

Assembling Bodies in New Ecologies of Existence

The Real Democracy Experience as Politics
Beyond Representation

VASSILIS S. TSIANOS, MARGARITA TSOMOU

The emergence of modern political sovereignty is founded not on a subjugated, working, tormented, reproductive, or disciplined body but on a stolen body (cf. Papadopoulos/Tsianos 2007). The establishment of sovereignty through the punishment, control, productivity, and disciplinization of the body is a recurrent theme of classic political and social theory: Hobbes's genesis of Leviathan, Marx's primary accumulation, Polanyi's great transformation, Foucault's great confinement. These are the stories told from the perspective of dominant power: how power is inscribed onto the body, how the order of power absorbs the body and renders it fertile, creative, manageable, profitable and governable. In *The Life of Romulus*, Plutarch tells the story in a different way. The myth and birth of Roman power starts with the abduction of the Sabine women. By means of subterfuge, Romulus kidnapped the women of the Sabine tribe so that the future growth of Rome's population could be assured. In its very first moment, the myth of modern political sovereignty is founded not on the issue of the productive transformation of the body under its power but on the theft of bodies. The life of power is a primordial result not of a capacity to transform the body into an available thing but of its disposition over life. The life of power is parasitic. It devours something it never owns. The stolen bodies are never completely absorbed into the order of power. The magic formula of social transformation that we attempt to grapple with is that the social changes not when people

resist, respond or react, but when they craft new situations, new worlds, new ecologies of existence. Resistance is only one of the things that sparks people's creative action – think of fantasy, melancholy, desire, boredom etc. Moreover, acting sometimes produces a surplus which does not just respond to oppression but creates a new occasion, an excess that is not reducible to what has existed before. The relation between social movements and power that played out in the 20th century can be depicted as an aleatoric succession of encounters. In the case of the relation of capital and labor, for example, we can see that in every one of these encounters labor attempted to escape its own conditions of existence and exploitation, and this escape kept transforming the tissue of everyday life itself. It is like a Beckett play – the actors coexist on the stage and each actor's deeds are the precondition for the actions of the other, but they never directly address each other or engage in systematic dialogue, they simply act and change the other through the material effects of their doings. We name this as imperceptible politics: politics that are imperceptible firstly because we are not trained to perceive them as ›proper‹ politics and, secondly, because they create an excess that cannot be addressed in the existing system of political representation. But these politics are so powerful that they change the very conditions of a certain situation and the very conditions of existence of the participating actors. Representations do not exist independently of the material world which they supposedly represent. Thus, politics is not about representations but about constructing the world. This work of construction can be done through concepts, affects, ideas. But these are not just outside matter – they belong to it, they are made of the same stuff. Concepts, affects, ideas are material, just as a cell, a neuron, tissue, water or soil is material. Radical politics are possible only when they are anchored in the flow of experience between people and between people and things (cf. Papadopoulos et al. 2015). In other words, politics is a practice that materializes in the everyday life of people and in their relations with each other and the world. Continuous experience works without being mediated by some form of representation; instead, it works by constantly being in a process of materializing.

POLICE AND POLITICS

Rancière understands politics as a singular accident in the history of forms of ruling power. To him, politics is a break of the police order, seen as the naming and counting of subjects. In his best-known work *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*, he suggests introducing a difference between politics and police, with the latter drifting radically away from its common meaning. Police indicates an array of procedures organized by power and generating consensus, which, according to Rancière, is

an order of bodies that defines the allocation of ways of doing, ways of being, and ways of saying, and sees that those bodies are assigned by name to a particular place and task; it is an order of the visible and the sayable that sees that a particular activity is visible and another is not, that this speech is understood as discourse and another as noise (Rancière 1999: 21).

To the counting of the police, i.e. the distinct identification as subordinate subjects by the sovereign power, Rancière opposes counting the share of the shareless through a conflictual foundation act of equality:

What I am trying to say is that it is democracy, understood as the power of the people, as the rule of those who neither have any special claim to nor any specific aptitude for its exercise, what turns politics conceivable as such. When power finds its way back to the hands of the most skilled, the strongest and the richest, there is no more politics. [...] To my understanding, democracy requires equality, vis-à-vis which even an oligarchic form of government as ours needs to justify itself to a larger or lesser extent. Yes, democracy does have a critical function: it is the wedge of equality, being objectively and subjectively inside the ruling body and preventing politics from merely becoming police. (Rancière 2011: 79)

This egalitarian *kairos* (a Greek word meaning the opportune or supreme moment) of political difference created from the tension between politics and police, between real democracy and authoritarian representation, establishes an urgent challenge for both representative democracy and its subjacent sovereignty. Sovereignty is the matrix of power able to render the territory, the population, and political representation governable. However, sovereignty is not in a position to integrate all spaces and possibilities of bodies into a new

post-national system of social rights. The social spaces of such post-liberal souverainism become unrepresentable, which has been made clear by the mass protests in Egypt and Tunisia, the Spanish 15-M movement in Puerta del Sol, the Greek summer of Syntagma Square, mass demonstrations in Tel Aviv, and the global coverage of the Occupy Wall Street movement in the US.

Here, the ideas and concepts of anti-austerity materialized themselves into relational processes of commoning, into flows of affects, into bodies enduring together, into vis-à-vis democracies creating shifts in the ›ways of doing‹ or the ›ways of being‹. One could say that these assemblies of the many with their democratic practices enacted by bodies in all their vulnerability were involved in confronting power by transforming representational partitions of the visible and the sayable into ›politics‹.

THE REAL DEMOCRACY SQUARES

Daily assemblies and collective self-care as seen in the practices of common dwelling and eating are variations of a bodily, affective, reproductive and prefigurative politics that not only places demands upon the delegitimized representative power but also seeks to enact the intended goals in practice. Square occupiers practice and even embody precisely what they are pointing at: unrest with political representation translates into a variety of experiments of collective voting processes and community self-organization. This practical dimension of representational criticism has led commentators all over the world to focus their analyses on the performativity of the protest – provided that performative acts are defined as not only representing a situation in the world (i.e. representing symbolic semantic systems with a referential relationship) but rather executing it. As German theatre scholar Erika Fischer-Lichte suggests in her book *Performativität: Eine Einführung*: »The concept of performativity describes certain symbolic actions that neither express nor represent anything preconceived but bring forward the reality they refer to.« (Fischer-Lichte 2013: 44)¹

Hence, it is reasonable to think of the reality delivered by the democratic movements in recent years as a set of activities, gestures, affects, relations,

1 Translation by the authors.

experiences, dances, formations, and articulations of the body and performative protocols. Thus, political action can be described with the aid of tools and concepts like presence and copresence, enactment, theatricality and performativity, experience, embodiment or cultural rituals/performances (cf. Singer 1959). According to Michel Foucault, the body is the paradigmatic site of the signature of sovereignty (2006: 233). The body does not relate to power as an external feature. This also applies to the current crisis of neoliberal governmentality and its modes of subjectification. Instead of satisfying a need for normative self-optimization, that is, connecting with others around normatively accepted experiences, a new space for experience in connecting to and gathering with others was created in the context of crisis and in the squares. This democracy *in actu* of gathered bodies strives to rethink and reconstitute sovereignty *in vivo* through its performances.

With Rancière, we can talk of the aesthetic character of protest in the moment when the order of distributing the sensible goes off the rails. In this case, going off the rails is to be understood as the visualization of a narrative track pointing back to the early history of political theatre: the *choros* as the protest of many. Protest is able to enhance the potential of the affected body by means of the aesthetic. The assemblies on the squares became a sort of political theatre, an *in actu*, that rendered the bodily protest readable, micropolitical, and manifold, a sort of anti-grammar of sovereignty: become minoritarian, become slower, become many. And it is this play of political theatre where we can be the dancing audience of an affective architecture and of the language of the commons.

BLOCKADE AND METROPOLITAN PANIC

Blockade and panic are the frightening potential of such assemblies *in actu*. Blockade takes place when the urban space, the public space of its inhabitants, turns against itself, when the movements that keep it bustling (street traffic, people rushing from place to place, the speed of vehicles) and the connections that keep it alive (daily rhythms, labor division, communications) are blocked to mobilize the space and the body as a means for assembly in action. Assembly and blockade are not the atomized (exhausted, self-employed) and administered (through interest groups or local parlia-

ments) poles of urban society. Metropolitan blockade does not mean dissecting and cutting off space but rather reproducing it, knitting together different parts of the city, creating layers of calm and action. The city becomes an area outside representative political power and oligarchic democracy. Metropolitan blockades are cracks in established politics, allowing the future to enter. ›The system is approaching its end: Let's download the future here and now.‹ It is with this image that protesters often characterize the spirit of the assemblies in Athens, Madrid, Tripoli, Tel Aviv, or Istanbul. When urban space revolves against itself, it generates a monster, as seen from the perspective of the established rule. Yet in the eyes of those who do not share a given order of political representation, who instead are blocking this order with their assemblies, this enables true democracy.

Most Athenian real democracy protagonists joined the square occupation and the assemblies in the evening, after work, and came from the unorganized world of the precarious. Their political attitude has very little to do with the political realism of those who regard themselves as professional organizations in the political field (be they governmental bodies or NGOs) and who are reproaching the Outraged (English translation for the *Indignados*, as they called themselves in the square occupation in Puerta Del Sol in Madrid, or the Greek *Aganaktismenoi* on Athens' Syntagma Square) for their alleged lack of sustainable political organization and institutionalization. However, the latter, rather than producing a discourse of political disenchantment, express real democratic infra-politics, that is, an assembly infrastructure addressed against the tyranny of the rationality of neoliberal crisis management. In the context of the Arab Spring, sociologist Asef Bayat talks of the spectacular rise of the ›social non-movements‹, which claim the streets and the whole metropolitan space (Bayat 2013). With this term he defines collective actions of non-collective actors. The difference between such social non-movements and the daily resistance of the subordinates is decisive and points at the most important function of the urban commons in the moral economics of the precarious and poor: »For the struggle and progress of those acting is not at the cost of other poor or at their own cost (as occurs with survival strategies), but at that of the state, the rich and powerful« (ibid: 74), that is, the metropolitan elites and their urban privileges. In *Life as Politics: How Ordinary People Change the Middle East*, Bayat describes this political form of the urban poor as the art of presence:

the courage and creativity to assert collective will in spite of all odds, to circumvent constraints, using what is available and discovering new spaces within which to make oneself heard, seen, felt, and realized. The art of presence is the fundamental moment in the life of non-movements, in life *as* politics. (ibid: 83)

Significantly, some years earlier, Saskia Sassen used the idea of presence to envisage the politics of the undocumented and underprivileged in global cities. Being *present* for each other in the urban space creates the possibility of street politics:

It is the fact of such presence, and not so much power *per se*, that creates operational and rhetoric open spaces. Such an interpretation strives for differentiating between powerlessness and invisibility/impotence, hence underpinning the complexity of powerlessness. (Sassen 2006: 317)

GESTURES, BODIES, AND CULTURAL PERFORMANCES AT SYNTAGMA SQUARE, 2011

Given our attitude regarding the notion of politics and its actualization on the squares, we would like to take a closer look at the gestures, performative protocols and affective body practices of real democracy.

The first thing that catches one's eye is that the body movements developed by the crowd of the Outraged are different from the usual gestures of protest, such as clenched fists or human chains. Instead, their repertoire is composed of moving hand palms and popular gestures of insult, of circular assemblies, where sign language is used and round dances on the square as well as the daily bodily articulations of the cohabitation of bodies, such as sleeping, eating, cleaning, etc. Across the globe, square occupiers were heterogeneous crowds trying to move beyond politically organized, registered fields, thus becoming hard to identify and represent, except as a crowd of many individuals. They developed new forms of community that were not based on a previously common language or a similar origin. Hence, they had to distance themselves from the old protest rituals, including their symbolic reference of political identification, as a multitude of the different and agree on new physical gestures. Such gestures allow the inclusion of anybody, no matter their social or political context. Given the lack of a previous unitary

(political) identity, the crowd has developed this new willful performativity, which is operationally bound to physical presence, body movement and common affection, to embrace all attendants. In this respect, the above-mentioned body practices have to be thought of as ›cultural performances‹, to put it in the words of anthropologist Milton Singer. Singer used this term to describe »particular instances of cultural organization, e.g. weddings, temple festivals, recitations, plays, dances, musical concerts« (Singer 1959: XII-XIII), by which a culture creates and represents its own self-understanding and self-image. Social roles, cohesion, intimacy, solidarity, and integration are staged in rituals and performative acts that represent and display the shared symbolic and practical knowledge, presenting and reproducing it as social order. Understanding the practices of the Outraged as ›cultural performances‹ means taking them seriously as social and hence political processes that constitute both meaning and community. The cultural performance of the present *Aganaktismenoi* produced a »performatively generated, episodic, physical communality« (ibid: XIII), as the one also created, for instance, in festivals, parades, or football stadiums, that was able to work as a means of inclusion. The movements they had generated and that produced this inclusion were based on popular culture and Greek daily life, for example moving hands, circular assemblies, the insulting *moutza* gestures, or traditional round dances amidst a cloud of tear gas.

BODY FORMATION OF DEMOCRACY

In Western tradition, the circle of assembled bodies stands for the choreographic picture we relate to the idea of ancient democracy: all free citizens of a city – the so-called *demos* – come together on a square to discuss and decide on their matters. Within this formation, a genuinely political space is created corresponding to the model of the *polis*, as described by Hannah Arendt in her book *The Human Condition* (1958), as a setting between people speaking freely with each other, thus creating public space. Political action needs this space where people appear before each other in order to organize themselves, speak to each other and act. While Arendt can conceive of this space in its abstract form at any place where language occurs, Judith Butler points out in her 2011 text on square occupations (›Bodies in Alliance and the Politics of the Street‹) the need of physical presence to split public space,

in this case as a semicircle arranged amphitheatrically around the speaker's stage acting as a human microphone (Butler 2011). Even if the square itself is rectangular, the bodies physically recreate the architectures of parliaments or ancient theatres, and voting is also performed physically. The Outraged claim the identity of the citizen in the *demos*, who decides directly on matters of the *polis* by raising hands. As »agents of creating meaning« (Foster 1986: 78) for an articulate matter, as dance historian Susan Foster puts it, the bodies in circular assemblies refer to the well-known form of democratic discussion of the Greek *polis* in the *agora* and articulate the occupiers' political strife for real or direct democracy beyond the rationale of representation. Thus, they enact a cultural performance, an archaic ritual of grassroots democratic practice.

DIRECT DEMOCRACY AS THE PRESENCE OF BODIES

Based on the Spanish Outraged movement, Athenians operated with the slogan »real democracy now!« or, alternatively, and by no means distinct in its definition, »direct democracy now!« Like the Spaniards before, the Greeks expressed their unrest with present-day democracies and their lack of citizen participation, tying up with current criticism of representative democracy and buzzwords such as »post-democracy« or »representation crisis«. Isabell Lorey interprets these aspects as putting into practice the criticism of representative organizations by the Outraged, quoting Rousseau's famous elaborations on the »social contract« that considered the physical presence of the whole citizenship as the basis of democratic sovereignty as a criticism of representative democracy: »the sovereign [can] only act when the people is assembled [...]« (Rousseau 2013: 100). »The sovereign [in this case, the people] [...] cannot be represented« (ibid: 106). In the assembly practice of the *agora* on the squares, Lorey sees a practical implementation of the opposite of representative democracy, which states that it represents the non-present. Lorey talks of »present-ative« instead of representative democracy, which is already expressed in the slogan »real democracy now!« What is »real« regarding this democratic practice is not that it is the only form of true democracy, but, as the interjection »now!« indicates, it is a form of democracy taking place right now, in this moment (Lorey 2012: 43). A practice that is not already laid out but is rather executed *in actu* and hence physically enacted. The community

of the *demos* sitting in a circle thus articulates its criticism of representative democracy performatively and physically.

BODIES IN CONFLICT

The round dances on Syntagma Square have a double: they were created in a situation of conflict with the police, and at the same time they were not meant as confrontation but rather as an end in itself to experience common joy. As a means of resistance to the operation of the police that aimed to clear the square from protesters, the Outraged started to dance traditional Greek circular dances together. While the air was filled with teargas that burned eyes and throat, people spontaneously took themselves by the hands and performed popular dancing steps that are known to everyone in Greece, synchronizing to the traditional partisan songs that were played through the loudspeakers of the assembly of the square. And the dance became more decisive and stronger, louder and the more intense the more teargas was thrown at them. The dancers seemed drunken but also pleased by this freaky setting that brought together crying and laughing, apocalyptic repression and joyful feast.

To Oliver Marchart, the two elements of conflict and acting for the common joy are hallmarks of dancing practices in protest settings. He considers dancing as potentially complementary to the revolutionary process, a non-utilitarian moment representing the necessarily excessive in revolution, as a replacement for terror and violence (Marchart 2013). On Syntagma Square, fun, joy, and virtuosity in movement were opposed to danger, fear, violence, and repression, yet much less strategically than what we know from declared dancing protest groups such as Rebel Clown Army or Pink Block. Different from dance used as a strategy for a planned confrontation with the police, round dances are rather part of some self-supply, a self-referential ritual of resilience of bodies in their vulnerability: jumping up and down in circles could offer a distraction from the teargas and set free unimagined energies, like in a trance.

ROUND DANCE

The circular movement serves in turn as self-assurance of the common resistance and as a mutual representation of solidarity. The Syntagma Square round dances are not a strategy used instrumentally (as artistic practices are used in demonstrations to articulate certain messages more »creatively«), but stem from the political homelessness of the Outraged, who had to invent new protest forms and performances. The form is borrowed from traditional popular culture, a social dance where everybody can join in, and through which the heterogeneous singularities can become a commonality in action, a commonality in dancing.

Amidst the tear gas, the Outraged became a dancing community who, faced with confrontation with the police, chose to perform a popular folklore dance not as a conflict but rather a strategy of common resistance. Addressing the politicians – as the ›third people‹ – was less relevant than constituting the collective self by arranging the bodies looking towards the center of the circle and hence facing each other. The joining of hands is definitely the modest yet complex message of these dancing bodies.

DIFFUSION OF SELF-CONSTITUTION IN DAILY LIFE

To many commentators, not only conservative ones, the violent dissolutions of the camps of the many in Athens and Madrid meant the end of the short spring of real democracy movements. In fact, many activists fell into a post-traumatic mood. The loss of Puerta del Sol and Syntagma Square brought about a loss of feeling at home amongst the many in metropolitan space. Yet, this melancholy of the many quickly turned into the creation of decentralized forms of self-constitution, replicating the experiences of the many in solidarity-based economies and welfare infrastructures in Greece, such as social kitchens, social clinics, for-free supermarkets, open music or language schools, time-banks, new currencies and non-monetary exchange networks, new collectives for avoiding evictions like the PAH network in Spain, the creation of municipal electorate platforms like *Barcelona en Comú* and new infra-policies taking the protest character of the many from the assemblies to the vast terrain of new general social hegemonies of solidarity of the vulnerable bodies in everyday life.

It was these social mobilizations and practices that created a climate in which a once marginal political force like the radical left coalition Syriza could become a true electoral alternative. At the same time, the election of Syriza did not stand for a return to naïve trust in representation. Syriza was elected thanks to the active many, who are much more than just ›voters‹ and have taken those representatives to power, who promised the potential of articulating before parliament the post-representative practices that have become hegemonic in society. The initiatives of self-constitution through self-organization are further developments of the politics of the squares and show that the election of a left government might be less progressive and transformative concerning the decolonialization of body and affect that can only occur through self-emancipation. The example of Embros Theatre might give some insights into the potential of these pre-figurative or performative politics for transforming life, but also theatre and art.

EXAMPLE EMBROS: POST-REPRESENTATIVE THEATRE

The EMBROS Theatre in Athens stands paradigmatically for the metamorphoses of the criticism of representation by the many into everyday performative politics of solidarity. The public theatre with the significant name of EMBROS – which translates as ›Forward‹ – was closed in 2007, remaining empty ever since. In November 2011, it was occupied by the activist collective Mavilli, comprised of well-known theatre makers, and reopened with a festival lasting several days. This opening festival was more than just a successful event: without any funding and organized within the shortest time, the whole of the Athens performance scene – from top choreographers to experimental newcomers – took part artistically or discursively in the ›reopening‹ (as the occupation was called). The theatre hall became the assembly space of the professionals who appeared as equals as a sign of self-organization, also because activities in the theatre were not restricted to performing or watching but also included common tasks like cleaning, serving at the bar, cooking, and maintenance. Theatrical acts of representation were complemented with moments of (re)production and reciprocal participation (cf. Malzacher 2015).

The EMBROS Theatre was cleared by the police and reoccupied by activists several times. Over the last four years, it has been run by renewed collective constellations, the only decision-making body remaining the weekly assembly, which is open to everybody. Many different things take place at EMBROS: discussions on immediate political issues, solo events, workshops, rehearsals of major or minor theatre companies, musical evenings, or festivals of different collectives. Such an open program without any clear selection criteria may usually seem random and detrimental to quality. Yet the remarkable and even magical aspect of the EMBROS Theatre is that the setting as a self-organized place of open social articulation creates such a strong framework that it draws its *raison d'être* from itself and remains immune to judgements of taste. EMBROS is more than a theatre; it is a place where public matters are brought forward. The theatre is materialized as a place of assembly, a post-representative *agora*, an open meeting point for the heterogeneous many, for projects of the LGBT community (Queer Festival), for the Athens migrant community, for media makers on strike, or grassroots unions. Everything happening here is of social relevance: when reputable theorists like Giorgio Agamben come to Athens, their appearance at the EMBROS Theatre often makes a bigger impact than the lecture at the representative museum that has invited them. Relevant questions are asked at EMBROS by a community of a discursive *demos* who are really negotiating something and taking each other seriously, without any remuneration or representation. This special feature is created because EMBROS brings together many heterogeneous public opinions and individuals that are not gathering as an audience but as active participants. Theatre is practiced as social intervention and self-organization, and thus, along Rancière's lines, as true politics.

This architecture of the interventionist theatre cannot be re-neutralized by a cultural policy that merely places EMBROS on the payroll of the new left government, making it a new public theatre (it can also not be sponsored because the government cannot spend any resources except from repaying the debt). EMBROS remains a place that, according to post-representative politics, creates new relationships between the autonomous, self-contained social units as decentralized forms of social territories, thus allowing a new relationship with the state – whose character, as was envisioned before the election, would undergo change in post-representative hegemony – precisely through initiatives like EMBROS.

THE SYRIZA-GOVERNMENT AND THE HORIZON OF POST-REPRESENTATION

Like EMBROS, comparable self-organized structures in society professionalized and radicalized themselves over the years, creating tools for the concrete transformation of politics that go beyond the national-international dichotomy. They introduced the possibility to combine and integrate the separated dimensions of politics of representation, participative forms of democracy and autonomous self-determination into a new concept of organizing the productive sphere.

But this potential was not actualized by the agents of political representation. Democracy, even in its most traditional liberal sense, was not extended into the everyday but instead was effectively abolished, since the last bailout in Greece introduced the condition that every law has to be approved by the Troika and thus rendered the legislative sovereignty of the Greek parliament obsolete.

Thus, today, we are left with the politics of the everyday, the ›social-non-movements‹, as the only form of the political that can be considered ›politics‹ in a Rancièrian sense. It is these non-official structures of self-organization that can re-distribute the sensible, understood as redistributing speech acts, power, spaces, names and positions in society. In an unforeseen speed, the political form of representative parliaments degenerated into that of a police that can only think of itself as having the duty to manage the neoliberal status quo.

The SYRIZA-leadership focused on the strategy of dialogical negotiations with the creditors and has considered the potential from below as a mere supporting chorus of the government-project.

After the government had voted for the bailout on August 8, 2015, Tasos Koronakis, back then still the secretary of the party, said in an interview:

as party, parliamentarian group and government we were sedated by the negotiations and did not put all our forces towards a more participatory model of governance, towards an entirely different plan of social activation that would utilize people, skills and possibilities and would have given us power during the negotiations, by achieving victories on the level of the everyday life of the citizens.²

2 <http://news.in.gr/greece/article/?aid=1500017621>, accessed January 26, 2016.

Indeed. We can see today that with this mere statist approach to politics – meaning a politics that thinks it can act as a transformative agent in society by obtaining the rule over the state and the government – could not mobilize enough power to implement alternatives to neoliberal austerity in the European Union.

The words of the former party secretary (in the end, Koronakis left not only his position but also the SYRIZA-party) about the mistakes of the government show the impact of the participative, embodied, affective and performative imaginary of the occupied squares as a leading vision for contemporary politics.

Beyond the dead ends of European solutions for the crisis and the enforcement of austerity programs, there is a need today to take the protagonism of the popular factor seriously. Because it is the radicalized population of the squares and their potential to build common experiences and relational mutualist togetherness that opened new spaces of possibilities and popularized the still valid agenda of real democracy, anti-austerity, solidarity and self-determination. Thus, the post-representational politics of the squares are still the horizon – no matter which government takes power. They define the diachronic criteria with which all the future notions of politics have to keep up. The experiences on the squares created an imaginary that cannot be erased. Their potentialities towards new ecologies of existence are still waiting for their fulfillment, for their materialization in the future - anything less is doomed to failure.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arendt, Hannah (2002): *Vita activa oder vom richtigen Leben*, München.
- Bayat, A. (2013) *Life as Politics: How Ordinary People Change the Middle East*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Butler, Judith (2013): *Dispossession: the Performative in the Political*. Conversations with Athina Athanasiou, Cambridge.
- Butler, Judith (2011): *Bodies in Alliance and the Politics of the Street* (<http://eipcp.net/transversal/1011/butler/en>, accessed February 08, 2016).
- Fischer-Lichte, Erika (2013): *Performativität*, Bielefeld, p. 44.

- Foster, Susan (1986): *Reading Dancing: Bodies and Subjects in Contemporary American Dance*, University Press, London. (<http://news.in.gr/greece/article/?aid=1500017621>, accessed January 26, 2016).
- Foucault, M. (2006) *Utopian Body* In Jones, C. A. (ed.) *Sensorium: Embodied Experience, Technology and Contemporary Art*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Lorey, Isabell (2011): *Non-representationist, Presentist Democracy*. Vortrag für Autonomy Project Symposium, Van Abbemuseum Eindhoven (<http://eipcp.net/transversal/1011/lorey/en>, accessed January 18, 2014).
- Lorey, Isabell (2012): *Demokratie statt Repräsentation: Zur konstituierenden Macht Besetzungsbewegungen*. In: Jens Kastner/Isabell Lorey/Gerald Raunig/ Tom Waibel (eds.): *Occupy! Die aktuellen Kämpfe um die Besetzung des Politischen*, Berlin/Wien, pp. 7-49.
- Malzacher, Florian (2015): *No Organum to Follow: Possibilities of Political Theatre Today*. In Florian Malzacher (ed.): *Not just a Mirror. Looking for the Political Theatre of Today*, Alexander Verlag, Berlin, pp. 16-30.
- Marchart, Oliver (2013): *Dancing Politics. Political Reflections on Choreography, Dance and Protest*. In Gerald Siegmung/Stefan Hülscher (eds.): *Dance, Politics and Co-Immunity*, Zürich, pp. 39-57.
- Papadopoulos, Dimitris/Tsianos, Vassilis S. (2007): *How to do sovereignty without people? The subjectless conditions of postliberal power*, *Boundary 2*, 34, (1), pp. 135-172.
- Papadopoulos, Dimitris/Tsianos, Vassilis S./Tsomou, Margarita (2015): *Athens: Metropolitan Blockade-Real Remocracy*. In: Peter Weibel (ed.): *Global Activism. Art and Conflict in the 21st Century*, a zkm book, Karlsruhe, pp. 225-232.
- Rancière, Jacques (1999): *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*, Minneapolis/London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rancière, Jacques (2011) *Democracies Against democracy*. In Giorgio Agamben et al., *Democracy: In What State?*, New York/Chichester: Columbia University Press.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques (2013): *Vom Gesellschaftsvertrag oder Grundsätze des Staatsvertrags*, Ditzigen.
- Singer, Milton (Hg) (1959): *Traditional India. Structure and Change*, Philadelphia: American Folklore Society.
- Sassen, S. (2006): *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*, Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.



