



Stavros Stavrides

2011

*Communities of crisis, squares in movement*

*Abstract.* This paper is going to become a chapter of an edited book titled *Regards on the Crisis in Europe*, to be published by professionaldreamers. “All these events – Stavrides argues – indicate societies in movement. And this movement goes beyond any agglomeration of particular demands which are expressed by different social groups in pursue of particular interests. In practices of collective improvisation and collective inventiveness common spaces are created in which people not only express their anger and needs but also develop forms of life in common. True, those forms are fragile, precarious, often ephemeral and sometimes contradictory in terms of ideological premises or values. But this collective and factual production of common spaces reinvents dissident politics, gives new form to practices which overspill the boundaries of dominant social roles.”



## Legitimation crisis and the role of contemporary communication practices

It is perhaps easy to recognize in our contemporary societies an economic system in paroxysmal attack against the very society which supports it and sustains it. Governing elites seem to believe that they have at last reached the heavens of the absolute capitalist utopia: money begets money without any mediating interference of often disobedient and unpredictable real people as well as always problematic production procedures. The arrogance and power of bankers and stock brokers is symptomatic of such a paroxysmal utopianism.

This euphoric optimism of the governing elites is, however, fading out quickly as the supposedly flawless machine of profit got stuck in the mud of a socio-economical crisis a lot more important than the periodical ones. Those real people who necessarily make this machine work are again visible: the crisis of loans has to do with real populations, their behavior, collective and individual, and directly affects economic processes, disturbing plans and falsifying future projections. In a period of a supposedly absolute predominance of the market laws, in a period when politics is supposedly effectively replaced by management, problems of governability arise again dangerously: “Those below” have to be re-integrated to a system which, caught in its own paroxysmal utopia, thought it could do without them. As so many social eruptions and statistics show, people are losing their faith in a system which presents itself as a mechanism of potential wealth distribution to which they expect to have access.

Collective disappointment, either explicitly expressed in riots or implicitly expressed in solitary depression, pauses new problems of governability: It seems that two crucial tasks are laid before this necessary “return to politics” for the governing elites. The first one is to ensure that people continue to be defined by social bonds which constitute individuals as economic subjects, as subjects whose behavior and motives can be analyzed, channeled, predicted upon and, ultimately, controlled by the use of economic parameters and measures only. The second one is to ensure that people continue to act and dream without any form of connectedness and coordination with others. Collective actions and aspirations, especially those that produce common spaces, as we will see, are to be blocked.

In a period of crisis those two priorities in population governance aim at producing individuals who share with others only fear<sup>1</sup>: fear about everything that keeps in destabilizing their life conditions and plans. At the same time, each one alone has to believe that he or she “will make it”. And that can possibly happen only at the expense of any other’s opportunity to make it too.

Cracks and ruptures manifest themselves often violently in the ambitious yet precarious edifice of this governing model. Outraged and rebellious people enter again the field of politics, acquire visibility and power to transform implemented policies. And out of these collective acts, public space acquires new meaning. It is as if people reclaim space as a locus of dissident acts, as locus separated from the dominant mediatic space of simulated participation.

It is certainly too early to say that dominant policies have entered into a crisis of no return, even though history travels with an amazing speed these days and



indications of a deepening of crisis proliferate. We can, however, observe in various parts of the world two interconnected series of phenomena which deeply affect what we could diagnose as a crisis of legitimation. The first series includes phenomena that have to do with the role of information and communication in destabilizing collective faith in the system. From the Latin American movements and uprisings (as the *argentnazo* or the people's anti-coup mobilizations in Venezuela) to the Arab revolutions (especially those in Tunisia and Egypt), including the "indignant" square occupations in European cities, communication and information exchanges through the so-called social media and interactive communication devices have played a very important role in molding collective action.

The second series includes phenomena that have to do with community oriented or community inspired actions which, often quite distinct from neo-communitarian neo-conservative ideologies, create or even re-invent communities-in-the-making. These are often unstable but always metastatic communities in movement.

Both series of phenomena converge in practices of re-definition and re-appropriation of public space. And both series of phenomena are characterized by forms of hybridization, the mixing of incompatible and often opposing elements in the creation of "unauthorized" combinations.

According to Homi Bhabha, hybridity characterizes a specific form of agency, "subaltern agency". As he suggests, "subaltern agency emerges as relocation and re-inscription" (Bhabha 2004: 227). We can attribute those two characteristics, relocation and re-inscription (understanding them not only metaphorically but also as descriptive terms), to a series of urban practices that are focused on the collective re-invention of public space. These practices create, use and disseminate information through the already mentioned new media. But they are not only practices of information exchange. Such practices "mark" the city through the information exchange they make possible. Re-inscription can invoke the material results of these practices on the city's body. It is a process of marking out specific places through inscriptions that do not only disseminate information (as in the case of wall writings or graffiti) but also connect places and create shared points of reference for specific emerging collectivities which recognize them. This happened, for example, during the days of the December 2008 youth uprising in Athens<sup>2</sup>, when a "migrant" stencil art spread all over the city center condensing the messages of the uprising in emblematic images. Some of these markings of the city's body were short-lived, others still survive.

Inscriptions over other inscriptions, messages and traces in combat with other traces. A re-inscription process, indeed, which can effectively transfer the feeling of a city in movement, a city in turmoil. Similar re-inscription acts have spread in Tunis and Cairo during the recent Arab uprisings and in Barcelona, Athens, Madrid and other European cities due to the "squares movement".

"Relocation" has to do with one very important characteristic of information dissemination: those new urban practices of public space appropriation and collective dissent use information exchanges with the aim of potentially coordinating those who participate in the exchanges. Information is not a flow, in this context, but an arrow directed towards potential receivers and returned as a promise of mutual involvement.



One of the early examples of such practices was the case of the “*pasalo*” mobilizations in Barcelona and Madrid on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2004: During the “night of the short messages” people exchanged through the internet and by SMS, a message that would overthrow a government: “Liars murderers. Your war our dead. *Pasalo* (Pass it on)”. This message was circulated the day before general elections and accused the government of systematically hiding from the people the real reasons for the bomb explosions which had killed 200 persons in three suburban trains. Huge demonstrations occupied the central squares in Barcelona and Madrid, as these were defined by the messages of protesters as meeting points<sup>3</sup>.

In this process, information (“they are not telling us the truth”) addresses people as potential actors. Information acquires a power to mobilize people through sharing and participation. The city is thus not simply the background or the medium through which information spreads, but an active element in the transformation of information to a call. Defined meeting points punctuate the city’s body and organize a network of locations connected by a common cause, a common will for action. This is what can be described as a re-location procedure. Spaces and actions are redefined, that is, they are connected in new ways. Analogous urban inventive forms of coordination developed during the Athens’ December, the Tunisian “Jasmine revolution” or the *indignados* square actions.

Rumors and gossip used to be forms of information exchange, which, in traditional societies, participated in the reproduction or refashioning of existing social and personal relations. In the past, communities preexisted those “media”; community values and global hierarchies were rarely questioned. In contemporary societies, however, interactive technologies mediate the creation of communities of collective action, which are not necessarily communities of people sharing a common identity or common values. These are communities in movement, communities developed through common action and the sharing of public space<sup>4</sup>.

It is not that opportunities are created by interactive media. It is that through the processes of re-inscription and re-location, shared information and shared meeting points bind people. In a curious reversal, re-territorializing happens through the active mediation of de-territorializing communication technologies. Communities become located in urban space and develop by re-defining and re-appropriating urban space.

### **“Common space” as threshold space**

Communities in movement “secrete” their own space. This is not the public space as we know it, space given from a certain authority to the public under specific conditions which, in the end, affirm the authority’s legitimacy. It is not private space either, if by this we mean space controlled and used by a limited group of people excluding anybody else. Communities secrete common space<sup>5</sup>, space used under conditions which communities collectively decide and open to anybody (not only to those who are members of the community). To be more exact, these communities do not have members: anyone who participates in the actions and accepts the rules of such a community is a *de facto* member. The use, maintenance and creation of common space



does not simply mirror the community. The community is secreted, developed and reproduced through practices focused on “common” space. To generalize this principle: the community is developed through commoning, through acts and forms of organization oriented towards the production of the common.

To get a clearer view of the importance of space commoning for the creation and support of communities in movement, let’s look at the recent example of the Syntagma square occupation in Athens. “A view from afar” would describe this occupation as a meeting point for protesters, just in front of the Parliament building, to denounce harsh, unjust and undemocratic austerity measures. Of course this view is not wrong: it just misses what is new in this occupation-protest. Syntagma square developed into a network of connected micro-squares, each one with a distinct character and spatial arrangement, all contained or, rather, territorialized in the area of what was known to be “the” central Athens’ public square. Each micro-square had its own group of people who lived there for some days, in their tents, people who focused their actions and their micro-urban environment to a specific task: a children playground, free reading and meditation area, a homeless campaign meeting point, a “time bank” (a form of services exchange based on the elimination of money and profit), a “we don’t pay” campaign meeting point (focused on organizing an active boycott of transportation fees and road tolls), a first aid medical center, a multimedia group node, a translation group stand etc. There were various levels on which those micro-communities were connected and, of course, all of them had to follow the general assembly’s rules and decisions. However, differences in space arrangement choices and in expression media (with the use of banners, placards, stickers, images, “works of art” etc.) were more than apparent. Although the common cause and common target (the Parliament) were dominant, each micro-square established different routines and different aesthetics and organized different micro-events during the occupation.

Space commoning was not a centralized procedure then, although the assembly and the assembly area acquired a symbolically as well as functionally central role. Space commoning was rather practiced as a collectively improvised process which was marked by a centrality – dispersion dialectics: dispersed activities and micro-events but also coordinated activities which were refocusing attention to the Parliament (i.e. protesters encircled the building); small groups enjoying and playing their favored music and larger (but informal) concerts in the centre in the square; commissions organizing their own space and activities but also reporting to the general assembly.

Space commoning in the re-appropriated squares of recent uprisings involves the production and use of in-between spaces. Common spaces emerge as threshold spaces, spaces which are not demarcated by a defining perimeter. Whereas public space bears the mark of a prevailing authority which defines it, common space is opened space, space in a process of opening towards “newcomers”<sup>6</sup>. Common spaces are porous spaces, spaces in movement, spaces-passages. “The wisdom hidden in the threshold experience lies in the awareness that otherness can only be approached by opening the borders of identity, forming – so to speak – intermediary zones of doubt, ambivalence, hybridity, zones of negotiable values” (Stavrides 2011:18).

In the occupied spaces, space commoning is a process of creating a network of threshold spaces. Divisions in space, thus, which are necessary for the creation of



micro-communities (or, indeed, micro-squares), do not result in space departmentalization. Micro-squares are porous themselves and a network of spaces-as-passages constitutes a spatial arrangement which resembles a miniature city, a miniature tent city with its open-air spaces.

Threshold spaces neither define people who use them nor are defined by them. They rather mediate negotiations between people about the meaning and use of space. Such spaces thus correspond to a process of identity opening which characterizes the square's experience. A miniature city: a "city of thresholds" (Stavrides 2011) in which encounters and dispersed initiatives build spaces of negotiation and osmosis where people explore a public culture based on solidarity and mutual respect.

Community in movement in Syntagma was not created through organizational schemes that presupposed a center of decisions or the absolute predominance of a central space. Spaces as well as decisions, were de-centralized and re-centralized. So was the process of creating those social bonds-in-the-making which created a community in constant re-making.

## **Re-inventing community**

Commoning procedures understood as a dialectics of dispersion-centralization<sup>7</sup> leave room for differentiated initiatives and individual improvisations. What was often described as an antithesis between spontaneous and organized acts or individual and collective behaviors (often by those of the left and the anarchist movement who considered themselves as "guardians" of the oppositional politics), was most of the times the result of this dialectics. Not everybody came to Syntagma to participate in the assembly. Many came only to shout and express their anger and disapproval. Some even used laser beam pointers to perform a contemporary version of voodoo magic (in a symbolically aggressive gesture they focused the laser beams as metaphoric pins on the Parliament building's "body"). On Sundays some brought their children along simply enjoying the air of a public space that was "different".

To search desperately for a locatable common identity which could include those people was a serious mistake. Sometimes it made participating activists of the left misunderstand completely the motives, practices and expressions of all those who participated more or less regularly.

There is an important methodological problem that re-surfaces in the description and interpretation dilemmas stemming from the Syntagma and squares' experience. Does one have to recognize in these phenomena, acts, utterances and expressions a represented but hidden meaning? Is interpretation a process of revealing the hidden logic of these events as embedded in their form? Or do we have to rethink our categories of understanding social events and forms of collective subjectivation as we face a process which possibly redefines dissident politics and communities in action?

One example: are those brandishing "their" national flags (in Syntagma, in Tunis, in Barcelona and elsewhere) simply nationalists? Is this therefore a potentially dangerous community resurfacing in a period of crisis? If we simply judge using a well established repertoire of political forms of expression, obviously this is the case. But in



the squares people used national symbols in various ways. One of them, i.e. in Athens, “wore” the flag as a kind of shield against those who “sell the country” (literally, indeed). Another one was to appeal through flag waving to an injured collective dignity: “rise up”, “wake up”, “we are here”, as the Spaniards are in their squares, as should the Italians, the French etc...

Another example: one way to judge the long discussions about real or direct democracy (in assemblies but also in smaller commissions or groups) which were predominant throughout the European squares experience, is to analyze the words and thoughts that were used. One could say that this or that kind of discourse was de-politicized, utopian, ineffective and so on. Another way, however, could be to compare words, acts and forms of expression. “Real” or direct democracy was performed in various ways in the squares. No matter what observers would say, women’s participation in the Tahrir square in Cairo is a *de facto* practicing of common space as democratic space. And people in the squares devised ways to take decisions and to defend themselves against police aggression which established new forms of direct equalitarian democracy. Just after one brutal police charge which had chased, hit and tear-gassed people, the square of Syntagma was again peacefully re-occupied. Then, people formed large human chains which transported, from hand to hand, small bottles of water to clean the square from the poisonous tear-gas remains. Collective inventiveness (in order to meet the lack of inefficient water) created a democratic equalitarian solidarity in practice. Those human chains, improvised to face a pressing situation, emblemize a community in movement which re-invents “real” democracy in action. Those human chains sometimes took the form of a dancing circle to either celebrate a victory (as in Tahrir after the announcement of Mubarak’s fall) or exorcise fear (as in Syntagma: people danced in the square as the police was “bombing” the area with suffocating gas grenades).

Discourses, practices and forms of expression can and should be interpreted as acts in movement. Their correspondences are sometimes strengthened but one should not deduce a preexisting pattern that maps their common ground. Discrepancies, ambiguities, contradictions are necessary ingredients of a potential community in action, a community of different people who remain different but recognize themselves as co-producers of a common space in the making.

Who were those people? Who are those people who still occupy the squares, still express their anger against measures which destroy their life and their future? Can a social identity include all of them? Can a common ideology describe them? Can patterns of action delimit their potential collective practices?

One thing that seems to unite those people, no matter how different their country’s context is in regard to the global economic-social crisis, is a collectively felt loss of power’s legitimacy. In myriads of inventive expressions people mock power, express their anger against power’s symbols and ridicule individual leaders. Consensus is shown to be in a deep crisis. Both societies of simulated democratic consensus and those outright “autarchic” seem to enter today in a deep legitimation crisis. Fear and state terror are the only means to control rebellious or simply outraged and disappointed people.



## “We”?

A peculiar “we” surfaces in the squares, an ambiguous “we” condenses, but can evaporate too in the current uprisings. Is this the “we” that marks the emergence of new political subjects, the emergence of those who did not count before but demand to take part, as Rancière understands the process of political subjectivation.<sup>8</sup>

Let us hear first what the written manifestos from the squares say: “We are ordinary people. We are like you, people who get up every morning to study, to work or find a job, people who have families and friends. People who work hard every day to provide a better future for those around us”<sup>9</sup> (Barcelona). “We are unemployed people, working people, pensioners, students, schoolchildren, farmers, immigrants, outraged with all those who plunder our lives and decide without us” (Heraklion, Greece). “We are working people, jobless people, pensioners and young who come to Syntagma to fight and struggle for our lives and our future” (Athens)<sup>10</sup>. “We are nobody” (Syntagma square anonymous placard).

This is a “we” of common people, an inclusive “we” which demands life and justice. This is a “we” that does not name, differentiate and erect barriers. And, most important perhaps, this is a “we” which is formed in complete opposition to the “national” or “cosmopolitan” “we” that the governing elites and the mainstream media attempt to impose. “We are not responsible, you are”. “We don’t have to pay your debts”, “We don’t have to fight your wars” (*pasalo* mobilizations). “We are not you”. Opposed to a recognizable outside, the outside which contains all those who destroy the future, there is a multifaceted “we”, a kaleidoscopic “we” full of refractions and open to ever new arrangements of differences.

Is it the “we” of the multitude? Perhaps, if we consider that the multitude is characterized by heterogeneous multiplicity. But the reasoning behind the choice of this term to describe the crowd in the current phase of capitalism is based on the idea that the multitude emerges as the human productive force in the period of biopolitical production. The multitude, according to Hardt and Negri (2004: 165), “is a multiplicity of singularities that produce and are produced in the biopolitical field of the common”<sup>11</sup>. In the squares and in the recent uprisings, the multitude does not present itself as a productive force through, even if we allow the term production to contain almost every form of human activity as Hardt and Negri do. True, capitalism attempts to distill out of every human activity its productive power on which the production of value and profit are necessarily based. People in the squares, however, are creating rather than producing<sup>12</sup>. Forms of sharing and forms of encounter in public are created while being performed. Could not these forms be potentially manipulated by dominant institutions and appropriated by the market by being turned into mechanisms of exploitation? Yes, but one should not judge only in terms of possibilities. Instead, what we know about the present situation shows us that forms of commoning are directly opposed to the main targets of the dominant politics and to the hegemonic project of governing the crisis as presented in the beginning of this text.

What theory of multitude can offer us, along with other attempts to rethink the political, including Agamben’s and Rancière’s, is the idea that politics is necessarily linked to processes of collective subjectivation. What these theories attempt to rethink is



not simply the changes in the definition of the political subject but, rather, the processes of constitution of collective subjects. Agamben uses the term “whatever singularities” to describe the subjectivities of a coming community<sup>13</sup> and Rancière speaks of the “democratic practice as the inscription of the part of those who have no part – which does not mean the ‘excluded’ but *anybody whoever*” (2010: 60 emphasis added). Hardt and Negri insist on the “making” of the multitude as a process which does not eliminate differences but creates common ground among singularities<sup>14</sup>.

Political subjectivation, thus, can be considered as a process that does not move towards the construction of collective identities and unified social bodies but towards new forms of coordination and interaction based on commoning practices which create open communities of commoners.

Probably these theorizations can only hint towards the possibility of a future different society, developing ideas about forms of collective action that can indeed pre-figure equalitarian and emancipating social relations. Is this enough today? Probably not, that is why it is urgently necessary to understand contemporary movements and learn from their actions, discourses and forms of organization.

One thing we know already is that these events have had the power to overthrow governments even in societies with a long tradition of absolutist regimes. And we also know that these events mark the return of people to collective action. Surely, those people cannot be described as the most disadvantaged or the most marginalized, although people of such kind have indeed participated in the squares or the uprisings. There is no obvious common economic or social definition that can include all of them, though.

A crisis of power legitimation unites them along with a shared feeling of a total absence of justice. Each and everyone draws experiences from his and her own life, that verify this prevailing injustice. In the Tunisia uprising, this feeling was expressed in a revolt against a corrupt family that ruled the country for many years. In the Athens December uprising, this feeling was everywhere in young people’s actions, because the killing of a young boy by a policeman condensed into a single act all dominant measures, politics and ideologies which imprison youth in a pre-determined future of antagonisms and disappointments. And in the squares, this feeling took the form of a collectively recognized economic injustice (imposed or, rather, accelerated through austerity measures). This feeling was probably behind the current U.K. riots, too.

All these events indicate societies in movement. And this movement goes beyond any agglomeration of particular demands which are expressed by different social groups in pursue of particular interests. In practices of collective improvisation and collective inventiveness common spaces are created in which people not only express their anger and needs but also develop forms of life in common. True, those forms are fragile, precarious, often ephemeral and sometimes contradictory in terms of ideological premises or values. But this collective and factual production of common spaces re-invents dissident politics, gives new form to practices which overspill the boundaries of dominant social roles<sup>15</sup>.

Sharing and solidarity are not introduced as values or ideologically sanctioned imperatives but are experienced in practice, in solving practical problems and in collectively organizing actions of protest. In such a context, there is no difference



between the solidarity which supports the organizing of defense against state aggression and the solidarity expressed in the collection of garbage in the occupied squares. Solidarity is not simply a force that sustains people in clashes with the state forces. Solidarity has become and becomes a creative force. In a period of crisis this proves to be not only ethically gratifying, but also effective. People are forced to devise, invent, discover ways to survive to the crisis. And through the squares experiences, practices of collective invention acquire the form of social experiment.

The most urgent and promising task, which during this crisis can counter the dominant model of governance, is the re-invention of common spaces. The realm of the common emerges in a constant confrontation with state-controlled, “authorized” public space. An emergence full of contradictions, perhaps, quite difficult to predict but nevertheless absolutely necessary. In the common realm, secreted by communities in movement, people find room to compare their dreams and needs, to rediscover solidarity and to fight the destructive “individualization of destinies” imposed by the dominant policies. Behind a multifarious and plural demand for justice and dignity, new roads to collective emancipation are gropingly tested and invented. And, as the Zapatistas say, we can only create these roads by walking. But we have to listen, to observe and to feel the walking movement... Together.

## Notes

1. “Fear does not revolutionize experience, it only renders it uncertain and precarious... At the base of fear lies the experience of being fully and irremediably exposed to the world.” (Carolis, 1996:43-44).
2. For an extended appraisal of the Athens December uprising see Stavrides 2010, Memos 2010, Sotiris 2009 and Mentinis 2009.
3. “The critical matter is that while most messages were very similar, the sender for each receiver was someone known, someone that had the receiver’s address in his/her cell phone’s address book. Thus, the network of diffusion was at the same time increasing at an exponential rate but without losing the proximity of the source, according to the well known ‘small worlds’ phenomenon.” (Castells *et al.* 2007:201); see also Cué 2004.
4. The idea of communities in movement echoes R. Zibechi’s choice of the term “societies in movement” to describe collective practices and events that go beyond the usual definition of social movements (see Zibechi 2010 and Zibechi 2007).



5. “Common space”, according to Hénaff and Strong, “admits no criteria; it is open to all in the same way. It is not owned or controlled... all can go there to extract from it what is there” (2001: 4). This is more or less an understanding of common space as pre-existing its social uses (including its potential enclosure), whereas here common space is primarily and necessarily considered as a social artifact created through practices of space commoning (see also Roggero 2010: 361-363).
6. In agreement with Rancière’s understanding of a “democracy to come” as “an infinite openness to the Other or the newcomer” (Rancière 2010: 59).
7. The idea of a dialectics of dispersion/centralization comes from Zibechi’s (2010: 55, 58) analysis of the Bolivian movements as anti-state forces and his corresponding understanding of a community in struggle as a “dispersion machine, always avoiding the concentration of power”.
8. see Rancière 2010: 32-33.
9. Available at <http://www.democraciarealya.es/manifiesto-comun/manifiesto-english/>
10. Available at <http://aganaktismenoihrakleio.blogspot.com/> (Heraklion Assembly) and <http://real-democracy.gr/el/ψηφισμα-λαικησ-συνελευσησ-πλατειασ-συνταγματοσ-0> (Athens, 27 May 2011)
11. Clearly distinguished from the “people” and the “mass”, the multitude is an “active social subject” which “although it remains multiple and internally different is able to act in common and thus rule itself” (Hardt and Negri 2004: 100).
12. Hardt and Negri clearly insist that today “labor cannot be limited to waged labor but must refer to human creative capacities in all their generality” (2004: 105). Virno believes that “the dividing line between Work and Action [poiesis and praxis]... has now disappeared altogether” (Virno 1996: 190). Consequently, “[t] here is no longer anything which distinguishes labor from the rest of human activities (Virno 2004: 102) There is, however, a movement that opposes the continuing entrapment of creative action by the logic of capital, which can be recognized in the square’s commoning experiences. Perhaps it is more appropriate to speak of a potential temporary emancipation of “doing” in the prospect of an “anti-politics of dignity” as theorized by Holloway (Holloway 2010: 245-249). This precarious emancipation of doing can be directly connected to the emergence of “political subjects” as collective subjects who do not fit into the existing social order. As Rancière insists, politics “occurs” when the dominant social order (“police”) is disrupted and thus re-defined. This may happen through acts which can be considered as creative not because they produce something (tangible or not) but because they form the emergent subjectivity of the acting subjects: “The political process of subjectivation ... continually *creates* newcomers” (Rancière 2010: 59 emphasis added).
13. Agamben’s theorizations gesture towards a “community without subjects” in which humans are to succeed “in making of the proper being-thus not an identity and an individual property but a singularity without identity, a common and absolutely exposed singularity” (1993:65).



14. Hardt and Negri prefer the term “singularity” instead of the term “identity”. For them, singularity is defined by and oriented towards multiplicity and is “always engaged in a process of becoming different” (Hardt and Negri 2009: 338-339). Hardt and Negri also share with Agamben an understanding of “co-belonging” which departs from the dominant understanding of community as identity (see also Stavrides 2011: 125).
15. These practices are recapturing the “movement of doing”, to use Holloway’s vocabulary, and go against the dominant classifications which constrain “dead doing”, “within an identity, within a role or character mask” (Holloway 2002: 63)

## References

- Agamben, G. (1993) *The Coming Community*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Angelis, M. de and Stavrides, S. (2010) Beyond Markets or States: Commoning as Collective Practice (a public interview), *An Architektur*, no 23 (also at <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/view/150>).
- Bhabha, H. 2004 *The Location of Culture*, Oxon:Routledge.
- Carolis, M. de (1996) Toward a Phenomenology of Opportunism, in *Radical Thought in Italy. A Potential Politics*, P. Virno and M. Hardt (eds.), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Castells, M., Fernández-Ardèvol, M., Linchuan Qiu, J., and Sey, A. (2007) *Mobile Communication and Society A Global Perspective*, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Cué, C. (2004) *Pásalo! Los cuatro días de marzo que cambiaron un país*, Barcelona: Península.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2004) *Multitude. War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2009) *Commonwealth*, Cambridge Ma.: Harvard University Press.
- Hénaff, M. and Strong, T.B. (2001) *Public Space and Democracy*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Holloway, J. (2002) *Change the World Without Taking Power*, London: Pluto Press.
- Holloway, J. (2010) *Crack Capitalism*, London: Pluto Press.
- Memos, Chr. (2010) Neoliberalism, Identification Process and the Dialectics of Crisis, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 34.1
- Mentinis, M. (2009) Peace, Legality, Democracy, *Radical Philosophy* 154.
- Rancière, J. (2010) *Dissensus. On Politics and Aesthetics*, London: Continuum.
- Roggero, G. (2010) Five Theses on the Common, *Rethinking Marxism*, 22:3, 357-373.
- Sotiris, P. (2009) Rebellion of Greek Youth, *Radical Philosophy* 154.
- Stavrides, S. (2010) The December 2008 Youth Uprising in Athens: Spatial Justice in an Emergent “City Of Thresholds”, *Spatial Justice* Vol. 2 available at: [http://www.jssj.org/archives/02/media/public\\_space\\_vo2.pdf](http://www.jssj.org/archives/02/media/public_space_vo2.pdf)
- Stavrides, S. (2011) *Towards the City of Thresholds*, Trento: Professionaldreamers.



Virno, P. (1996) *Virtuosity and Revolution: The Political Theory of Exodus*, in *Radical Thought in Italy. A Potential Politics*, P. Virno and M. Hardt (eds.), Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Virno, P. (2004) *A Grammar of the Multitude*, Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Zibechi, R. (2007) *Autonomías y emancipaciones: América Latina en movimiento*, Lima: Programa Democracia y Transformación Global and Fondo Editorial de la Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Unidad de Post Grado, UNMSM.

Zibechi, R. (2010) *Dispersing Power. Social Movements as Anti-State Forces*, Oakland: AK Press.