Outraged Spatialities:
The Production of Public Space in the *#spanishrevolution*

Álvaro Sevilla-Buitrago[1]

Departamento de Urbanística y Ordenación del Territorio
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
alvaro.sevilla@upm.es

Abstract

The spatial processes deployed by the *15-M* movement in Spain include elements of social change that exceed the limits of conventional politics. Located at a liminal level, these processes operate in the often unnoticed realm of the micropolitics of urban everyday life and the regimes of place that regulate it, providing new criteria for understanding sociospatial and urban phenomena. This article shows how public space, its representations and the spatialities associated with them have served as a support for, have determined and, ultimately, have been reshaped and transformed by the Spanish "indignados" (outraged), in particular in the city and the metropolitan area of Madrid. Drawing on a series of theoretical approaches to the articulation of recent revolts, the deployment of a prefigurative politics and the occupation of public space, I will give an experience-based account of the spatial constitution and effects of these connections in and around Madrid's Puerta del Sol. As a whole, the indignados' occupations and actions provide urban theory with conceptual and practical tools to imagine alternative forms of collective commitment in the production of spaces of hope for social progress and generalized self-management.

Keywords: Indignados, *15-M* movement, public space, spatiality, place regime, politics of scale, right to the city.

Resumen

Los procesos espaciales desencadenados por las recientes protestas urbanas en España incorporan elementos de cambio social que exceden los límites de la política convencional. Situándose en un nivel liminar, estos procesos operan en la esfera inadvertida de las micropolíticas de la vida cotidiana y los regímenes de lugar que la regulan. En sus espacialidades encontramos una serie de claves de reflexión para idear nuevos criterios de comprensión de los fenómenos urbanos y socioespaciales. En este artículo mostraremos el modo en que el espacio urbano —en concreto la ciudad y el área metropolitana de Madrid— y sus representaciones han servido de soporte, han sido empleados, han condicionado y, en última instancia, han sido reconfigurados por el movimiento del *15-M*. Apoyándose en una serie de contribuciones teóricas sobre la articulación entre las recientes revueltas, el despliegue de políticas prefigurativas y la ocupación del espacio público, el trabajo desarrolla una descripción de la constitución y repercusiones espaciales de los campamentos y asambleas en y alrededor de la Puerta del Sol. En conjunto, la experiencia madrileña ofrece a la teoría urbana vías para imaginar otras formas de compromiso colectivo en la producción de espacios de esperanza para el progreso social y la autogestión generalizada.

Palabras clave: Indignados, *15-M*, espacio público, espacialidad, régimen de lugar, política de la escala, derecho a la ciudad.

> For us it's not about *possessing* territory. Rather, it's a matter of increasing the density of the communes, of circulation, and of solidarities to the point that the territory becomes unreadable, opaque to all authority. We don't want to occupy the territory, we want to *be* the territory. (Comité Invisible, 2007:97-8)

Introduction

Although the emergence of the *15-M* movement has been a political event of the first order in Spain, its interest exceeds the boundaries of conventional politics. The *spatiality* of the movement has gone almost unnoticed even though its development directly addresses urban and spatial theory; its complexity and power to unleash changes in social space merit a profound study. Today, even more than two years after the hatching of the movement, the content and political horizon of the *#spanishrevolution* — one of the *hashtags* used by outraged Twitterers — continues to be vague. Nevertheless, the spatial practices and imaginaries deployed by the *indignados* have become consolidated and proven to be yet another of its more successful facets in promoting the spread and organization of the protest.

Such phenomena show why space and the city matter in the formation of a sound social theory. Space — in this case urban public space — is an active container, a device with which and across which *the political* is constructed and enacted. In a contribution to the debate on the 2010-1 world riots and protests, Judith Butler has insisted that "the square and the street are not only the material supports for action, but they themselves are part of any theory of public and corporeal action that we might propose" (Butler, 2011:n.p.). In this article I will show how space — particularly the public space of Madrid and its metropolitan area — has served as a platform for the movement and how it has determined and, simultaneously, been reshaped by the *indignados*.

Spatial regimes in the production of the public realm

I will use a series of recent approaches as a theoretical threshold to expand the horizon of thought, introducing ideas that frame the subsequent description and analysis of the *15-M*'s spaces. In the aforementioned contribution, Butler problematizes the very 'public' character of the space where the protests take place. Far from taking it for granted, Butler suggests that this public condition is in permanent negotiation and considers the demonstrations as an extreme example of this contested constitution: "We miss something of the point of public demonstrations, if we fail to see that the very public character of the space is being disputed and even fought over when these crowds gather" (Butler, 2011:n.p.). Referring to Hannah Arendt's *The Human Condition*, Butler emphasizes the fact that any political action *needs* a 'space of appearance' — a container, a place in which the action comes into being and that predates the constitution of the public realm — and, at the same time, *creates* its own space through the establishment of new relations in the context of pre-existing spaces (Arendt, 1998:198-207).

Similarly, Jacques Rancière has proposed in his recent work a series of perspectives in which *the political* acquires its constitution, among others, through iterative and performative spatial practices that found and enact — but also deny and refute — the meaning of the public realm. Here, too, politics appears when a new spatiality contests the configuration of pre-existing space. Rancière has used the idea of a 'partition of the sensible' (*partage du sensible*) to describe the work of "all the activities which create order by distributing places, names, functions" (Rancière, 1994:173). This distribution is the expression of a police order that seeks to remove the possibility of resistance — the constitutive antagonism of democracy — through an oversaturation of the content of space that prevents (re)appropriation: a totalitarian regime of production of place. But, in spite of these hegemonic aspirations, the spatial closure is neither complete nor perfect. There are always fractures and crevices through which a proper politics can appear again (Rancière, 2010; see also Žižek, 2010:274-8). The moment of this appearance arises when "those who are not equally included in the existing socio-political order, demand their 'right to equality', a demand that both calls the political into being … and exposes the 'wrongs' of the police order" (Swyngedouw, 2011:56).

As we will see when analyzing the *indignados*' spatial practices, this production of a new public space by demonstrations and riots unleashes a wider social and political reconfiguration that alters the conventional structures of our everyday spatialities. Here is Butler once again:

> As much as we must insist on there being material conditions for public assembly and public speech, we have also to ask *how it is that assembly and speech reconfigure the materiality of public space, and produce, or reproduce, the public character of that material environment*. And when crowds move outside the square, to the side street or the back alley, to the neighborhoods where streets are not yet paved, then something more happens. At such a moment, politics is no longer defined as the exclusive business of public sphere distinct from a private one, but it crosses that line again and again, bringing attention to the way that politics is already in the home, or on the street, or in the neighborhood, or indeed in those virtual spaces that are unbound by the architecture of the public square. (Butler, 2011: n.p., my emphasis).

Certainly the space of political appearance is not an empty space; it is not the passive receptacle of human action. It is, on the contrary, an active support, it has agency and it constructs actions in the same way as it is constructed by them. Space is a device that defines our social being and articulates our practices. The political action must be understood not only as a struggle *in* space, but also as a struggle *for* and *with* space, a struggle for the (re)appropriation of the skills, capacities and social capitals to organize it (Lefebvre, 1991:164-8). Crucially, these struggles anticipate the material support they pursue: their social organization founds the spatial justice they are after. It is not only a question of ideals — these become real and materialize in concrete practices. As we will see, the camps of the *15-M* movement, especially that of Madrid, have enacted the network of self-management of basic needs (food distribution, mutual aid, education and culture, organization of space …) that the *indignados* reclaimed for society as a whole. Hence we could speak of an exercise of prefigurative politics (Gordon, 2008:34-40), of autonomous schools of democracy in which "an alliance enacts the social order it seeks to bring about" (Butler, 2011:n.p.).

But this autonomous production of space is neither easy nor straightforward. It needs a previous location to come into being, so it will have to negotiate its evolution in the context of a foreign space, shaped by an antagonistic order. Therefore the spatial dimension of the political action is subject to a dialectic between the production of a new spatial regime by demonstrators and the influence of the built space, of the urban fabric, on them. The new space is constructed against the pre-existing public space, removing its legitimating role as a civic theatre for the established order. However, it is important to consider that the process takes place in the context of such order, so the emergent political action is deeply determined by the landscapes and territories thereof. As well as supporting

the demonstrations, the square and the street also shape the protest, creating tensions as the new spatialization proceeds. As Butler indicates:

> [T]he bodies on the street redeploy the space of appearance in order to contest and negate the existing forms of political legitimacy — and just as they sometimes fill or take over public space, the material history of those structures also work on them, and become part of their very action, remaking a history in the midst of its most concrete and sedimented artifices. (Butler, 2011:n.p.).

Bearing this inertia in mind — this plastic character of the existing city in its interaction with the new uses that people make of it — will allow us to appreciate the extent and depth of the spatial reconfigurations developed by the *indignados*. Moreover, the protests make theoretical contributions such as Butler's incomplete in spite of their interest. Beyond the obvious — and unfortunately more and more frequent — absence of a concrete consideration of the sociological constitution and composition of the political subject that occupies public space, Butler and other thinkers seem to show an excessive fascination with the process of occupying particular physical spaces. However, they do not tackle the real transformation unleashed by the uprisings from 2010 on: the prefiguration of a revolution of *spatiality* itself, a bottom-up transformation of the spatial relations that constitute and regulate our social and political life at the material and imaginary level.[2]

The first steps of the movement

Although the events that created the *15-M* movement were relatively well covered by the international press, I would like to briefly describe what happened in Spain and in particular, in Madrid, during those weeks. Following a series of preliminary demonstrations during the month of April 2011, two recently-created organizations, Juventud Sin Futuro — university students protesting about the difficult economic situation suffered by young people in Spain — and Democracia Real Ya — a group with a wider spectrum protesting against the poverty and corruption of Spanish politicians, the virtual two-party system, the consensus regarding neo-liberal economic reforms and the submittal of crisis policy to the whims of financial markets — called a joint demonstration on Sunday 15 May, one week before the regional and local elections. The protest was a success, and almost

---

[2] On the other hand, Butler denounces the absence of the gender dimension in the study of these phenomena. For example, she criticizes Arendt's masculinisation of political action in public space, the way she maintains the female body in the private realm, in the sphere of care, as the one responsible for fulfilling the tasks of social reproduction. Conversely, it would be male bodies, free from this burden, which have the capacity to appear and intervene in the public square. However, as Cindi Katz (2001) contends, it is precisely the body of social reproduction that is more directly affected by the neoliberal assault on informal modes of life-work — at home or within the community (see also Purcell, 2008). After all, the recent protests in different countries were born precisely within this field of resistance; they appeared in response to the attacks on the spheres of care and education and the onslaught on the access to and production of social resources that ease these tasks. Butler (2001:n.p) says: "[W]e have to not only bring the material urgencies of the body into the square, but make those needs central to the demands of politics". But isn't this precisely just what is happening?

25,000 people took part in more than 50 cities. The demonstration organized in Madrid ended at Puerta del Sol, an emblematic square in the center of the city; minor disturbances broke out at the close of the meeting and 24 demonstrators were arrested. In protest against this and in order to demand their release, dozens of people set up a camp in the square and spent the night there.

The camp was broken up the next day by the police: this was the real start of the revolt. News of the eviction spread on social networks and new actions were spontaneously called. That same evening, more than 5,000 people went to Puerta del Sol to make themselves heard and protest against the police intervention. The crowd continued to concentrate until late and a new, much larger camp was set up during that night. The crowds continued to gather and grow during the following days and the camp increased in size until it occupied practically the whole square, with new camps springing up simultaneously in Barcelona, Valencia, Seville and many other Spanish cities. The motto of *Juventud Sin Futuro* — «no home, no job, no future: no fear» — appeared to have taken root among the demonstrators. Faced with the increasing police presence, the request made by right-wing politicians to 'clean up' the squares in the country and the ban on demonstrations by the judicial body regulating the on-going electoral process — based on its opinion that the movement could influence the decision of voters during the elections of 22 May — the rebels chanted slogans such as «the people's voice is not illegal». As the days passed and the crowds continued to grow, the fear of a new police intervention waned, since the crowds in Puerta del Sol and neighboring streets, which on occasions numbered 10,000, made this impossible.

The day of the election arrived. The repercussion on the results was minimal — the right wing inflicted a historic defeat on the socialdemocratic party, which was hard hit by the economic crisis and abandoned to its fate by traditional voters due to its neoliberal reforms and austerity policies — but the camps continued to exist for another three weeks. During this time, the camp in Puerta del Sol doubled in size, with the organization becoming more and more sophisticated and complex as the movement deployed its own constituent process in space. Specific thematic commissions were established — international affairs, health, environmental crisis, education, cities, etc. — that made use of the adjoining streets and squares for holding their assemblies. An initiative was set up to transfer the movement and debates to other districts of Madrid and cities in the metropolitan region — coordinated by the so-called Popular Assembly of Madrid — with a march to Madrid being organized from the most important Spanish cities.[3] In view of the consolidation of these initiatives for enlarging the space of the movement and of the increasing pressure by local traders and local and regional authorities — both in

---

[3] The dynamic has been reproduced in Madrid and other cities later with the repeated flow of the so called 'citizen's tides' (thematic demonstrations) from the peripheries to the city center, protesting against the attempts to privatize public education and health care, the erosion of social justice and so on: e.g. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wC6XpEvyfRY [accessed: 2/3/2014].

the hands of the conservative party — the General Assembly, responsible for coordinating the decisions of the sub-assemblies within the movement, decided to dismantle the camp, leaving an information point as a physical element of reference, symbolizing the occupation in the center of Spain. The point was removed soon, but in any case the movement had already reached a considerable degree of organization and the *indignados* kept on celebrating periodic assemblies and preparing actions in Madrid and other cities, widening and deepening the virtual exchange and networks until the massive reappearance of the movement a year after its bloom in May 2012, within an even harder and more aggressive political context, with the whole country at the edge of social and economic collapse. Subsequent rallies have met with increasing police violence and the new government's attempt to quell the streets, tightening the legal restraints on demonstrations.[4]

The *indignados* revolutionize social space

But what are the movement's spaces? What is the peculiarity of its spatial practices? The spatialities deployed by the *indignados* are complex and polymorphic, multiplicative, trans-scalar, and irreducible to a uniform logic as a direct result of the plural, spontaneous nature of the demonstrations. Although this situation has on occasions slowed the organization down, it is precisely one of the reasons for their success and survival over time, for the attention they have received from the media and the failure of politicians to understand, establish links with or suffocate the *#spanishrevolution*. These spatial practices have temporarily altered the pre-existing regimes of place and scale, and they have prefigured the path to an alternative urban future (Lefebvre, 2003; Purcell, 2013) — the future of the social protest in Spain will determine whether this was a momentary or permanent achievement.

Of course the most striking aspect of the movement is the occupation and (re)appropriation of public space and its ability to eradicate the commodification and alienation of the city's central places (Sorkin, 1992; Mitchell, 2003; Low & Smith, 2006) for a prolonged period of time. The camps allowed many to discover in the streets a personal but political space, a communal place of their own. The recurring slogan chanted during the first concentrations, «This square is our home!» expresses this aspect to perfection. In the case of Madrid, the camp led to a change from the occasional, hetero-regulated occupation of Puerta del Sol — in addition to its conventional touristic and commercial uses, the square is usually the chosen site for certain authorized demonstrations and concentrations — to another potentially more permanent, self-managed type of occupation. It is worth highlighting the *functional* and *symbolic* dimensions of this occupation. With respect to the first aspect, the occupation was open to many different types of

---

[4] E.g. in the turmoil following the attempt to 'Besiege the Congress' in September 2012: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UDCRgqspmyU [accessed 2/3/2014].

people, but not to all the *activities*. Of course, traffic was interrupted or slowed down during most of the day, and although tourists continued to visit the square, the main force of attraction for them was the event itself, not the shops in Puerta del Sol. This led to protests by retailers, who lost clients, demanded compensation from the government and called for the camp to be evicted on many occasions. In contraposition to this understanding of public space as a mere vehicle of consumption and exchange value, the *indignados* used the zone for a wide array of new realities and processes, as the members of the camp and external groups proposed to carry out new activities which soon accompanied the concentrations and assemblies: for instance, a popular library, a nursery, theatres, an organic market garden, and so on.

On the symbolic plane, the occupation of Puerta del Sol, center of the city and the whole country — the square is the origin of the Spanish main road network — has allowed it to occupy a prominent place in the local and national imagination, for the Spanish and international press. Logically, the media compared the occupation of Puerta del Sol to that of Tahrir Square in Egypt and Syntagma Square in Athens, but there are as many similarities between these cases as there are differences (Hadjimichalis, 2013). They all share the common detonator of a gradual deterioration in the material conditions of social reproduction among the middle and lower classes and differ in the extremely specific political contexts intrinsic to that social and economic decline. However, beyond this obvious comparison, a deeper common thread is quite evident in these experiences; all three transform the conventional regime of place (McDowell, 1999:5) — the situation, content and meaning that certain spaces have and represent in the urban formation — and challenge the established 'partition of the sensible', endorsing Henri Lefebvre's idea according to which the right to the city is expressed, firstly, as the *right to centrality*: the right to occupy central areas, both physically and in terms of the organization and circulation of power, taking the form of a revolutionary program that reclaims the self-management (*autogestion*) of public space (Lefebvre, 2003:150; see also Chatterton, 2010; Goonewardena, 2011). This ever-problematic conception (Marcuse, 2011), takes on a new meaning in these experiences. In Madrid, this program generated its own spatiality, its own centrality. The struggle creates a genuine space of appearance, every "alliance brings about its own location" (Butler, 2011:n.p.). In fact, the occupation of the city center became the opportunity to change what the center of the political space should mean in a democratic society.

Similarly, in a recent intervention Andy Merrifield has stated that "it's not in space that people act: *people become space by acting*" (Merrifield, 2011:475, original emphasis), suggesting the need to break down pre-existing territorial structures. Merrifield invites us to go beyond the concept of the 'right to the city' in order to adopt a global and widespread 'politics of the encounter' that "percolates through the whole social fabric" (Merrifield, 2011:473). Of course in this sense he considers the implicit potentials of mobilization and organization through virtual

online social networks. This leads us to the second aspect to be highlighted in the *#spanishrevolution*. Although it is now almost a common aspect in the discussion of the recent dynamics of social movements, it is necessary to emphasize the massive use of virtual social networks, which allowed the *15-M* movement to be everywhere before physically occupying any space. During May 2011, considering only exchanges in Twitter in Spain, there were more than 580,000 messages related to the *hashtags* of the concentrations, submitted by almost 88,000 users (BIFI, 2011). Even though these figures are significant, the most important aspect was their radically democratic role in mobilizing the movement and organizing it, converting that period into an open process calling for all manner of actions by anonymous users, the eventual success of which was dependent exclusively on the conditions of opportunity on the course of events.

In any case, it is necessary to mention that the Spanish demonstrations — and perhaps this would apply to the Arab Spring too — also showed the limitations and shortcomings of these virtual networks. The latter have most certainly been essential in the calls and dissemination of the former. But the achieved effect requires the physical occupation of public space. These urban moments enact, materialize and push the encounter to levels to which virtual networks cannot aspire. This is just another example of how the given space determines the new one appearing within it. The historical spatial divide between material and virtual is still very wide and perhaps will remain so for the decades to come: when the time comes, it is the streets that continue to attract attention and have the power to give the protest a proper voice. It is public space that provides the opportunity to alter everyday normality, to block certain urban flows, to emerge and occupy the collective imagination. It is in squares that we find the essence of the *event* that virtual social networks support and distribute in a wider and longer revolutionary *sequence* (Swyngedouw & Smith, 2012).

Streets keep on talking, but they do so in a different manner. Virtual social networks have, in fact, contributed to a third spatial transformation — the capacity of the movement to spread — and to one of its most singular characteristics, the rupture of the conventional *scalar regime*: that stratification of social space in a hierarchic vertical order which, in the capitalist system, segments and differentiates social relations so as to reproduce certain patterns of uneven development and the social division of labor (Smith, 1992; Swyngedouw, 1997; Brenner, 2001). The movement congregated more than 70 cities in a virtual space of common participation; in the case of Madrid, the growth and internal organization of the camp took place at the same time as the expansion of its assemblies to other streets and squares in the city center and the transferring of actions to all the city districts and to other townships in the metropolitan region. This simultaneous construction has decentralized the spaces of political activity, gradually doing away with conventional scalar hierarchies. The direct consequence of regaining the right to centrality — the right to occupy the symbolic and functional heart of the city and rewrite its contents, the right to administer and distribute centrality — is the ability

to subvert the scalar division of space, its vertical segmentation. Although Puerta del Sol maintained its symbolic centrality, its political bodies soon began to function on the same level as those established in a virtual forum, on street corners two blocks away from the square, in districts in a more remote part of the city or in a city in another part of the country. A continuous, de-hierarchized but variegated space was being produced, diversified in a multitude of heterogeneous locations. When the center took on a different role with respect to other spaces, this was done for the purpose of accommodating and debating initiatives formulated in other places: consequently, the center of the social space was projected as a non-differentiated site of democratic reception, and not as a stronghold of power from which decisions and rules emanate towards an eternally mute peripheral area.

Lastly, this sociospatial inversion and the dynamics associated with it have given rise to a new social topography — an active counter-topography that, according to Cindi Katz (2001), connects different places where social reproduction is under siege. The result is a volatile production of space that is constantly rewritten through spontaneous practices, sometimes involuntary, sometimes contradictory — especially in the first steps of the movement — but useful in the long term, as far as the efforts of the participants converted the occasional misunderstandings into opportunities for imagining and materializing different actions to those that were planned. These networks have subsequently developed a more precise organization in order to respond to new scenarios and landscapes of protest. This is evident in the proliferation of *escraches* — actions of public denounce held outside politicians' homes or workplaces — and, especially, in the powerful network of resistance against evictions promoted by the Plataforma de Afectados por la Hipoteca (Mortgage Victims' Platform).[5] This collective redefinition of the meaning of places and the way in which we relate to them could have a lasting effect on the manner in which we regard the city and in general, on our sociospatial and political imaginaries and the practices we use to reproduce them.

Conclusions

The influence of physical spaces — in particular public spaces — on our everyday practices and our social imaginations is so deep that it can often prevent us from seeing what is beyond their mere materiality: the structures that govern and articulate these spaces, the spatiality underlying specific locations and guiding our perception of and interaction with them (see also Goonewardena, 2005). These unapparent spatialities incorporate a deliberate arrangement of the regimes of scale and place that determines and regulates our social being and our forms of socialization. As such, they become strategic vectors of power: the more natural and unmediated their properties appear, the more effective they become. The

---

[5]   The network was actually a spin-off of the *15-M* movement. Its actions (e.g. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KTe3Mam-Oew, accessed: 2/3/2014) have met with enthusiastic support from civil society.

'partition of the sensible' to which Rancière refers is, after all, a spatial trap by which the government of subjects is inadvertently transferred to the administration of objects, "an established order of governance with everyone in their 'proper' place in the seemingly natural order of things" (Dikeç, 2005:174).

In any case, we know that this order is precarious and can be altered with a proper political emergence. Rancière himself suggests that the "political action always acts upon the social as the litigious distribution of places and roles" (Rancière, 2003:201), "shif[ing] a body from the place assigned to it or chang[ing] a place's destination" (Rancière, 1998:30) — in other words, producing a space of appearance which prefigures the possibility that all the individuals are counted as equals. The irruption of the *indignados* in the midst of the Spanish local and regional election campaign was one of these moments of emergence in the context of a densely hegemonized public sphere. This appearance broke the codes that dictated how and where the voices of the people could be expressed, what they could say and how they could narrate and represent public space.

In short, we are dealing with actions that deeply modify the spatial *status quo* and exceed the institutionally normalized urban order. In the intervention I mentioned at the beginning of this article, Judith Butler calls them anarchist moments or passages, caught between two political forms: that which collapses and that which is still to come. In fact this judgment repeats the usual tendency to not recognize the riots and protests as full political movements, relegating them to a condition of pre-political moments (Garnier, 1996; 2010). On the contrary, we must defend the plenitude of the *15-M* movement and those spatial processes that made it possible to reshape our everyday spatialities. If we really believe that space is important in understanding our social being then we should recognize the significance of the Spanish camps at several levels:

a) The possibility and consequences of prolonged occupation of public space and the reorganization of its contents and representations, outside the scope of established institutional codes.

b) The relationship of that occupation and organization with the massive use of virtual social networks as a new space for prefigurative political activism and radical democracy.

c) The dialectic between these networks and their specific materialization in physical spatialities and the ability of that dialectic to reshape social space, deploying a bottom-up re-scaling of urban public space.

d) The people's capacity to contest the established regime of place, to produce new sites and identities related to them; in sum, to rewrite urban landscapes through a commitment to social justice, self-management and the deployment of common capacities, without being controlled by planned organizations or hetero-regulated participatory processes.

In my opinion, the transient an-architectures and spaces of the *indignados* suggest the need to review some ideals and guidelines assumed by critical urban theory and sociospatial and political theory. They could be useful in providing new criteria for comprehending urban and sociospatial phenomena and in imagining other forms of commitment to collective efforts aimed at building spaces of hope for social change, self-management and generalized emancipation.

References

Arendt, Hannah. 1998. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

BIFI. 2011. *Estudio sobre las interacciones del 15-M*. [Online] http://15-M.bifi.es/ [accessed: 19-10-2011]

Brenner, Neil. 2001. The limits to scale? Methodological reflections on scalar structuration. *Progress in Human Geography* 25, 591-614.

Butler, Judith. 2011. Bodies in Alliance and the Politics of the Street. *Transversal* 10/11. [Online] http://www.eipcp.net/transversal/1011/butler/en [accessed: 19-10-2011.

Chatterton, Paul. 2010. Autonomy: The Struggle for Survival, Self-Management and the Common. Antipode 42, 897-908.

Comité invisible. 2007. *L'insurrection qui vient*. Paris: La Fabrique.

Dikeç, Mustafa. 2005. Space, Politics and the Political. *Environment & Planning D: Society and Space* 23, 171-188.

Garnier, Jean-Pierre. 1996. *Des barbares dans la cité: de la tyrannie du marché à la violence urbaine*. Paris: Flammarion.

Garnier, Jean-Pierre. 2010. *Une violence éminemment contemporaine: Essais sur la ville, la petite bourgeoisie intellectuelle et l'effacement des classes populaires*. Marseille: Agone.

Goonewardena, Kanishka. 2005. The Urban Sensorium: Space, Ideology and the Aestheticization of Politics. *Antipode* 37, 46–71.

Goonewardena, Kanishka. 2011. Henri Lefebvre y la revolución de la vida cotidiana, la ciudad y el Estado. *Urban* nueva serie 2, 25-39.

Gordon, Uri. 2008. *Anarchy Alive!: Anti-Authoritarian Politics from Practice to Theory*. Sydney: Pluto Press.

Hadjimichalis, Costis. 2013. Luchas urbanas y construcción de redes de solidaridad en Atenas durante la crisis. *Urban* nueva serie 6, 79-97.

Katz, Cindi. 2001. Vagabond Capitalism and the Necessity of Social Reproduction. *Antipode* 33, 709-728.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lefebvre, Henri. 2003. *The Urban Revolution*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Low, Setha & Neil Smith (eds.). 2006. *The politics of public space*. New York: Routledge.

Marcuse, Peter. 2011. ¿Qué derecho para qué ciudad en Lefebvre? *Urban* nueva serie 2, 17-21.

McDowell, Linda. 1999. *Gender, Identity, and Place: Understanding Feminist Geographies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesotta Press.

Merrifield, Andy. 2011. The right to the city and beyond. Notes on a Lefebvrian reconceptualization. *City* 15, 468-476.

Mitchell, Don. 2003. *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space*. New York: Guilford.

Purcell, Mark. 2008. *Recapturing Democracy: Neoliberalization and the Struggle for Alternative Urban Futures*. New York: Routledge.

Purcell, Mark. 2013. *The Down-Deep Delight of Democracy*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Rancière, Jacques. 1994. Post-Democracy, Politics and Philosophy: an interview with Jacques Rancière. *Angelaki* 1, 171-178.

Rancière, Jacques. 1998. *Disagreement*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesotta Press.

Rancière, Jacques. 2003. Politics and Aesthetics: an interview. *Angelaki* 8, 194-211.

Rancière, Jacques. 2010. Ten Theses on Politics. In Rancière, J. *Dissensus. On Politics and Aesthetics*. London: Continuum, 27-44.

Sorkin, Michael, (ed.). 1992. *Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space*. New York: Noonday.

Smith, Neil. 1992. Contours of a Spatialized Politics: Homeless Vehicles and the Production of Geographical Scale. *Social Text*, 33, 54-81.

Swyngedouw, Erik. 1997. Neither global nor local: 'glocalization' and the politics of scale. In K. Cox (ed.) *Spaces of Globalization*. New York: Guilford Press, 137-166.

Swyngedouw, Erik. 2009. The Antinomies of the Postpolitical City: In Search of a Democratic Politics of Environmental Production. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 33, 601-620.

Swyngedouw, Erik. 2011. ¡La Naturaleza no existe! La sostenibilidad como síntoma de una planificación despolitizada. *Urban* nueva serie 1, 41-66.

Swyngedouw, Erik & Neil Smith. 2012. Erik Swyngedouw in conversation with Neil Smith. Seminar at the CUNY Graduate Center, 18 April 2012 [Online] http://vimeo.com/42628112 [accessed: 29-06-2012]

Žižek, Slavoj. 2010. *Living in the End Times*. New York: Verso.