Commons: A Social Outcome of the movement of the squares

by Angelos Varvarousis (a), Viviana Asara (b) & Bengi Akbulut (c)

a) Institute for Environmental Science and Technology, Autonomous University of Barcelona (Spain)

b) Institute for Multi-Level Governance and Development, Vienna University of Economics and Business (Austria)
c) Department of Geography, Planning and Environment, Concordia University (Canada)

Paper published in the journal Social Movement Studies (version before print)

Abstract

This paper examines the evolvement of the "movement of the squares" following the end of the more visible cycles of mobilization of the square occupation. We argue that a crucial aspect of this evolution lies in the creation of a social infrastructure of alternative (re)productive projects in the form of commons. We call this type of outcomes "social" in order to distinguish them from the cultural, political and biographical outcomes underlined in typologies on the consequences of social movements. Bridging social movement studies with the literature on the commons, we build a conceptual framework of their relationship. Through a comparative analysis of the movements in Athens and Barcelona, we show how the commoning practices of the square encampments gave rise to more durable commons disseminated across cities´ social fabrics. We identify both direct and indirect mechanisms of movements´ transmutation into commons, and distinguish the former into transplantation, ideation, and breeding processes. Our second aim is to scrutinize the political dimension of these commons in relation to what has been framed as the "post-political condition". We maintain that the post-square commons constitute political and politicizing actions for activists and users for their effects on everyday life, for their capacity to link their practices with broader, structural dynamics of injustice, inequality and exclusion, and for their selective engagement with counter-austerity politics.

1. Introduction:

2011 was a long year. Amid a multidimensional crisis a series of urban uprisings swept the squares in countries as diverse as the USA, Israel, Greece, Tunisia, Spain and the UK, soon evolving into social movements. The long year was preceded and followed by uprisings: the so-called Arab Spring at the end of 2010 ushered it in, and several mobilizations in countries such as Turkey, Brazil and Hong Kong followed it in subsequent years. The central characteristics of the "movement of the squares"(Fernández-Savater et al., 2017) have been a recent focus in the literature, such as the symbolicdimension of 'square politics', foregrounding role of claims such as democracy and social justice, contestation of austerity politics, mobilization of inclusiveness as a key principle, rejection of formal representation, and the politicization of 'everyday people' (ibid; Asara, 2016; Flesher Fominaya 2017). Here we focus on a different dimension: the forms of commoning - i.e. the social practices performed by commoners to manage and reclaim the commons - produced during encampments, and their blossoming and transformation into more durable commons in the aftermath of square occupations.

Indeed, the end of square mobilisations was followed by the proliferation of self-organised ventures at neighborhood-level, covering needs related to social (re)production such as solidarity clinics, community gardens and workers' cooperatives (Arampatzi, 2017). Recent studies focus on this post-square period by scrutinizing these projects' organizational features and forms of action. This literature reveals how the post-square movements in Southern Europe combine contentious politics with networks and spaces of solidarity in a mutually reinforcing way (Blanco and León, 2017), addressing needs and developing alternatives to austerity (Arampatzi, 2017) through directly-democratic and inclusive organizations (Simsa and Totter, 2017). Others, similar to us, conceptualize these initiatives as commons, capable of reshaping everyday life against neoliberal hegemony (Roussos, 2019), whose articulation and defense parallel the contestation of dispossessions wrought by regimes of austerity (Mayer, 2013:13-14; Harvey, 2012).

Such organizations and networks that "aimed at supporting different forms of consumption" and (re)production (Forno and Graziano 2014:10) - rather than being centered on contentious forms of actions - have been variously called Sustainable Community Organizations, Alternative Action Organizations and Alternative Forms of Resilience (Forno and Graziano, 2014; Zamponi and Bosi, 2018; D´Alisa et al., 2015). That a variety of terms exist for capturing similar phenomena is symptomatic of an important gap in social movement studies, pertaining to a lack of conceptualisation of a specific type of their outcomes and of its relationship to movements.

Firstly, the literature on the consequences of social movements is dominated by the categorization of outcomes into political, cultural and personal/biographical (see Bosi et al. 2016; Giugni, 2008), which is inadequate for tackling the relationship between cycles of mobilisations and new commoning initiatives. Secondly, post-square studies similarly fail to scrutinize the emergence of these alternative initiatives and their relation to the movement of the squares. The few studies that have put squares movements "in context" by analyzing their continuity and genealogy (Zamponi and Fernández González, 2017:65; Flesher Fominaya, 2015) remain analytically focused on what predates them rather than their aftermath. Thirdly, analyzing the connection of the squares' movement with the birth of these new forms of collective action is important not least in relation to the latter's alleged depoliticization effects and to what has been framed as "post-political condition" (Blühdorn 2017). Work on the post-political condition underlines that the political (contestation and agonistic engagement) is increasingly colonized by politics (technocratic

mechanisms within an unquestioned political-economic framework) eroding democracy through a consensual mode of governance (Wilson and Swyngedouw, 2014:6). Some authors see these commoning projects as instances of the post-political itself : they read them as experiential forms of self-organization of exclusion by the marginalized, plagued by consumption-based self-realisation and depoliticisation, dampening social conflict (Blühdorn, 2017:57, 2014). Or, as self-help groups, they see them as doomed to later transform into service-delivery organizations coopted by the government (Mayer, 2000; Uitermark and Nicholls, 2014; Bagguley, 2002). Others instead consider them as forms of politicization that are spatialising sustained transformative strategies (Dikeç and Swyngedouw, 2017:8).

By taking a bird´s eye view on the movements in Athens and Barcelona, we aim to address these three sets of issues through the following questions: What is the relationship (both empirically and theoretically) between these self-organized ventures and square mobilizations? How did these commoning initiatives emerge from the square mobilizations and disseminated? Do these projects constitute "political action" or are they post-political manifestations, and how?

By answering those questions, we more particularly address two of the research foci of this special issue: What forms of movements and activism emerge in the post-political condition and what is their prefigurative power? Do they have the capacity to re-politicise the post-political order, or may they – unwittingly – themselves be an integral part of it?

This paper bridges two lines of inquiry in tackling these questions: social movement studies and theories of the commons. The analytical lens of the commons has rarely been utilized in social movement studies; conversely, the literature on the commons falls critically short in the treatment of the relation between commons and social movements. We contend that their systematic dialoguecan enhance our understanding of what happens between visible cycles of contention. Buildingour conceptualization on the literatures on movement continuity, we propose a fourth category of social movements' outcomes in addition to the threefold categorization (Bosi et al 2016; Giugni2008), what we call the social outcomes of movements. These occur in the social arena rather than in the cultural, political-institutional or biographical fields, and encompass an array of social infrastructures involved in the collective organization of everyday social life. Commons constitute only one type among potential social outcomes, which can take the form of labour unions, NGO's, free spaces, service-provision organisations (often hierarchically organized), etc. We argue that an important form that the social outcomes of the squares movement have taken is commons, developing an alternative social infrastructure covering different spheres of social (re)production, such as care, education, food, housing and finance.

By comparing the post-square movements in Athens and Barcelona, we show that bridging the commons theories with social movement studies helps untangle the mechanisms of square mobilisations' transmutation and their decentralization into the social fabric. Following the distinction between direct and indirect effects of social movements (Bosi and Uba, 2009:410; Giugni 2008), we identify both indirect and direct mechanisms of transmutation, and differentiate the latter further into three categories: transplantation, breeding and ideation. The former involves the continuation (transplantation) of some of the squares' commons after the encampments were lifted; the second entails the materialization of commons that had only been ideated (ideation) during the square occupation; and the third relates to the emergence (breeding) of commons out of the decentralization of the movement, in both ideational and material terms. Our findings point towards a co-productive relation between the commons and the social movements, i.e. where commons are produced within, through and because of social movements, while at the same time becoming the basis new social movements can sparkle from.

2.   Theorising social outcomes: bridging social movement studies with theories on the commons

2A) The social outcomes of social movements

Social movement studies have generally retained a "bias towards adversarial social movement mobilization" (Yates, 2015a:237) sparsely paying attention to what happens in between cycles of contention, where "less is known about the role played by informal networks and social movement organizations in the aftermath of protests" (Gade, 2019:56). Important exceptions to this tendency are the "movement continuity" studies, featuring the concepts of abeyance structures (Taylor, 1989), free spaces (Polletta, 1999) and submerged networks (Melucci, 1996). For Melucci (1996), latency (networks submerged in everyday life) and visibility are two correlated and alternating phases of social movements. However, as put by Yates (2015a:240), he « does not explicitly discuss how there might be other forms of visibility to public mobilisation, or how latent processes might themselves become a focus of overt political attention".

The literature on abeyance structures (Taylor, 1989; Staggenborg, 1998), on the other hand, defines these as those structures that allow social movements to persist in the face of unfavourable circumstances to mass mobilization. Embracing a more fluid conception of movements (Staggenborg and Taylor, 2005:48), it offers insights on abeyance periods capable of maintaining networks, tactics and collective identity, even creating "movement communities" across multiple movements (Staggenborg, 1998). This work resonates with Melucci´s conception of movements "as ´submerged networks´ that erupt into visible collective action from time to time", encompassing collective action in a variety of arenas beyond cycles of protest (Staggenborg and Taylor, 2005:40,41). Movement continuities also include spillover effects onto other social movements through movement-to-movement linkages of activists, ideas, and tactics (Meyer and Whittier, 1994). However, this literature has stressed the relative passivity of movements in abeyance (Bagguley, 2002), where they are only concerned with reproducing themselves, driven by "decline, failure and demobilization" and "maintain[ing] the culture of the movement rather than to challenge and transform the wider society" (Bagguley, 2002:170). Furthermore, the afterlives of movements are treated in a rather instrumental way in this literature, i.e. important only because waves of protest feed on them, downplaying the significance of these processes (see also Yates, 2015a).

While the free spaces concept can be also seen as a movement outcome, it is mostly discussed in relation to its operation within and preceding movements. Referring to relatively autonomous, small-scale settings that can support launch a movement (Polletta, 1999) by providing the physical and conceptual space where participants create networks, and develop counter-hegemonic frames (Anahita, 2009), the concept has not included different modes of (re)production and consumption aimed at changing societal structures as a form of action, overlooking an important dimension of transformation and politicization of everyday life.

The scholarship on prefigurative politics has partly addressed this gap, focusing on forms of action that can prefigure and enact movements´ goals in daily practice (Yates, 2015b) through everyday negotiations in alternative communal spaces (Yates, 2015a). Prefigurative politics involves development of political perspectives and new norms, and a particular framing of resistance as a "logics of subtraction" beyond the capitalist market and the state (Naegler, 2018) through processes

of experimentation, demonstration and diffusion (Yates, 2015b; Asara and Kallis, 2020). These are politicising processes that have broader implications for socio-cultural change in themselves (Yates, 2015a). Prefigurative organizing involves setting up informal organizations relying on assembly decision-making, inclusive membership, informal monitoring and sanctions, while focusing on attempting "to build an alternative economy in the here and now" (Simsa and Totter, 2017:287; Asara, 2020). While these accounts resonate with this paper´s understanding of the political dimension of commons, we hold that commons is a more suited tool for understanding the prefigurative forms of organization within the context of our case studies due to its focus on the sharing of common resources.

We integrate these insights into an expanded theoretical perspective through the notion of social outcomes of social movements. We argue that this constitutes an additional type of outcome distinct from the existing categorization of political, biographical/personal and cultural outcomes (Bosi et al, 2016; Giugni, 2008). Rather than seeing the afterlives´ structures in an instrumental way, we propose to view social outcomes as having a co-productive dimension in relation to the social movements and a creative dimension vis-à-vis the social fabric. That is to say, the new social infrastructure, which the concept of social outcomes refers to, is created within, through and because of social movements; it is substantiated and dispersed in the social fabric both during and especially in the aftermath of the more visible cycles of mobilization. The dispersed new social infrastructure can in turn operate as the matrix from where new cycles of mobilization can emerge.

Social movements can constitute a critical period of rupture when collective invention flourishes (Stavrides 2016). The diffusion and of new structures and organizations, experimented during the movements´ mobilization across the social fabric, constitute the social outcomes of social movements. These are manifested in the social arena (rather than cultural, political-institutional and biographical level), mostly affecting the meso-level of collective action and societal organization (i.e. rather than the individual level as in biographical outcomes, or the political-institutional level as in political outcomes) and are related to the collective organization of everyday social life, including social provisioning. They involve new schemes of production and reproduction, spillover effects, loose structures of solidarity and social ties, new labour unions, NGOs and service-providing organizations (often with hierarchical organizational structures), and free spaces. Commons are hence only one possible form that social outcomes can take. Following the movement continuity literature, these new schemes, networks and structures can be conceived as the movements´ transmutation and continuation beyond the more visible cycles of protest, until they retain a collective identity, dense interconnected social ties among themselves and pose collective challenges to systems of authority (which are among the defining features of social movements, hence commons do not simply make social movements, see Snow, 2004).

2B) Commons as social outcomes

While social outcomes can encompass a panoply of initiatives, we claim that one important social outcome took the form of commons in the case of the movements of the squares. Following De Angelis and Harvie (2014:280) we define commons as "social systems in which resources are shared by a community of users/producers (commoners), who also define the modes of use and production, distribution and circulation of these resources through democratic and horizontal forms of governance (commoning)". The "grammar of the commons" which distinguishes

commons from other types of social outcomes hence includes common management, horizontality and direct participation of all members in decision-making.

In line with a few studies which have identified the production of new commons as a characterizing feature of the movement of the squares (Roussos, 2019; Mayer, 2013:14), we frame the grassroots initiatives that followed the squares movement as commons. Utilizing the concept of commons enables linking these contemporary experiences with the tradition of self-organization systems including the management of common resources. These theories emphasise the role such grassroots ventures play in the broader economic and (re)productive setting and are thus conducive to analyse the post-square alternative economic ventures that have substantial implications for everyday life transformation beyond being mere alternative cultural spaces. Not by chance, the term "commons" had become part of the movement vocabulary in both Athens and Barcelona (Varvarousis 2019; Asara, 2020).

2C) Integrating commons and social movements

Even though social movements and community-based management (commons) are two paradigmatic forms of collective action, their interaction has been barely explored, not least at the theoretical level. While most of the contemporary literature on the commons (e.g. the common-pool-resource tradition) focuses on the conditions under which natural resources can be cooperatively and effectively be managed, its frontiers have been pushed in recent years. At the forefront of this evolution is the shift towards the study of the role the commons play in societal transformations. Yet this scholarship treats social movements as contentious mobilizations demanding changes and the commons as the social systems that bring about those changes (Harvey 2012; De Angelis 2017). We seek to expand the potential of this approach to analyse the movement of the squares in Athens and Barcelona as well as their afterlives.

It has been shown that commoning is an integral part of many contemporary social movements (Stavrides 2016; Dikeç and Swyngedouw 2016). But how these commoning processes evolve when the more visible phase of mobilizations ends is a question that the commons literature has largely neglected. Stavrides (2016) as well as Hardt and Negri (2012), examine the commoning aspects of the square movements, but fail to explore their relation with the proliferation of new commons in their wake. De Angelis (2017) even argues that the commons created during social movements "die" after the end of mobilizations. A few recent studies focus on the production of urban commons as a logic of resistance in countering processes of dispossession and enclosure, conceptualizing it as the material articulation of daily engagement against the neoliberal urban fabric (Di Feliciantonio, 2017; Asara, 2020), shaping everyday life (Roussos, 2019). However, a conceptualization of how commons emerge from and are connected to social movements is still missing and constitutes our goal here. Bridging commons studies with the social movements literature, which identifies both direct and indirect effects of movements (where the latter occur after affecting some intermediary factor which is crucial for the outcome of interest, see Bosi and Uba, 2009:410), helps delineate direct and indirect mechanisms of commons' emergence out of the movement of the squares, as detailed in the next section.

Furthermore, such commons projects that constitute the "heritage" of social movements are often seen as a sign of their withdrawal, depoliticization and fragmentation in the social movement studies literature, rather than a form of their continuation (Bagguley, 2002; Uitermark and Nicholls,

2014). For example, Mayer (2000) argues that the evolution of urban movements into communal experiments in the 1970s transformed them into self-help groups and ´rehab-squatting´ initiatives in the 1980s, failing "to politicize and mobilize" (Mayer, 2013:13). These studies suggest that it is not the alternative organizations and spaces (e.g. commons) that are inherently depoliticizing, but their evolution into service-provision organisations depending on external funding.

Other scholars claimed that alternatives such as grassroots spaces can establish synergies with contentious forms of action (De Moor, 2020; Blanco and León, 2017). Urban solidarity spaces have an empowerment role vis-à-vis austerity, where alternative modes of economic conduct are imagined and built (Arampatzi, 2017). As mentioned, prefigurative politics literature shows how alternative spaces (e.g. social centres) can transport political meanings and ideas through practices and discourses (Yates, 2015a). We complement these insights with Rancière's conceptualization of political action. For Rancière, political action is not about "expressing demands to rectify inequalities or un-freedoms, or a call to the state" (Swyngedouw, 2014), but rather the disruption of the naturalized order that socio-spatially allocates things, people, activities through forms of institutionalization and representation; it is a reconfiguration of what is acceptable and visible (Rancière, 1999). The political emerges through a process of disidentification with the roles and identities of the existing order and the production of a collective political subject by enacting equality as presupposition—i.e. everyone's ability to govern given the right to speak and participate (Decreus et al, 2014).

We argue that the commoning that takes place during movements' contentious phases does not automatically evaporate when the mobilizations are over, but can disseminate across the social fabric. In line with the movement continuity studies, we hold that the transmutation of social movements into commons-based experiments does not necessarily signify their "death" or depoliticization. We claim that the alternative social infrastructure inherited by a social movement can develop its main properties on a larger scale, rather than going into demobilization or a passive holding process – which distinguishes our perspective from the abeyance literature. Obviously there is no absolute rule to judge the effects of the commons on depoliticization or movement fragmentation. In our cases, the commons-based experiments play a politicizing role on everyday life and operated as active networks for the emergence of new mobilizations, pointing to a co-productive relation between the commons and social movements. We substantiate these arguments through the empirical analysis of the movement of the squares and their afterlives in Athens and Barcelona.

3.   Research design

The research is based on a "case-based comparative analysis" (Della Porta, 2008) or multiple-case design (Yin, 2003), where two paradigmatic cases of commons' emergence in the aftermath of protest cycles have been selected: the movements of the squares in Athens and Barcelona. A 'universalizing comparison' (Della Porta, 2008) can identify common properties among different instances of the phenomenon under investigation, by intentionally selecting cases that are similar in as many respects as possible (most-similar system design) with an eye to contextual dissimilarities and differing features of the analysed phenomenon (Della Porta, 2008). The comparison of two cases facilitates theory building, focusing on how and why the exemplary outcomes might have occurred on both cases (Yin, 2003).

These two movements exhibit affinities in temporal, symbolic, and organizational aspects, and in terms of their evolution. They operated, to some extent, as a source of learning, imitation and inspiration for each other. They were triggered by similar grievances, i.e. harsh austerity measures and the sweeping crisis of representation (Flesher Fominaya 2017; Asara, 2016) attracted a high share of previously non-politicised activists and adopted similar decision-making mechanisms. In addition, both movements catalyzed big changes in the political landscapes of their respective countries, marked by Syriza, Podemos and Barcelona en Comú's electoral success in Greece, Spain and Barcelona, respectively. Most importantly, both mobilizations had similar afterlives with the blossoming of grassroots ventures, which we refer here as commons (Varvarousis 2020; Flesher Fominaya 2017; Roussos, 2019).

The two cases also present contextual differences which may have contributed to variations in the development of commons, that however lie beyond the scope of this paper. First, while there was an earlier strong tradition of experimenting with alternative economy organizations in Catalonia (Conill et al 2012), such ventures were marginal before the squares' movement in Greece (Varvarousis and Kallis 2017). Second, despite the severe crisis and austerity measures in Spain, Greece's economic meltdown was the biggest ever faced by a country of the global North after the WW2. Third, Athens witnessed the "December Revolt" urban uprising in 2008, which produced a series of social outcomes on the movements of the squares.

Validity issues related to inferring causal attribution between movements' actions and the observed changes (i.e. outcomes) (Giugni, 2008) are dealt with by utilizing data triangulation, on the one hand, and a diachronic analysis that is able to identify the various mechanisms of commons' emergence at a disaggregated level, on the other. Our argument is informed by a collection of primary data by the first two authors in Athens and Barcelona, respectively. Ethnographic research has been conducted on the "Aganaktismenoi" movement in the occupied Syntagma square in Athens for 30 days between May-July 2011 by the first author, and over a period of three years (May 2011-May 2014) on the Indignados in Barcelona by the second author. For the case of Athens, the first author had established connections and authentic dialogue with participants in a number of the movement's committees and groups, while also following some neighborhood assemblies. As a "partially participating observer", the second author had also been able to establish a certain degree of familiarity with the movement's participants, enabling access to movement's activities and meetings including square encampments, protest events, neighbourhood assemblies, as well as assemblies and activities of many of the commons detailed here.

Secondly, the analysis builds on semi-structured interviews and focus groups. 18 in-depth semi-structured interviews and 2 focus groups (all recorded and transcribed) were conducted between September 2013 and May 2014 in Athens with key movement participants involved in various encampment commissions. 74 in-depth interviews and 6 mini-focus groups were conducted in Barcelona between May 2011 and May 2014 with 93 activists involved in the square occupation and the commoning projects, keeping an eye on gender balance.[1] Of these, 45 interviews and 4 mini-focus groups were with participants of square and neighbourhood assemblies during the first year of the movement, while the rest involved participants of the post-square commons. Indignant interviewees were selected through a "deliberate, but rarely random sampling process" (Blee and Taylor, 2002:100) to ensure a diverse but complete representation of kinds of activism, social class,

---

[1] In 2016 and 2019 15 additional interviews were conducted in some of the commons, which further informed the analysis of this paper.

and forms of participation in the movement. Interviews and mini-focus groups with participants of commons focused on the origins, organizational structure, activities, participants´ relationships with neighbors and state authorities, and their transformational visions. The interviews were recorded, transcribed and analyzed through a thematic analysis methodology (Ritchie and Lewis 2003) by identifying common themes and subthemes, their clustering into a manageable number, understanding their relations, and linking of themes to the adopted theoretical framework.

Finally, additional insights were drawn from a face-to-face country-wide survey conducted in Greece between May 2016 and May 2017 with 404 respondents from 118 projects about commoning ventures, accompanied by 600 hours of participant observation in these initiatives. Projects were chosen by probability sampling among a list of 600 projects identified in three online databases. The survey included four subthemes, namely demographic information, perceptions about participants' engagement and opinions about the broader commons' movement in Greece, and perceived impact of the new commons on their everyday life.

4.   Square politics and transitional commoning spaces in Athens and Barcelona

Common space was "secreted" (Stavrides 2016), i.e. molded in a changeable manner, in both cities during the encampments. Numerous commons with similar characteristics were created alongside this new common space: social kitchens; self-organized medical centers; libraries, art and cinema spaces, kindergartens, time banks, exchange bazaars and even a community garden (in Barcelona) symbolized the collective effort to reinvent everyday life "in common" by offering a basic (re)productive social infrastructure. A number of content-related commissions fostering discussions on core socio-political issues emerged, such as education, unemployment, direct/real democracy, the economy and the environment. Some of these persisted throughout the occupations, while others appeared and disappeared in a matter of hours.

In both cases the General Assembly was the supreme decision-making body on both practical/organizational and content-related matters that effected the whole movement. Both Syntagma Square and Plaça Catalunya became the epicenters of incipient urban commoning practices. Especially after the squares were left, popular assemblies were meeting independently in their neighborhoods and periodically convening at the general assembly of Syntagma Square (in Athens) and the Inter-Neighbourhood Coordinating Space (INCS, in Barcelona). The discussions taking place in the general assembly/INCS fed back to the neighborhood assemblies, though without binding them. This emerging decentralization-recentralization mechanism evolved into a network of interconnected commoning projects that were dispersed throughout the metropolitan space.

The square commons operated as transitional common spaces[2] (Varvarousis and Kallis 2017; Varvarousis 2018), facilitating interactions between diverse people and groups; they were subsequently transmuted into a series of new projects that diffused in the urban fabric of Athens and Barcelona.

---

[2] Transitional commons have also been theorized as liminal commons (Varvarousis and Kallis, 2017; Varvarousis, 2020).

5. "Squaring" the city: the social outcomes in Athens and Barcelona

5A) The transmutation of the social movement in the social fabric

Following the literature on movements' outcomes (Bosi and Uba, 2009), we identify direct and indirect mechanisms of emergence and diffusion of the new commons from the squares' transitional commons. The 'direct mechanisms' consist of three forms. Firstly, some of the commoning projects created in the squares continued their activities in neighbourhoods after the mobilizations ended, in many cases with the same membership and name. We call this the transplantation process. Secondly, certain commoning projects were conceived during the encampment periods, but materialized only in their aftermath. We call this the ideation process. Thirdly, numerous ventures were conceived and emerged during the post-square decentralization of the movement into the neighbourhoods, in the bosom of commoning spaces such as neighbourhood assemblies and other informal groups at the neighbourhood level. From these, new commons were bred. We call this the breeding process. We call this the breeding process. Finally, the "event" of the squares also created a series of imaginary and discursive resources, which gave birth to a new public culture, a different ´social climate´ (Fernández-Savater, 2012) or even, as Karyotis (2018: 30) put it, "a Plan C based on the social reorganization around the commons", operating as a generator of commons through indirect mechanisms. These are indirect as they occurred through "a two-step process in which movement mobilization first influences certain aspects of their environment such as their institutional allies or public opinion" (Giugni, 2008:1587)), i.e. outcomes that are not social but political or cultural, which act as intermediary factors for the development of subsequent social outcomes. This points to the fact that "the domains of different outcomes (political, cultural, and biographical [and we would add, social]) can mutually influence one another" (Bosi and Uba, 2009:413).

Neighborhood commoning initiatives had been marginal in Athens before 2011: the few ones created during the 2008 December Revolt were mostly inactive yet became reactivated during the movement of the squares. Preexisting political networks, organizations and radical parties played a role in their stronger diffusion in the aftermath of the movement of the squares. Survey findings indicate that the majority (54 percent) of the new commons was created by groups of individuals, although a substantial share (20 percent) was created directly by radical political groups/parties—such as Solidarity4all, a network dedicated to promoting commoning projects, founded and funded by Syriza, the leftwing party in power in Greece between 2015-2019.

In Barcelona, solidarity economy initiatives, collaborative consumption/production practices and other networks that existed before the crisis (Conill et al 2012) as social outcomes of the past movements (Flesher Fominaya 2015) also played a role in the diffusion of new commoning projects (see also Flesher Fominaya, 2017). An important role was played by occupied spaces (e.g. Can Masdeu, Can Vies) and Neighbourhood Associations. The Indignados movement represented an additional boost.

5B) Social outcomes in Athens and Barcelona

The boom of commoning projects in Athens has been connected to the Syntagma mobilisations, as revealed by our survey: 51 percent of respondents stated that the ventures they participate in are direct outcomes of the social movements in Greece between 2008-2011 while only 23 percent

considered their projects unrelated. These new projects encompass a wide spectrum of ventures such as self-managed social clinics and pharmacies, worker cooperatives, urban occupations, time banks, alternative currencies and solidarity exchange networks, urban gardens, farmer/consumer cooperatives, farmer markets, art/publishing collectives and an occupied factory.

This "explosion" indicates that a horizontal solidarity and commoning network inherited partly from the square mobilisations was established as a resilience system to cope with the crisis and the dismantling of the welfare state. Social clinics, for instance, aim to provide healthcare to those excluded from the public health system; some also struggle against austerity by attempting to develop an alternative healthcare model. These clinics hardly existed before 2011, but multiplied afterwards. In 2014 there were 72 social clinics across Greece (Adam & Teloni 2015). Likewise, solidarity hubs mainly active at the neighborhood level, are involved in the distribution of food, clothing, and free lessons. While very few existed before 2011, there were over 110 in 2014 (Solidarity4all 2014). Direct producer-to-consumer networks also flourished after 2011: virtually absent before 2011, 47 recorded networks existed across Greece in 2014 (Solidarity4all 2014). Finally, 70 percent of existing social-solidarity economy organizations in the country was created after 2011, of which 36 percent are based in Athens (Varvarousis et al. 2017).

Barcelona similarly witnessed a surge of new commons in the aftermath of the square occupation, including time banks, social centers, free canteens for the disadvantaged, food banks, barter markets organized by neighbourhood assemblies, community gardens, anti-eviction networks, and agro-ecological producer-to-consumer groups (doubling between 2011-2015 in Barcelona (Fernàndez and Miró, 2016)). Cooperatives witnessed an increase of more than 3,000 workers in the years 2011-2015 (ibid). The annual Catalunya Fair (and Network) of Solidarity Economy was created one year after the encampments. Currently there are around 4700 social-solidarity economy initiatives (860 cooperatives and 260 community economies) in Barcelona, involving about 500,000 members and 100,000 volunteers (Fernàndez and Miró, 2016).

But how the transitional commons of the squares gave birth to these new commons?

In both cities, discussions about the aftermath had already begun during the encampment period. In Athens, this happened within a context of increasing police violence in early July. The proposals varied from disseminating the squares´ political practices throughout Athens to strengthening existing neighborhood assemblies, creation of solidarity hubs of commoning practices and maintaining the square occupation at any cost. In Barcelona, instead, the General Assembly decided to leave Plaça Catalunya and decentralize in the neighborhoods to focus on "the creation of alternatives", despite conflicting views over timing (see Asara, 2016).

Despite these differences, encampments' transitional commons disseminated within the urban fabric in both cases, through direct and indirect mechanisms explained above. In Athens, the transplantation process occurred with some square projects such as the artist collective, the time bank and the exchange bazaar, which continued their activities for months (or even years) after the end of mobilizations. The first network of community gardens in Barcelona was created following the interactions during the planting community garden in the square (Asara and Kallis, 2020).

The ideation process, on the other hand, is embodied in the peri-urban eco-community project "Spithari Waking Life" and the "Metropolitan Social Clinic" that treats thousands of patients yearly, both of which were conceived during the occupation but materialized in its aftermath. A series of projects were conceived during the encampment period but materialized afterwards also in Barcelona, such as the CASX, a self-managed, no-interest social finance cooperative.

However, the majority of ventures were created through a breeding process in Barcelona. An example is Ateneu Cooperatiu La Base that emerged out of the Poble Sec neighbourhood assembly, an umbrella project involving sub-commons such as an agroecological consumption cooperative and a co-maternity nursing group. Other examples include Recreant Cruïlles, a self-managed project of a community garden and cultural spaces (Asara and Kallis, 2020) that sprouted from the 'Esquerra de l'Eixample' neighbourhood assembly, and the Gracia squatted bank, a space for meeting, discussion and second-hand clothing exchange, that arose from the homonymous neighbourhood assembly. The squatted Poblenou Indignant community gardens were founded for the use of both movement activists and neighbors; while directly inspired by the square community garden, they emerged from the Poblenou neighbourhood assembly. Similarly in Athens, "Solidarity of Pireaus", which includes a social kitchen, a time bank, manufacturing and (peri)urban farming, was conceived in 2012 – a year after the end of the mobilizations - by a new group of residents of the port-city who wanted to do something similar to what happened in Syntagma in their neighbourhood.

Numerous new projects were created also with the "square effect" on "public culture" (Pantazidou 2013), i.e. through indirect mechanisms. These were further bolstered by the pre-existing social infrastructure created by past movements. As mentioned earlier, of survey respondents who consider their projects unrelated to the movements in Greece between 2008-2011 (23 percent), a fraction participated in projects that had existed prior to them. A 2017 study likewise shows that the majority of social-solidarity economy initiatives were launched immediately after the movements of 2011 (Varvarousis et al 2017).

While we do not have comparable data for Barcelona, our ethnographic research indicates that the creation of new commons was indirectly boosted by the new type of social climate produced by the Indignados. The most prominent case is Can Batlló, a 14-ha former factory space hosting numerous commons, including socio-cultural spaces (an auditorium, a self-managed library, etc), a (book) publisher, a brewery and a (co-)housing cooperative, a cooperative incubator, a carpentry shop, a blacksmith and construction spaces (Asara, 2019). Can Batlló came out of a 40-year struggle, but its self-management could only be initiated soon after the square occupation. Other noteworthy examples include Ateneu Flor de Maig, a self-managed socio-cultural space squatted in autumn 2012, historically an important consumption cooperative; the Farigola square, a common space creating an "unofficial" square; and the Xino garden whose participants´ have increased after the square occupation (Asara and Kallis, 2020).

This close link between the new commons and the square mobilizations is indeed an important aspect of the political character of the former, as we elaborate below.

6.   The political character of the new commons

Our final set of questions relates to the political character of these new commons, especially from a post-political viewpoint: Does their decentralization across the social fabric signify depoliticization? Are these commons just a part of the post-political status quo, even reinforcing it?

The commons sprouted with the square movements were motivated by the need to 'spatialize' (Dikeç and Swyngedouw, 2017) the movement values onto the urban social fabric, rather than by

mere self-realization and expressive politics. They aim to enact different social relations, economic organisations and institutions at the local level, create networked alternatives at multiple scales, and mobilize a vision of organizing everyday life collectively based on democratic self-management. Our ethnographic research in Barcelona indicates that motivations for taking part in the commons include the "struggle to transform society", satisfying basic needs and combining work with activism. Similarly in Greece, our survey reveals that while individually-oriented values such as "an alternative lifestyle" or "improved psychological condition" are important for participation (71 and 62 percent respectively), politically-oriented motives are more central: 80 percent of respondents stated "contribution to social and political change" and 63 percent "political expression" as motivations for participation. Similarly, while "covering basic needs" and "provision of services to those in need" were framed as important goals (53 and 63 percent respectively), "promotion of radical politics", "societal change", "creation of a different politics in daily life" and even "subversion of capitalism" are equally (if not more) important objectives for the projects (55, 70, 77 and 44 percent respectively).

The political orientation of such motivations aside, if the new commons were limited to an exercise of "survival lifestylism" and had turned into insulated enclaves or mere sub-cultural spaces disconnected from the broader neighbourhood and city-level issues and struggles, they could have been read, as Blühdorn (2017) cautions, as integral to the post-political condition. Our cases, however, depict a different scenario. Firstly, these commons not only hold inclusiveness and openness as foundational principles, but often also engage proactively with the wider neighbourhood and city, which turns them into spaces of resistance from which to launch counter austerity politics. In Barcelona, for instance, Ateneu La Base fights against urban plans that are criticized for promoting more gentrification in the neighbourhood and Can Batlló collaborates with the Neighbourhood Association to make the local administration to comply with its commitment to building public services. In Athens, a local initiative in Plato's Academy aiming to transform an abandoned public space into a commons blocked the construction of a shopping mall. In addition, the alternative social infrastructure created after the movement of the squares became the basis upon which the new "solidarity to refugees" movement evolved amid the massive migrant flows in 2015-2016 to Greece (Varvarousis, 2018). These characteristics distinguish the new commons from the "reactionary commoning" linked to right-wing movements, e.g. self-organized soup kitchens and medical centres targeting only natives, organized by members of the Golden Dawn. These findings resonate with other studies that explore the political character of the new commons (Arampatzi, 2017; Blanco and León, 2017; Loukakis, 2018).

Secondly, the open and active engagement in the cities´ politics implies a (re)politicization of groups previously not active politically. This politicization process started during the square encampments (Asara, 2016) and continued to characterize the post-square commons (see also Zamponi and Bosi, 2018; Roussos, 2019), transforming the worldviews of many people that were not previously politically engaged (Varvarousis, 2019), including both core activists and users of the commons. For example, Can Batlló has been able to increase its core participants (active in at least one commission) from 300 to 370 between 2014 and 2017, organizing more than 2,000 activities and including almost 50,000 users (Can Batlló, 2018). A significant portion of users are neighbours that became politicised by learning about assembly-based democracy and becomingenmeshed in political debates, albeit not without challenges. As recalled by a participant, "neighbours that were previously not politicised join just because they think it is a nice and interesting project. […] Sometimes this is complicated, at the beginning there were debates [onbasic issues]… so we wondered: ´do we really have to discuss this? This is obvious!´". The commoning practices that proliferate in the squares' aftermath are political in opening up spaces

for enacting direct democracy and performing novel ways of being and acting in common. They are political spaces where disagreement and conflict are recognized and negotiated, and where everyone appropriates voice and performs the capacity to govern, i.e. acts politically (Swyngedouw, 2014; 2011). In this sense, the political potential of these practices lies in their staging of alternative ways of being and acting in common, and materializing claims of equality, solidarity and freedom, as long as they remain open to new voices to be heard and new concerns to appear as common concerns (Swyngedouw 2014).

Thirdly, the new commons often build resilient, alternative socio-economic configurations in the face of the environmental and social threats posed by neoliberal policies, covering basic needs such as food, housing, health, childcare and education (D´Alisa et al, 2015). Their effort to re-embed and relocalise production and consumption e.g. through agroecological food networks, collaborative consumption, repair and recycle, eco-production and DIY, are instances of building society-nature relationships differently.

Fourthly, these commoning practices are political not necessarily in the sense of their eventual effectiveness in transforming the established order, but in their actual practices and capacity of politicizing the particular issues they have emerged from. These initiatives do not only transport issues that can be deemed narrow and needs-based to the public space, but also visibilize and problematize the links between broader dynamics of injustice, inequality and exclusion, on the one hand, and the particular issues they address through their everyday practices, on the other. Thus we do not understand the political aspect of the new commons as an absolute or a teleological feature, but rather a process of linking issues and creating understandings, forging networks and alliances, and enacting alternative relations and modes of being that are framed and practiced as interventions to disrupt the established trajectories of production, consumption, access and distribution.

An important conundrum is whether these commons will turn into mere tools of satisfying material needs, side-tracking or blunting their oppositional forms of action and their potential role in broader political change; or into service-providing organizations as discussed in section 3 (Mayer, 2000; Uitermark and Nicholls, 2014; Bagguley, 2002). This requires a closer inspection on whether the post-square commons are able to establish synergistic relationships with more contentious forms of action in the longer term (De Moor, 2020). While synergistic relations can be observed between these two forms of action in the period in which fieldwork was conducted in Barcelona (see also Blanco and León, 2017), contentious repertoires of action seem to have partially diminished as a consequence of commons´ forms of action in Athens. In sum, this is an empirical question that calls for further research to scrutinize the conditions enabling a synergistic (versus conflictual) relationship between contention and commoning.

Finally, the new commons' political dimension can also be found in their connection with political movements. The victory of Syriza, for instance, was in part associated with the spreading of commoning projects across Greece (see also Roussos, 2019). Similarly, Barcelona en Comú relied on the social infrastructure created by the Indignados and other movements (see also Gonick, 2017). Yet of course this is no guarantee that political outcomes can be sustained in time, as evidenced by Syriza's failure to live up to the hopes it had aroused (Roussos, 2019) and its electoral defeat.

7.   Conclusions

This article has focused on the conceptualization of the social outcomes of social movements, which we have argued to encompass a panoply of concepts mobilized in social movement studies: alternative action organizations, sustainable community movements, alternative forms of resilience, abeyance structures, free spaces, spillover effects, and submerged networks. We have argued that the category of social outcomes should deserve adequate consideration along with other categories of movements´ outcomes, i.e. cultural, political and biographical for an enriched understanding of movements´ consequences.

This study has maintained that one important characteristic of the movement of the squares can be found in their enhanced ability to create commons – itself a specific type of social outcomes - onto which the movement transmuted in the aftermath of the wave of protest. It has identified the direct (transplantation, ideation and breeding processes) and indirect mechanisms through which commons were forged from the transitional commons and commoning practices of the squares. While indebted to conceptualisations of abeyance structures and free spaces, the commons in this article do not represent a "hibernation" of the movement in a passive stand-by mode (as in the most abeyance literature). On the other hand, the commons concept allows us to better understand (vis-à-vis the free space concept) an important transformation of everyday life granted by the different modes of consumption, production, being-in-common enacted by these alternative structures in a specific type of organizational system.

Our comparative research demonstrated that social movements can be transmuted and spread into the social fabric by consolidating thee precarious transitional commons they produced into more stable commons that aim at reorganizing social (re)production. These social outcomes do not only constitute the "heritage" of mobilizations, but also often operate as bases for new mobilizations and contentious politics. We maintain that the commons emerged from the movement of the squares in Barcelona and Athens are political and politicizing because they are able to politicize the particular issues they emerge from, linking the specific issues, practices and activities they focus on with broader, structural dynamics of injustice, inequality and exclusion, while affecting participants´ everyday life.

The commons which stemmed out of the movement of the squares are certainly not completely novel or radically different from the social outcomes emerged from earlier protest cycles of the 1970s and 1980s in countries such as Germany, France or Italy, or of the alterglobalization movement. They do, however, present important novelties, such as the increased focus on the economic aspect or on some form of production that guarantees either some means of livelihood and self-employment or the project´s economic autonomy— their focus on social provisioning or what Andretta and Guidi (2017) have called political producerism. Their inclusiveness and consistent, proactive engagement with the neighbourhood and city so as to be commons for (rather than merely of) the neighbourhood is another such novelty. Many initiatives that had sprouted out of previous waves of protest (e.g. in the 1970s) may be seen as having turned into mere service-providing organizations, fully integrated into the capitalist system (Uitermark and Nicholls, 2014; Mayer, 2000), and this is indeed a risk of the commons of the movement of the squares. However, it would be wrong to judge the new commons' potential by a pre-defined conception of political success that does not take their specificities nor those of the political-institutional contexts into account. Our argument is not that the commons in our study are revolutionary "hotspots" or panaceas that will unhinge the neoliberal logic, but rather that they merit attention for the

politicization potentialities in terms of subjectivities and social fabric and their connection to other movement outcomes.

Acknowledgments

References

Asara, V. (2020). Untangling the radical imaginaries of the Indignados' movement: Commons, autonomy and ecologism. *Environmental Politics*, DOI: 10.1080/09644016.2020.1773176.

Asara, V. (2019). The Redefinition and Co-Production of Public Services by Urban Movements: The Can Batlló Social Innovation in Barcelona. *PArtecipazione e COnflitto,* 12 (2): 539-565.

Asara, V. (2016) The Indignados as a socio-environmental movement. Framing the crisis and democracy. *Environmental Policy and Governance* 26 (6): 527-542.

Asara, V., G. Kallis (2020). Prefigurative territories: The production of space by the Indignados movement. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*. Paper under review.

Anahita, S. (2009). Nestled into Niches: Prefigurative Communities on Lesbian Land, *Journal of Homosexuality*, 56(6),719-737,

Andretta, M. and R. Guidi (2017). Political consumerism and producerism in times of crisis: A social movement perspective. *PArtecipazione e COnflitto,* 10(1):246-274.

Arampatzi, A. (2017). The spatiality of counter-austerity politics in Athens, Greece: Emergent ´urban solidarity spaces´. *Urban Studies*, 54(9), 2155-2171.

Bagguley; P. (2002). Contemporary British Feminism: A social movement in abeyance?, *Social Movement Studies*, 1(2),169-185.

Blanco, I. and M. León (2017). Social innovation, reciprocity and contentious politics: Facing the socio-urban crisis in Ciutat Meridiana, Barcelona. *Urban Studies,* 54(9),2172-2188.

Blee, K. and V. Taylor. 2002. *Semi-structured interviewing in social movement research* (pp.92-117). In: *Methods of social movements research*, B. Klandermans and S. Staggenborg (eds). London: University of Minnesota Press.

Blühdorn, I. (2017) Post-capitalism, post-growth, postconsumerism? Eco-political hopes beyond sustainability. *Global Discourse,* 7(1):42-61.

Blühdorn, I. (2014) Post-ecologist governmentality: Post-democracy, post-politics and the politics of unsustainability. In: J. Wilson and E. Swyngedouw (eds), *The post-political and its discontents: Spaces of depoliticisation, spectres of radical politics*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Bosi, L. and K. Uba (2009) Introduction: the outcomes of social movements. *Mobilization: An International Journal* 14(4): 409-415

Bosi, L., Giugni, M., Uba, K., 2016. *The Consequences of Social Movements*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Can Batlló (2018) Project 2013-2018. Dossier realitzat per la Comisió d'Estratègia de Can Batlló amb el suport i la feina de tota la comunitat.

Conill, J., Castells, M., Cardenas, A. and Servon, L. 2012. Beyond the crisis: The emergence of alternative economic practices. In: Castells, M., Caraça, J. and Cardoso, G. (eds.) *Aftermath: The Cultures of Economic Crisis.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

D´Alisa, G., F. Forno and S. Maurano (2015) Grassroots (economics) activism in times of crisis: Mapping the redundancy of collective actions. *PArtecipazione e COnflitto*, 8(2):328-342.

De Angelis, M. and Harvie, D. 2014. The Commons, in M. Parker et al. (eds), *The Routledge Companion to Alternative Organizations*, Abington: Routledge, pp. 280-294

De Angelis, M., (2017). *Omnia Sunt Communia. On the Commons and the Transformation to Postcapitalism.* Zed Books. London

Decreus, T., Lievens, M. and Braeckman, A., (2014). Building collective identities: How new social movements try to overcome post-politics. *Parallax,* 20(2), pp.136-148.

Della Porta, D. (2008). Comparative analysis: case-oriented versus variable-oriented researchand. In: D. Della Porta and M. Keating (Eds), *Approaches and methodologies in the social sciences: pluralist approach.* Cambridge University Press.

De Moor, J. (2020). Alternatives to resistance? Comparing depoliticization in two British environmental movement scenes. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 44(1):124-144.

Di Feliciantonio, C. (2017). Spaces of the expelled as spaces of the urban commons? Analysing the re-emergence of squatting initiatives in Rome. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 41(5):708-725.

Dikeç, M., Swyngedouw, E., (2017). Theorizing The Politicizing City. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 41(1):1-18.

Fernàndez, A. and I. Miró (2016) L'economia social i solidària a Barcelona. Comissionat d'Economia Cooperativa, Social i Solidària, Ajuntament de Barcelona.

Fernández-Savater, A., Flesher Fominaya, C, L. Carvalho, Çiğdem, H. Elsadda, W. El-Tamami, P. Horrillo, S. Nanclares, and S. Stavrides. 2017. Life after the squares: reflections on the consequences of the Occupy movements. *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest*, 16, NO. 1,119–151

Flesher Fominaya, C. (2017) European anti-austerity and pro-democracy protests in the wake of the global financial crisis*, Social Movement Studies*, 16(1),1-20.

Flesher Fominaya, C. (2015) Debunking Spontaneity: Spain's 15- M/Indignados as Autonomous Movement. *Social Movement Studies*, 14(2),142-163.

Forno, F., Graziano, P., 2014. Sustainable Community Movement Organisations. *Journal of Consumer Culture,* 14(2):139-157.

Gade, T. (2019). Together all the way? Abeyance and co-optation of Sunni networks in Lebanon. *Social Movement Studies*, 18(1),56-77.

Giugni, M. (2008) Political, Biographical, and Cultural Consequences of Social Movements. *Sociology Compass* 2(5): 1582–1600

Gonick, S. 2017. Indignation and inclusion: activism, difference, and emergent urban politics in postcrash Madrid. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 34(2):209-226.

Hardt, M., Negri, A., 2012. *Declaration.* Self-published and distributed by Argo Navis Author Services.

Karyotis, T. (2018) Beyond hope: prospects for the commons in austerity-stricken Greece. In: Holloway J, Nasioka K and Doulos P (eds.) *Beyond Crisis: After the Collapse of Institutional Hope in Greece, What?* San Francisco: PM Press.

Loukakis, A. (2018) Not Just Solidarity Providers. Investigating the political dimension of Alternative Action Organisations (AAOs) during the economic crisis in Greece. *PArtecipazione e COnflitto,* 11(1),12-37.

Mayer, M. (2013). First world urban activism. *City*, 17(1),5-19.

Mayer, M. (2000). Social movements in European cities: Transitions from the 1970s to the 1990s. In A. Bagnasco and P. Le Galès (eds) *Cities in Contemporary Europe* (pp 131–152). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mayer, D. and N. Whittier (1994). Social movement spillover. *Social Problems*, 41(2),277-298.

Melucci, A.(1996). *Challenging codes. Collective action in the information age.* Cambridge University Press.

Naegler, L. (2018) ´Goldman-Sachs doesn´t care if you raise chicken´: the challenges of resistant prefiguration. *Social Movement Studies*, 17(5),507-523.

Pantazidou, M., 2013. Treading new ground: a changing moment for citizen action in Greece. *Development in Practice* 23 (5–6), 755–770.

Polletta, F. 1999. "Free spaces" in collective action. *Theory and Society*, 28(1),1–38.

Rancière, J. 1999. *Disagreement: Politics and philosophy.* University of Minnesota Press.

Ritchie, J. and J. Lewis. (2003). *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers.* London: Sage.

Roussos, K. 2019. Grassroots collective action within and beyond institutional and state solutions: the (re-)politicization of everyday life in crisis-ridden Greece. *Social Movement Studies* 18(3).

Simsa, R. and M. Totter (2017) Social movement organizations in Spain: Being partial as the prefigurative enactment of social change. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, 12(4)280-296.

Snow, D. (2004), "Social movements as challenges to authority: resistance to an emerging conceptual hegemony. In: Myers, D. and Cress, D. (Ed.) *Authority in Contention. Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change, Vol. 25*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, Bingley.

Solidarity4all, 2014. Building Hope against Fear and Devastation. Available at: https://www.solidarity4all.gr/en/news/solidarity-all-building-hope-against-fear-anddevastation, Accessed date: 1 October 2019.

Staggenborg, S. (1998) Social Movement Communities and Cycles of Protest: The Emergence and Maintenance of a Local Women's Movement. *Social Problems*, 45 (2): 180-204

Staggenborg, S. and V. Taylor (2005). Whatever happened to the women´s movement? *Mobilization: An International Journal*,10(1),37-52.

Stavrides, S. (2016). *Commons space*. Zed Books. London.

Stavrides, S. (2013) *The City of Thresholds*. Trento: Professional Dreamers.

Uitermark, J. and W. Nicholls (2014). From depoliticization to policing: The rise and decline of new social movements in Amsterdam and Paris. *Antipode*, 46(4),970-991.

Taylor, V. (1989). Social Movement Continuity: The Women' s Movement in Abeyance. *American Sociological Review*, 54(5),761–775.

Varvarousis, A. (2020). The rhizomatic expansion of Commoning through social movements. *Ecological Economics*, 171

Varvarousis, A. (2019). Crisis, Liminality and the Decolonization of the Social Imaginary. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 2(3), 493–512.

Varvarousis, A. (2018). Crisis Commons and Liminality: Modern Rituals of Transition in Greece. PhD Thesis

Varvarousis, A., Kallis, G. (2017) Commoning against the crisis. In: Manuel Castells et al. (eds). *Another Economy Is Possible. Culture and Economy in a Time of Crisis*. Cambridge. Polity Press

Varvarousis, A., Temple, N., Galanos, C., Tsitsirigos, G., Bekridaki, G. (2017) *Social and Solidarity Economy Report*. Athens. British Council Publications. Available at: https://www.britishcouncil.org/society/social-enterprise/greece-social-and-solidarity-economy-report

Wilson, J. and E. Swyngedouw. (2014) Seeds of dystopia: Post-politics and the return of the political. In: J. Wilson and E. Swyngedouw (eds), *The post-political and its discontents: Spaces of depoliticisation, spectres of radical politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Yates, L. (2015a) Everyday politics, social practices and movement networks: daily life in Barcelona´s social centres. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 66(2):236-258.

Yates, L. (2015b) Rethinking prefiguration: Alternatives, micro-politics and goals in social movements. *Social Movement Studies*, 14(1),1-21.

Yin, R. (2003). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 3rd edn. London: Sage.

Zamponi, L. and L. Bosi (2018) Politicizing solidarity in times of crisis: The politics of Alternative Action Organizations in Greece, Italy, and Spain. *American Behavioral Scientist* 62(6):796-815.

Zamponi, L. and J. Fernández González (2017) Dissenting youth: how student and youth struggles helped shape anti-austerity mobilisations in Souther Europe. *Social Movement Studies*,16(1),64-81.