

Urban Panics and Black Holes

Ambiguities of Deceleration in the Time of Financialization

MARIOS EMMANOULIDIS

Translated by Eva Athyridou

The movement of the squares¹ is now accepted as commonplace: a project of political rediscovery, a recurrence of the political body in public space. The event of the squares is an experimental production machine of politics, an experiment on our selves and on our relations with others. It is the labor of the contingent production of another subjectivity. It became a project »of production of abilities disconnected from the reinforcement of the organized power network« (Foucault 1988: 27). But it is not only the participating bodies that were involved in the squares. The whole social body was energized by it. Moreover, the event of the squares motivated a political chattering, a creative or a boring one, which followed the economic verbalism and the dominant narrative about the sovereign debt as a collective guilt of the first year of the crisis in Greece. All these aspects establish the strategic importance of the movement of the squares and its place as a decisive moment. Even if the event did not last long, even if it suddenly ceased, or simply reappeared to disappear again. Even if this experimental machine had its limits.

1 I thank Eva Athyridou, Dimitris Koros, Meriç Özgünes and Anna Tsouflidou for their contribution to the authorship of this paper.

If we consider the movement of the squares as a decisive moment in the discontinuous lines of resistance or lines of flight, it is useful to examine it in the context of financialization as the new form of capitalism².

FINANCIALIZATION AND THE CRISIS OF NEOLIBERAL GOVERNMENTALITY

a. The Perpetual Character of the Crisis and the Dangerous *Parasites*

The event of the squares is undoubtedly linked with the crisis, or, more specifically, with the management of the crisis. And here we are talking about a financial crisis which rapidly turned into a sovereign debt crisis. We would probably not understand much if we considered this crisis a circumstantial disorder, which would result in us returning to normality and to our old dilemmas (neoliberalism vs Keynesianism³). The unending crisis is not an accident. Neither is it a deviation from a normality into which we will return when states and supranational organizations will impose the necessary arrangements on financial capital and introduce a new equilibrium between real and financial capital. It would be more accurate to talk neither about the crisis itself, nor about a crisis-regime, but, more specifically, about a perpetual crisis. And I mean a status of perpetual crisis which is linked to the political economy of danger, with financialization as a modern form of capitalism. I think that it is useful to examine the squares-experience, its temporality, its critical attitude, in the frame of a constant crisis as the product of financialization⁴.

The financial crisis of 2008 rapidly turned into a sovereign debt crisis. However, the crisis was not the revelation of the functional inability of the Greek state (and actually not only of the Greek state), even though it was considered proof of a corrupt and impotent state. On the contrary, it has made

2 Some of the most important books on financialization are: Bryan/Rafferty 2006; Sotiropoulos/Milios/Lapatsioras 2013; LiPuma/Lee 2004.

3 »For Foucault's crisis of governmentality, Keynesianism was the problem; for us, it appears to be part of the solution«. (Dean 2010: 265)

4 For the perpetual crisis of finance cf. Bryan 2012: 171-6.

evident a systemic crisis and the state's fundamental exhaustion with regard to knowing and governing the economy. If good governance is linked with the governance of the economy (according to Quesnay⁵), the economy had become invisible to the state even before the crisis occurred. And this issue no longer is a tug of war between minimum and maximum governance, nor one between welfare and neoliberal state. Perhaps it is related to something else, something that the term ›neoliberalism‹ is not broad enough to describe. It is probably a condition where the state is incapable of understanding and controlling capital flows, as capital ignores the state, it slides over it, it crosses it, it penetrates it. Capital (or a crucial modality of it) is now moving in a way that disregards state security (as it escapes it)⁶. Neither consensus nor legitimacy are prerequisites for capital to move, to be produced and to accumulate. If so, to the extent that capital is moving in such a way, economy is not a space where the state can guarantee the well-being of the population. The sovereign debt crisis revealed the constituent crisis of the confidence in the state in the time of financialization: The states function as enterprises with a specific risk profile and their policies are under the constant evaluation of the markets.

Consequently, the administration itself is getting dismantled as the guarantor, the secure field of the population's life. However, »the measure of political efficiency becomes a naked political possibility and effectiveness, of injecting economy within the population's life, through bypassing the injection of the economy to politics« (Foucault 2007: 95)⁷. That is the paradox of the violent and convulsive process of privatizing society with the use of techniques that refer to a sovereign modality of power, rather than to a neoliberal governmentality. We could say, though, that in this era of an infinite

5 »Quesnay speaks of good government as ›economic government‹« (Foucault 2007: 95).

6 It is not »the winding paths of capital« (Arrighi 1994: 12), but the fractals of its nomadic movements.

7 »The essential issue of government will be the introduction of economy into political practice« (Foucault 2007: 95), although, according to Foucault, for liberalism, »economic science never claimed that it had to be the line of conduct, the complete programming of what could be called governmental rationality« (Foucault 2008: 286).

acceleration of capital, the capacity of the market as a mechanism of understanding things is entering a crisis, at the same time that it remains the only regime for the production of truth. In this context of limited visibility, and of a constant crisis of trust and comprehension, the only space to which state and capital are anchored is the life, the labor, and the property of the population.⁸ And that because it is in those elements of life and of labor that capital's risk gets apportioned and shared. »The political government of the population in this era of financialization relies on the liquidation of its life and of its labor. It relies on the conversion of the social body into a wasteland of open, decoded flows into a permanent reconstruction of the living standards of the population. And, subsequently, on its exclusion from the strategic constitutive processes of democracy« (Emmanouilidis 2013: 138).

Yet this refuge of capital and state in the population is a shelter in the most dangerous and precarious position. The danger presented by the poor, the parasites of the financial apparatus, was revealed by the crisis of subprime loans.⁹ The poor, these insolvent debtors, were the parasites who shook the global financial system. An understanding of this doubtful position, the position of the poor as the most puissant and the weakest spot, is essential to understanding the course of scattered lines of resistance¹⁰.

b. The Crisis of Neoliberal Governmentality

I refer to the result of the tension between financialization and neoliberal governmentality as a crisis of neoliberal governmentality: The fast and pre-

8 »Finance creates the social world in the image of capital, and the social world becomes the *anchor* of finance« (Bryan 2012: 176) [my emphasis].

9 »The parasite invents something new. Since he does not eat like everyone else, he builds a new logic. He crosses the exchange, makes it into a diagonal. [...] He wants to give his voice for matter, (hot) air for solid, superstructure for infrastructure. People laugh, the parasite is expelled, he is made fun of, he is beaten, he cheats us; but he invents anew. This novelty must be analyzed. [...] He makes the order of things as well as the states of things – solid and gas – into diagonals« (Serres 1982: 35-39).

10 For an analysis of politics of exodus and lines of resistance cf. Papadopoulos/Stephenson/Tsianos 2008.

carious time of financial markets also became the time of the state, an anxious-debtor state subsumed (and regulated) to the constant evaluation of the markets. The result was the constant feeling of a definite crisis – the end of the state – which was expressed as an inability or indifference of the state to positively regulate the population’s life.

More specifically, the crisis of neoliberal governmentality was expressed as a crisis of security and freedom – pillars of neoliberalism.

(a) In Greece, the revolt of December 2008 brought about a crisis of security before the economic crisis unfolded. It was the moment when the precariat, the poor, the poorest of the poor, immigrants, school students, wildly invaded the central political scene. In this entrance of the precariat, of the immigrants and not only them, in the central political scene, or, in other words, the diaspora of their visibility throughout the social space, state power has reacted by employing practices of exclusion and discipline. It dissected the urban space, manufacturing a wide siege zone bordered around three university institutions, and with the »avaton of Exarcheia¹¹ at the epicenter, it organized its policing for the purification of the space. Neoliberals then were asking for martial law to be imposed. The intensification of the political protection in terms of state sovereignty came along with an escalation of the far-right fascist and racist violence: The period after December 2008 was the first threshold of Golden Dawn’s appearance.¹² In that regard, December 2008 was a crack, a destituent force, from which a crisis in the constitutive procedures of neoliberal subjectivity unfolded. As if it were the management of a crisis even before the crisis itself.

(b) The financial crisis put another basic element of neoliberal governmentality into crisis: the subjects’ freedom of action and movement¹³, a freedom of the neoliberal subject that constituted the coordinated feeling of the infinite possibility for the risk-taking of differential credit actions with a feeling of an infinite possibility for the unfolding of the self. The crisis, as a crisis of

11 »Avaton« is the Greek word for the autonomous monastic state of Mount Athos, the entrance to which is prohibited to women. Exarcheia is a region in the center of Athens characterized by vivid political activities in which the presence of the state is limited and questioned by leftist and anarchist groups.

12 Golden Dawn is the Greek neo-Nazi party.

13 Free to choose-obliged to be free to choose, cf. Rose 1999:87.

the subjects' pervasive feeling of finitude and shrinkage, or the impossibility of undertaking such actions, was also a crisis of the field of the subjects' practices of freedom.¹⁴

METROPOLITAN BLOCKADE: THE TACTICS OF DECELERATION AND THE TEASE OF NON-GOVERMENTALITY

And then, when the consensus produced by this era of financialization (until 2008) came to an end, the dangerousness of the population was revealed when they suddenly sat in the squares. Because this population refused impoverishment, the liquidation of its life, its political exclusion by a state in a crisis of material and moral solvency. The crisis of neoliberal governmentality has revealed and produced a political exhaustion of representative and accountable government.

The population has refused the degradation of its life and got together in the squares. It attempted to reinvent direct democratic procedures, the so-called ›real democracy‹, it released its body from the fear of violence, it spoke words of resistance and disobedience, words of betrayed and de-subjugated subjects. »Metropolitan assemblies de-block and re-claim the subjectivity of the panic-stricken, precarious, exhausted inhabitants of the city.« (Tsianos forthcoming)

They gathered, they settled, they did not move linearly, unlike in December 2008, as an exceptional, dangerous ›inside‹ of an ›outside‹: The people participating in the processes of the square movement attempted to establish the inside space of democracy and to replace the Parliament, the representative processes of a decaying, immoral ›outside‹. »*Blockade* and *panic* are what makes these acting assemblies look so threatening. [...] Metropolitan blockade means multiplying space rather than segmenting and cutting it off,

14 Michel Serres defines crisis as the point of appearance of the finitude of nature; as the appearance of a barrage to the world, the knowledge that »we are infinite as far as the logic, the research, the desire and the will is concerned, and of that nature beyond us is finite« (Serres 2011: 47).

connecting the various parts of the city, creating layers of quietness and action. The city becomes a zone outside representative political power and oligarchic democracy« (ibid).

The event of the squares was in some way the activation of moral and political art. And it was about the art of those who had the preoccupation and the will »not to be governed *like that*, by that, in the name of those principles, with such and such an objective in mind and by means of such procedures, not like that, not for that, not by them« (Foucault 2007b: 44).

What is important about the movement of the squares is the appearance of the body in public space, in this space of political gathering. The emergence of the body in public territory. Political split is primarily taking place on the ground, says Jean-Luc Nancy (2013: 7). And it is a land without labor and pleasure, even if the squares movement was a feast. The squares were a place for citizens to get together, ensured that they were on the right side, a side with multiple features. The event of the squares was the new territorial politics enacted through physical presence. And that new politics was at the same moment a project of deceleration, as if it were a counterweight against the infinite speed of financial flows. If we assume that the encounter in the squares was initiated by networks rather than the expectable groups and collectives, its destination was the encounter of bodies in one territory, an encounter in which, paradoxically, the utmost speed of networks became almost stationary. An encounter of bodies beyond the pervasive trading field, beyond the fenced field of trade unions and political parties.¹⁵ Deceleration, though, is not immobility, it is not the absence of speed. »Moving strongly but not too quickly«, is the title of the second part of Mahler's 1st Symphony¹⁶. It means that I slow down to see, to hear, to get together. If the demonstration moves dynamically to ideally produce an explosive event in a dense time, the time in the squares is slow and continuous: an extended occupation of a central space.

The multitude settled in the center of Athens, on the Syntagma square across from the Parliament, disorganizing the city center's regulatory power. And the space of the city center got smoothed out and became a place where

15 »In the forefront of the mobilizations, new social strata entered, different, or rather beyond the »people of the Left«, the syndicates and the movements« (Milios forthcoming; translation by Eva Athyridou).

16 I thank Eva Athyridou for mentioning this to me.

time stopped being abstract time and became the concrete time of bodies. And then, the bodies became a major minority sitting in a ›smooth‹ central space: a place empty of monetary erosion where money no longer is the strategic power relation¹⁷. Thousands of discourses sprang from this smooth place; but it is not the discourses we are interested in. It was there that non-representative politics was activated for a moment as a strategic relation.

And all these, a certainly bold sparking, were made possible through the slow banality of bodies in squares. »The general intellect was spreading harmlessly in instant communication, at the service of financial desire, entrenched in formalistic research, a schizophrenic body in a potential assemblage with neoliberal governmentality. This general intellect then suddenly washed up in a barbarian, multiple, though complete, body« (Emmanouilidis 2013: 145)¹⁸.

All of a sudden (and in an unexpected way), the possibility of producing a new life appeared as an outcome of this crisis of liberty and the security apparatuses of neoliberalism. »People disidentified themselves from the atomized panicking individual to become an urban monster that devours space« (Papadopoulos/Tsianos/Tsomou 2012: n.p.). Squares have reactivated the force of the art of being many. And it was not only a practice of truth, a parrhesia. It was a practice, an apprenticeship of physical courage. While the demonstration on May 5, 2010 (Marfin Bank, Athens) collapsed

17 »The power which every individual exercises over the activity of others [...] exists in him *as the owner of exchange values, of money*. The individual carries his social power, as well as his bond with society, in his pocket«, (Marx 1989: 109; translation by Eva Athyridou). Money for Marx is a strategic power relation and »money becomes the *real community*«. For Foucault, »we must distinguish the relationships of power as strategic games between liberties – in which some try to control the conduct of others, who in turn try to avoid allowing their conduct to be controlled or try to control the conduct of the others – and the states of domination, which are what we ordinarily call power. [...] The word ›game‹ can lead you astray: when I say ›game‹ I mean a set of rules by which truth is produced. It is not a game in the sense of an amusement; it is a set of procedures that lead to a certain result, which, on the basis of its principles and its rules of procedures, may be considered valid or invalid, winning or losing« (Foucault 1997: 297).

18 Translation by Eva Athyridou.

in face of its dazzling blast of violence, on the other side, the Aganaktismenoi, the Indignados, decided to avoid this violence in the first place. As best as they could, they attempted to better manage state violence. In the gathering of June 28-29, 2011, they were seeking ways of escaping a possible clash. It was a tactic of clashing, leaving and returning to the square.

This tactic of avoidance and of reoccupation at the same moment established the bodies of the squares as visible and permanent, as it was not disappearing in the frontal collision with the State¹⁹. Principally, state violence became visible and delegitimized through this process. Though, after the ›summer vacations‹ of the squares movement and the following attack on the President of the Republic, the movement ended with a big demonstration. It was the revolt of February 12, 2012. This demonstration was a movement of ›absolute refusal‹ (Hatzopoulos/Marmaras/Parsanoglou 2012: n.p.). And on that day, the desire to become radically ungovernable has appeared at once so clear, on that day that was the last day of the revolt in Athens, the ›termination‹ of ›the indignation movement‹, its ›end‹. The revolt of February 12, 2012 in Athens, approached the tease of the absolute refusal of governmentality, and then it withdrew from it (the massive demonstration of the same day in Thessaloniki felt as if it was a lament). And if we can afford to be a bit blasphemous towards the passion of the revolt, of the courage of the body on this day, the tease of this revolt, the limit that it touched, was itself the tease of Foucault's non-governmentality²⁰. Conversions of the squares movement have started from then on; the strategic management of the movement's potential, or its will.

19 ›Armies were like plants, immobile, firm-rooted, nourished through long stems to the head. We might be a vapour, blowing where we listed. Our kingdoms lay in each man's mind, and as we wanted nothing material to live on, so perhaps we offered nothing material to the killing. It seemed that a regular soldier might be helpless without a target. He would own the ground he sat on, and what he could poke his rifle at‹ (Lawrence 1989: 8).

20 ›I do not think that the will not to be governed at all is something that one could consider an originary aspiration. I think that, in fact, the will not to be governed is always the will not to be governed thusly, like that, by these people, at this price. [...] I was not referring to something that would be a fundamental anarchism, that would be like an originary freedom, absolutely and wholeheartedly resistant to any governmentalization. I did not say it, but this does not mean that

3. GOLDEN DAWN AS AN APPARATUS OF CAPTURE²¹

The labor of deceleration (as the temporality of the squares) is ambiguous, though. It has differential lineages and it follows different paths. A deceleration-fixation and a deceleration-escape from neoliberal governmentality. This deceleration sets a limit to the chaos of financialization²². But this limit cannot be the impossible and undesirable return to disciplines of national sovereignty or to the welfare state. This limit is the possibility of discovering our abilities beyond power systems and within the slow time of non-representative democracy.

Right after the event of the squares, another struggle develops and takes form. Maybe it is useful to transpose our subject and to examine this dangerous, paranoid, fascist opinion which claims to be protecting us from the chaotic nomadic movement of capital and the inability of state management²³. An opinion which claims to be able to set a symbolic threshold in deterritorialized capitalism and to cover the gap of governance's lost ability²⁴. Even if this fascist hand cannot produce the future, it claims to be able to manage the present, directly and efficiently in a way that an articulated policy would

I absolutely exclude it [my emphasis]. I think that my presentation stops at this point, because it was already too long« (Foucault 2007: 74-75). As for Foucault's mention of »originary freedom«, Judith Butler remarks, »he offers and withdraws it at once. »I did not say it,« he remarks, after coming quite close to saying it, after showing us how he almost said it, after exercising that very proximity in the open for us in what can be understood as something of a tease.« (Butler 2001: n.p.)

21 For the relation between the post-crisis regime of a perpetual crisis, post-neoliberalism and the Greek Nazi party Golden Dawn cf. Emmanouilidis 2013.

22 »To slow down is to set a limit in chaos to which all speeds are subject« (Deleuze/Guattari 1994: 118).

23 »It is as if the struggle against chaos does not take place without an affinity with the enemy, because another struggle develops and takes on more importance – the struggle against opinion, which claims to protect us from chaos itself« (ibid: 203).

24 »Our Western political system results from the coupling of two heterogenous elements, a politico-juridical rationality and an economic-governmental rationality, a »form of constitution« and a »form of government«. Inconsumerable they may be, but they legitimate and confer mutual consistency on each other« (Agamben 2011: 4).

not. It claims that it is able to cure the crisis of neoliberal governmentality and the state's inability to constitute a field of production, of trust, of providence for its population in the era of financialization. The fascist overcodification is the return of the demand for solid materials, the resorting to the solid (the naked strength of the bodies, the timeless Hellenism, etc.) as a response to the liquidation of life that the process of financialization demands, and not the crisis itself as a deviation from a normality. But this desire, the barrage to solid materials is the deleterious, desperate, suicidal choice of the crisis' victims.

The period after the event of the squares and primarily after the revolt of February 12, 2012 was not just a threshold of creative upheaval in the shape of a multitude invading to SYRIZA (Gavriilidis 2015). It was also a threshold of normalization, which was crossed with the appearance of Golden Dawn's punitive practices and sovereign commands. The strategic function of Golden Dawn became possible due to its political presence: The neo-nazi party was using the squares movement's critique while at the same moment capturing it, transposing it and making a part of that critique disappear. In the meantime, rebellion was invading (or was reterritorialized) in the systemic procedures of Parliament.

In that context, the event of the squares became heterogeneous: Any relation between the movement of the squares and the rising of Golden Dawn since spring 2012 is a strategic relation, i.e. »a possible connection between disparate terms, which remain disparate« (Foucault 2008: 42).²⁵ It is not about an inner connection of two, though, as a part of the squares movement's discourse was drained in Golden Dawn, got lost and reappeared as a discourse of an apparatus different to the one of the »squares«.

The connection between the event of the squares and Golden Dawn is neither a relation of continuity nor of completion. We are not talking about the »upper« part of the Square that became Golden Dawn. Instead, what happened here is a redirection of discourse through circulation, its shift and adaptation, its appropriation and misappropriation. Golden Dawn captured the squares' energy and made it disappear in a »black hole« of racism and

25 »The function of strategic logic is to establish the possible connections between disparate terms which remain disparate. The logic of strategy is the logic of connections between the heterogeneous and not the logic of the homogenization of the contradictory« (Foucault 2008: 42).

fascism.²⁶ »If I were to assign a content to fascism«, Deleuze says, »it would typically be a line of flight that turns deadly« (Deleuze 2011: 219).

If »to govern means to structure the possible field of action of others« (Foucault 1982: 790), i.e. the ability to determine the strategic territory and the disputed objects of action, then it must have been Golden Dawn that since the summer of 2012, and for the subsequent year, was ruling Greek society. Golden Dawn caused the shift of this strategic battlefield. From Syntagma, the space of the square, from a space of potential democratic practices, Golden Dawn shifted the place to impoverished neighborhoods²⁷. Golden Dawn occupied the city. The population's denial of impoverishment and the moral critique of the management of the crisis turned into a contempt towards democracy and a desire (or acceptance) to exterminate poor immigrants²⁸. This shift was the defeat of the revolt in Athens and at the same time the administration of this defeat: a threshold of normalization.

And these shifts, the capture and the annihilation of acts of resistance and lines of flight, snuck into the anti-state sentiment of society, has enabled Golden Dawn's racist war to unleash. And it was the racist war unleashed by Golden Dawn that ensured the required amount of state sovereignty. It was this racist war that managed to impose the normality of the crisis and to establish the new normativity for a population facing a permanent crisis. This

26 A black hole is an outcome of a failed line of flight and functions as an apparatus of capture: »[The machine] may produce an effect of closure, as if the aggregate had fallen into and continues to spin in a kind of black hole. This is what happens under conditions of precocious or extremely sudden deterritorialization, and when specific, interspecific and cosmic paths are blocked. [...] It is important to bring up this ›black hole‹ function again because it can increase our understanding of phenomena of inhibition [...]. Every fascism is defined by a micro-black hole that stands on its own and communicates with others, before resonated in a great generalized central black hole. There is fascism when a war machine is installed in each hole. [...] What makes fascism dangerous is its molecular or micropolitical power for it is a mass movement: a cancerous body rather than a totalitarian organism« (Deleuze/Guattari 2004: 368).

27 And again, after the Golden Dawn pogrom of May 2011, against immigrants.

28 ›...to exterminate the impoverishment through the extermination of the poor immigrants«.

war was not arranged by a sovereign state but it made the state become sovereign²⁹. Because »war is transformative, not instrumental« (Dillon 2014: n.p.).

I do not think that the recourse to the ›deep state‹ and the erosion of the state apparatuses from the far-right are adequate explanations of the dynamics of fascism and its strategic function. There is something more than the stigma of historical fascism that has intruded in, or has infiltrated the state apparatus, which is more superficial than the dark metaphor of the threatening depth that intensifies the so-called existing state problem of Greece today. The dynamics of fascism do not rely on the secret transactions – against a supposed transparency or democratic character of the visible state – or the ideological erosion of the state apparatuses. They consist of the uncharted, infinite financial transactions in the surface of the social body that anemically fund democracy, block the activation of politics as a strategic relation, and produce the possibility of fascization of our times.

What is important in our times is the following definitive and unalterable fact: Something has changed, and that which has changed is also connected, at the same time, with the presence of fascism in our time, the possibility of its dynamics – the process of financialization (and not just financial capital itself), already before the crisis, went along with a rearrangement of the modality of power, an intensification of the sovereignty of an impotent political authority, a fascization of the systems of power, but also with the possibility of the fascization of the multitude as a desperate reaction to the inability of escape.

29 »The harsh measures towards irregular immigration and immigrants and the discourse on sub-humans and intruders, the threats to the existence of our society, could for some people be explained as signs of an authoritarian, barbaric, exceptional state, but the fact is that an exceptional and barbaric state is a strong, proud and confident state that stands on its feet and imposes the government of the social body through terror. However, the state now is a frightened formation which cannot govern with security, it cannot even deceit, as it cannot plan, therefore its oppressive statements are violent signs of distress« (Koros 2014: n.p.).

INCONSISTENCY

The event of the squares in Greece has appeared suddenly, just a year after the end of the powerful strikes and protests organized by trade unions. It lasted for one or two months and the constituent process which started from the squares remained incomplete. No matter how it ended, the squares succeed in creating a »smooth place« in the center of the city and to motivate a critical political project (a »just-in-time« project)³⁰.

So on the one hand we have the strategic battle of the depreciation of labor power, and the liquidation of all elements of life, and on the other hand the slow, underground or sudden, movements of the many trying to escape annihilation or searching for a unifying point from which to resist.

And there is a last issue concerning the transmutations of the critical practices. There is a fine, subtle line, between the square event and the growing interest for the commons and practices of collaboration. But the collaborative practices might fund another movement as well: the funding of the capital valorization through the activation of a small, local, moral entrepreneurship. This process leads to the reassembly of neoliberal subjectivity.

This temporal discontinuity of resistance, its unexpected acts, the vulnerability of its potential, and recently, its reterritorialization in parliamentary procedures, puts the critical project in a permanent starting position, or makes it appear as if it is in a permanent starting position. As a result of this, the practice of critique remains constant while at the same moment it is constantly in a position of emergence. A position, which we can conceive in contiguity to financial capital (as a »body without organs«), and which is related to the production of a post-crisis, fluctuated subject, in a position of impotent prudence and prediction of its life events. It is as if we are still in the same blind place which made Deleuze wonder in 1977 (in his last, unanswered letter to Foucault): »how to maintain the rights of a microanalysis (diffusion, heterogeneity, piecemeal character) and yet find a sort of unifying

30 »Overall, the occupy protest movement is not linear, synchronic, nor evolutionary. Its failure to produce a new permanent structure for real democracy or for organising future mobilisations or a new »species« of revolutionary subjects is also its strength. The occupy protest movement is, strictly speaking, not a movement at all, but a block of strange and unfamiliar becomings emerging in different locales« (Kambouri/Hatzopoulos 2011: n.p.).

principle which is not of the State, party, totalization, or representation type?» (Deleuze 1997: n.p.).

But we probably have to avoid this unanswered questioning of a unifying principle. Maybe it is now time to accept the ambiguous power of the obscure position where the body, as a victim of financial capital, is a body of strength where capital anchors itself. Because this obscure position is the power and the weakness of the poor. Maybe now it is time to accept that the critical attitude of our time demands or presupposes inconsistency, the rupture with reasons and outcomes of action.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agamben, Giorgio (2011): *Introductory Note on the Concept of Democracy*, translated by Walter McCuaig. In: Giorgio Agamben/ Alain Badiou et al. (eds.): *Democracy in What State?* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Arrighi, Giovanni (1994): *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Time*, London: Verso.
- Bryan, Dick/Rafferty, Michael (2006): *Capitalism with Derivatives: A Political Economy of Financial Derivatives*, London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Bryan, Dick (2012): *Going forward: The Perpetual Crisis of Finance*. In: *Culture and Organization* 18/2, pp. 171-176.
- Butler, Judith (2001): *What is Critique? An Essay on Foucault's Virtue* (<http://eicpc.net/transversal/0806/butler/en>, accessed January 20, 2016)
- Dean, Mitchell (2010): *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*, London: Sage.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1997): *Desire and Pleasure*, translated by Melissa McMahon (<http://www.artdes.monash.edu.au/globe/delfou.html#1>, accessed January 20, 2016).
- Deleuze, Gilles/Guattari, Félix (1994): *What is Philosophy?*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles/Guattari, Félix (2004): *A Thousand Plateaus*, translated by Brian Massumi, London: Continuum.

- Dillon, Michael (2014): *Bloody Mess: Why Sovereigns Fail, and How They Get Away With It* (<https://www.opendemocracy.net/author/michael-dillon>, accessed January 20, 2016).
- Dosse, Francois (2011): *Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari: Intersecting Lives*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Emmanouilidis, Marios (2013): *Economy and the Crisis of Neoliberal Governmentality. The Strategic Function of the Racist Apparatus*. In: Marios Emmanouilidis/Afroditi Koukoutsaki (eds.): *Golden Dawn and Strategies for the Management of the Crisis*, Athens: Futura, 2013, pp. 15-100 (in Greek).
- Emmanouilidis, Marios (2013): *The Crisis of Neoliberal Governmentality and the Tactics of Deceleration*. In: Marios Emmanouilidis et al. (eds.): *Life, Discourse, Politics in the Times of Crisis*, Social Workgroup of Thessaloniki (2.6.2012), Thessaloniki: Eneken, pp. 136-146 (in Greek).
- Emmanouilidis, Marios (forthcoming): *The Temporal Modality of Financialization and the Folding of the Indebted Subjectivity: Outline of a Derivative Governmentality of Debt*. In: *Phàsis: European Journal of Philosophy* 5.
- Foucault, Michel (1982): *The Subject and Power*. In: *Critical Inquiry* 8/4, pp. 777-795. (http://www.unisa.edu.au/Global/EASS/HRI/foucault_-_the_subject_and_power.pdf, accessed January 20, 2016).
- Foucault, Michel (1988): *What is Enlightenment?*, translated by Sotiris Rozanis, Athens: Erasmus (in Greek).
- Foucault, Michel (1997): *The Ethics of the Concern of the Self as a Practice of Freedom*. In: Paul Rabinow (ed.): *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth (Essential Works, Vol. 1)*, translated by Robert Hurley et al., New York: The New Press, pp. 281-301.
- Foucault, Michel (2007): *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France (1977-1978)*, translated by Graham Burchell, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foucault, Michel (2007b): *What is Critique?*, In: *The Politics of Truth*, translated by Lysa Hochroth and Catherine Porter, Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), pp. 41-60.
- Foucault, Michel (2008): *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France (1978-1979)*, translated by Graham Burchell, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Gavriilidis, Akis (2015): SYRIZA (and Podemos). ›Populist Inclusion‹ or Interruption of Representation? (<https://nomadicuniversality.wordpress.com/2015/06/01/syriza-and-podemos-populist-inclusion-or-interruption-of-representation/>, accessed January 20, 2016).
- Hatzopoulos, Pavlos/Marmaras, Ilias/Parsanoglou Dimitris (2012): An Absolute Refusal? Notes on the 12 February Demonstration in Athens (<https://nomadicuniversality.wordpress.com/2012/02/13/an-absolute-refusal-notes-on-the-12-february-demonstration-in-athens/>, accessed January 20, 2016).
- Kambouri, Nelli/Hatzopoulos, Pavlos (2011): The Tactics of Occupation: Becoming Cockroach. (<https://nomadicuniversality.wordpress.com/2011/11/26/the-tactics-of-occupation-becoming-cockroach/>, accessed January 20, 2016).
- Koros, Dimitris (2014): The Unlimited Extension of Immigrants' Detention: Towards Governance Through Uncertainty?, paper presented in the Common Session of the Common Study Programme on Criminal Justice and Critical Criminology, Corinth (October 31, 2014) (https://www.academia.edu/11997564/The_unlimited_extension_of_immigrants_detention_Towards_governance_through_uncertainty, accessed January 20, 2016).
- Lawrence T. E. (1989): *The Evolution of a Revolt*, Kansas: Combat Studies Institute.
- LiPuma, Edward/Lee, Benjamin (2004): *Financial Derivatives and the Globalization of Risk*, Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Marx, Karl (1989): *Grundrisse: Outlines of the Critique of Political Economy*, v. 1, translated by Dimitris Divaris, Athens: Stohastis (in Greek).
- Milios, Jannis (forthcoming): *The SYRIZA Experience. The Subversion That Never Happened*. In: Jannis Milios et al. (eds.): *First Time Left*, Athens: Poreia, (in Greek).
- Nancy Jean-Luc (2013): *Coming out of Panic*, Athens: Eleftheriaki Kouloura (in Greek).
- Papadopoulos, Dimitris/ Niamh Stephenson/Tsianos, Vassilis (2008): *Escape Routes: Control and Subversion in the 21st Century*, London: Pluto Press.
- Papadopoulos, Dimitris/Tsianos, Vassilis/Tsomou, Margarita (2012): Athens: Metropolitan Blockade - Real Democracy (<http://eipcp.net/transversal/1011/ptt/en>, accessed January 20, 2016).

- Rose, Nikolas (1999): *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Serres, Michel (1982): *The Parasite*, translated by Lawrence Schehr, Baltimore/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Serres, Michel (2011): *Times of Crisis*, translated by Lisa Lakka, Athens: Kalentis (in Greek).
- Sotiropoulos, Dimitris/Milios, John/Lapatsioras, Spyros (2013): *A Political Economy of Contemporary Capitalism and its Crisis: Demystifying Finance*, London/New York: Routledge.
- Tsianos, Vassilis S. (forthcoming): *After Real Democracy: The Speculative Sociology of ›Social Non-Movements‹ and Assemblies*. In: Andreas Oberprantacher/Andrei Siclodi (eds.): *Subjectivation in Political Theory and Contemporary Practices*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.