthro-po-obScene: Immuno-biopolitics and depoliticizing ontologies in the Anthropocene. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 35(6), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276418757314>
- Verbeek, P.-P. (2011). *Moralizing technology: Understanding and designing the morality of things*. The University of Chicago Press.