

# 19 **Everyday practices in Greece in the shadow of property**

Urban domination subverted?

*Irene Sotiropoulou*

The more difficult and more disappointing the conditions of life are and the more discouraged the Conscious gets, the more the Shadow is empowered until, finally, its darkness has become overwhelming.

C. Jung (1972: 94)

## **Introduction**

This chapter is a first attempt to explore the stance towards property in urban space adopted by grassroots everyday practices in Greek urban centres. The schemes do not use official currency, and neither do they follow the rule of obligatory (re)payment in kind. The discussion also examines mainstream perceptions of property, because on the basis of those perceptions the sharing practices are attacked, suppressed and accused of illegality.

The research question of this chapter is whether grassroots perceptions and practices about property have any potential to defy or subvert the mainstream private property institutions and the mentalities that are linked to them. The complexity of the issue, as well as the attempt to use psychoanalytical tools to explore collective efforts and arrangements, show that untameness in the city may take various forms, mixing the symbolic with basic needs and the institutional with collective unconscious and conscious behaviours.

Consequently, half of the chapter is dedicated to theory. The next section presents the theoretical framework adopted for the analysis. Given that the use of psychoanalysis in studying economic phenomena is still at experimental stage, the following section contains a number of reflections on my theoretical caveats and the methods I used to access the empirical data. Three contrasting case studies are presented so that we can have a concrete picture of how our analytical tools can give us useful insights on the perceptions of property. Those same case studies are further discussed in the final section with the intention to explore whether grassroots initiatives may offer new thinking and practices in contrast to private property establishment.

## Theoretical background

### *Private property as a patriarchal institution in capitalism*

Private property can be understood as a patriarchal institution, which has been reconstructed through capitalism to support, sustain and promote a set of behaviours which can be performed only by specific people from the general population, and which reinforce the hierarchical superiority those people enjoy within our society. In other words, capitalist private property is not only an institution related to men. It is also a construction in favour of men who are white, middle-class, possibly engaged in entrepreneurial activities, and of course Western European or Anglo-Saxon. These individuals tend to favour their own privilege and the hierarchical system which privileges them (Richardson 2010; Pateman 1988: 60–4, 148–52, 185).

As a result, perceptions of self, freedom and citizenship are built on and around this private property axis, which is sexualized and politicized in such a way that various hierarchies are reproduced and reinforced through the idea that a free man can treat as his private property everything he mixes his effort or works with. Conversely, no person can acquire rights through their personal work and effort unless they are a free man. To this, the class axis adds the fact that people who do not already have private property titles in their hands are unable to acquire property over what they mix their personal effort with. Commodification and privatization are based on this perception: that the private property owner is able, even by contracting for the work of other people, to mix this bought human work with his property and augment his property instead of having the other people establish claims over what they have produced (Bhandar 2011; Mayes 2005; Pateman, 1988: 1–17, 39–153).

No matter how problematic it sounds, the feminization of the working class and of anyone and any social group that is not what capitalist private property describes as an owner proves that the main axis of social inequalities is still that of gender. This means that gender inequality and subordination is reproduced on various levels of economic activity and institutional structures, and it transcends other inequalities, such as class, ethnicity and educational level. In other words, to treat *homo economicus* as the private property owner and producer/entrepreneur means that all people who are not like him are subjected to the binary constructions of patriarchy. If you are not a *homo economicus*, whether you lack the ‘homo’ or the ‘economicus’ part, or both, you enter the economic space as a second-rate citizen.

An additional deeply ingrained assumption within capitalism is that owners of private property do not have any obligations to or (inter)dependencies with society, or social connections to other owners. In economics, this is expressed technically with the term ‘externalities’. Therefore, all social costs of private property and its use by its owner are calculated independently of the enactment

and performance of private property. This is one aspect of the private–public divide, where the private owner is deemed to be self-constrained and independent in theory, but in practice he treats his private property as non-constrained over the commons, and as dependent on the suppression of the other members of society and on the (ab)use of the public or common resources (Agathangelou and Ling 2006; Baland and Francois 2005; Fitzpatrick 2006).

*Private property as the shadow expression of a suppressed archetype*

The second theoretical approach about private property stems from this ambivalent or contradictory aspect of private property. The private property owner is institutionally without dependencies and social bonds, but practically he bases again and again his private income or profit on all the other people who produce but cannot acquire property over their effort, given that they are not already property owners. His social bonds establish and reinforce inequalities and exploitation, which are full of deprivation and violence if seen from the point of view of the non-owners (Pateman 1988: 39–115).

On a collective level, the property institution is part of an economic structure which is based on scarcity and greed. Private property is never enough if freedom is constructed through owning things, particularly if each private property has its individual and collective externalities, passed on to other members of society and the public or common spaces and resources. Then, owners and non-owners are forced to seek private property, obviously with much better results for the former than for the latter. And if private property is never enough, then land and urban space are never enough either, no matter what the size of the population is or whether humans have certain needs for social survival and reproduction which cannot exceed certain levels imposed by their mere biology.

However, instead of resolving the contradictions which lead to so much poverty and exploitation, it seems that people are more prone to enhance the contradictions and perform them again and again. To understand this effect over people's behaviour and how the private property institution might influence their perceptions and economic activities, I use B. Lietaer's adaptation of Jungian analysis theory to economic issues (2011). Lietaer explains how the suppression of women and of an archetype directly connected to them (the archetype of mother goddess) in our society leads to behaviours which tend to reinforce economic problems at the expense not only of women, but of all people who are less advantaged in terms of power and/or finances. This Jungian analysis shows that economic institutions, patriarchy and economic injustice are intertwined and form a trap for all of us, programming our behaviour so that we remain in the trap and reinforce those same institutions that trap us.

The symbol of mother goddess (and the women behind it) is the archetype which mostly affects our productive activities or our economic life in its broad sense. A suppressed archetype, just like any other major symbol of human societies, cannot disappear, but turns into its shadows – that is, its negative, aggressive and anti-social alter ego. In other words, it is transformed within the collective

psyche (and in individual psyches too) into negative aspects of will which cannot be avoided by people and societies, but affect them deeply and unconsciously. Sometimes there are completely destructive results because those suppressed psychic forces are uncontrollable (Jung 1980: 18–103; 1988: 17–63). Then, a suppressed mother goddess becomes either a condition of scarcity or a condition of greed (Lietaer 2011: 55–121, 133–9, 366–87; Jung 1972: 94–5). It seems that in a crumbling capitalist patriarchy, both scarcity and greed can coexist at the same time, in the same economy.

### **Theoretical caveats and methods used for this project**

In terms of typical private property rules, there is no need for authorities to suppress the two initiatives I present in my first two case studies, as they do not defy private property directly and turn to common spaces for their activities to take place. While it could be argued that such collective activities are practised by a marginal group of people in comparison with the total population of the urban areas examined, I believe their analysis can be illuminating. In other words, my intention here is to use the theoretical approach outlined in the previous section in order to examine why people undertake such initiatives, and why public authorities and individuals appear to be compelled to try to ban or expel them from public space.

#### ***Theoretical caveats***

To analyse my case studies, I used a feminist critique of property and the Jungian analysis of capitalism, as an analysis of a suppressed feminine archetype. I hope both theoretical approaches complement each other, in the sense that the first describes the situation as it is and the second explains forces which work against or for collective efforts to supersede capitalist problems.

Such an approach comes, however, with a number of risks. My worries lie particularly with the second approach: that is, with the use of psychoanalysis to understand capitalist economic activity and its alternatives. First, the last thing I want is to depoliticize my topic, much less to make it a vague new age discussion about new consciousness and an individualist stance in the face of collective problems. Second, I am aware that Jung's theory, just like all psychological theories, is embedded in patriarchy, just like all the episteme we have in academia. I do not want to replicate stereotypes about which activity or social stance is feminine and what is masculine – something that is not easy to avoid when using archetypes. Third, no matter whether I think that stereotyping genders does not help in any analysis, I cannot close my eyes in the face of a situation where people still live collectively through such stereotypes. Much less can I close my eyes to the fact that the archetypes we have are ones that have been embedded for thousands of years in patriarchy (San Miguel 2011). Therefore, bringing into consciousness archetypes and shadows could be seen as a first step to being able to escape collectively from the trap of the unconscious (Jung 1912: 163–230).

Fourth, social struggles not only include psychological conditions, but also include stereotypes, either as points to fight against, or as ideas to develop and use in movements and political debates. To ignore this aspect of a struggle does not make the analysis more militant; rather it makes it more shallow (Beverley 2004; Icaza and Vazquez 2013). Fifth, to my knowledge, even if we accept the Marxist distinction that our capitalist societies consist of production relations which create the base structure on the one hand and cultural constructions like ideas or artistic expression which are the social superstructure on the other hand, there is no satisfactory explanation on how base structures and superstructures interact. In other words, how are people affected by production relations and how do they then construct their ideas and arts accordingly? And if we are trapped into base and super-structure spaces, can we create new base/infra-structures if the existing ones are inescapable in mental and psychic terms? The Jungian school has worked extensively on the relationships between collective and individual psychology, and even if we could say that the direct use in economics of this school's work might be quite risky, we cannot refine this theory to discuss the economy unless we actually use this theory to discuss the economy.

Finally, just like all academic explorations, I expect this one to be refined, corrected or rejected by further research in the future. For this reason, and taking into consideration the aforementioned caveats, I take a number of analytical risks as I believe it is necessary to challenge the privatization and masculinization discourses here and now (Talpade Mohanty 2002).

### *Methods used*

In constructing this chapter, I decided to use concrete examples and data originating in my own empirical research to understand the implications of the theoretical arguments previously outlined, with the intention of raising more elaborate questions for further research.

In the discussion that follows, I have used two case studies for which I have collected data through field observation and participation between 2011 and 2013. The schemes that are the subject of both case studies have also their own Facebook pages and member listings from which I obtained regular information on their activities. In addition, I regularly have free discussions with people who participate in these schemes, not only concerning problems arising from the function of the schemes, but also with reference to general issues in Greek society and economy which affect the schemes and their members.

I have made extensive use of internet tools and Facebook discussions not only because the scheme members use those tools for their internal issues, but also because negotiation and debate with local authorities and private businesses takes place through mass media and online/social media. The use of the internet permitted me to have a shadow case: in other words, to have data available from extensive public debates concerning a gentrification project where artists participate and defend the gentrification policies. This third case epitomizes a number of key aspects underpinning everyday discursive practices on private property. As such,

this case offers an opportunity to explore the contrast with the everyday practices examined through my initial two case studies.

I have always conducted my empirical research in the open, which means that I announce my researcher identity so that collectives and their members are aware of my work. The initiatives described in the first two case studies are groups with which I have had regular collaboration and discussions and which have been very positive to my participating and observing. Public debates are accessible to all, while if a debate takes place on an individual Facebook wall, even if this is public, I also announce that I am researching the topic and I am interested in the discussion for research purposes. However, it is a basic principle that I maintain the confidentiality required to protect individuals and communities. I access the material through my Facebook research account, where people can access my name, contact details and writings.

## **The case studies**

### *Case study 1: Sharing food in a small city*

The first case study concerns a social kitchen which emerged from the ‘movement of the squares’<sup>1</sup> in the summer of 2011 in a small city in Greece, a long way from Athens. It is run and supported by individuals, local food producers and inhabitants of the city who contribute work, money and raw food, or run artistic events to raise money to buy food for the kitchen. The kitchen group uses one room for the purpose of food sharing, communal meals and the gatherings of the social kitchen assembly. This is located at the back of the downtown school building complex, but is independent of the rest of the complex.

The meals are not cooked in that room, except in emergencies. Many people have their meal delivered to them, and therefore only some of the people benefiting from this scheme actually eat in the room. Only one meal is served each day, and in total more than 200 households receive a meal every evening. To avoid disturbances to the commercial stores which are located on the same street, the organizers share food after 20.30 in the evening, and the meal is served in the room after 21.00.

However, the shop owners in the area have not been happy with this arrangement. They have complained publicly many times that the social kitchen should not be in this location, as people who wait outside could disturb their business and discourage locals and tourists from shopping. The shop owners found official support from the local chamber of commerce and the city mayor. Both pressed to have the kitchen relocated to a public building well outside the town centre (which would make this scheme less accessible to those who need it most). However, plans to relocate the kitchen did not succeed despite the claim made by the chamber and the mayor that the kitchen disturbed the happy celebratory atmosphere of the street. The shop owners then blamed two thefts that had happened in the area on the social kitchen and the people who receive meals there. In reality it was very unlikely that any illegal act would have taken place during the hours when the

kitchen is open (around 20.30–22.30) because there are plenty of people around at that time, and they would have noticed any activity of that kind.

### ***Case study 2: Sharing used goods in Athens***

The second case study concerns a regular free-exchange bazaar, a kind of initiative which also emerged from the ‘movement of squares’ in the summer of 2011. This is a give-and-take gathering which takes place regularly at a designated public place in Athens. People bring and give for free unused and unwanted items, and take what they need out of the things other people have contributed to the bazaar (Sotiropoulou 2012: 44–6). This bazaar is run by a citizens’ assembly, and it has been organized many times over about two years in Syntagma Square, which is the central downtown square of Athens.

Problems with the local mayor started as far back as late 2012. The bazaar plan to hold a New Year’s Eve event was suspended because the city council organized a charity event with the same purpose in Syntagma Square. Apart from the obvious crowding out of the bazaar organizers by the official charity, the main difference was that those organizing the free-exchange bazaar did not perceive the activity as charity, but as an act of solidarity. In contrast, the official event was an explicitly charitable venture, directly based on the discourse that ‘rich people give to the poor’.

In late April 2013, the Athens Municipal Police forced the bazaar organizers to cancel their next planned bazaar and retrieve the goods that had already been accumulated in Syntagma Square. These consisted primarily of second-hand books, which were transferred to an artists’ squat near Syntagma Square. After this incident, the bazaar never took place in the square again.

The mayor of Athens justified this action by claiming that the square is the property of all citizens and that the organizers did not have a permit to hold a bazaar there. (Of course, no permit would have been granted for a bazaar had they applied for one.) Syntagma Square is well known as a downtown meeting place and a site of political struggle. It is situated in one of the main commercial areas in Athens, and is also a space where non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and also private companies can set up kiosks to promote their services. Many private companies use the subway entrance in the square as a location to give away leaflets, offers and sample products. None of those activities has been considered as a trespass against citizens’ property, and the mayor has not as yet replied to citizens’ questions about whether these activities all had the necessary permits.

By contrast, in the case of the free-exchange bazaar, the mayor declared that he would not tolerate anomie, while portraying the exchange of books in a public space as an occupation of the square. This means that, in effect, the ban applied only to non-commercial free-exchange but not to the established commercial activity that takes place in the square. In other words, what became questioned through this conflict was whether people can collectively exchange things with each other for free in a public space.

### ***Case study 3: Nothing belongs to the people?***

The third case study emerged quite late, in early September 2013, when I had already written the first draft of this chapter, and is related to an artistic project and real estate development plan in one of the oldest and most disadvantaged neighbourhoods of downtown Athens. This area is undergoing gentrification, with real estate investors and companies showing an increasing interest in investing there. The artistic project was one of the first to be openly and privately funded by a real estate company that had bought properties in the area.

I decided to include this case study for a number of reasons. It is clear that the poverty and the poor people of the area are considered ‘the problem’ for any revitalization of the neighbourhood by the municipality who sent the police and by the real estate investors of the area who demanded such handling (Chatzistefanou 2013). The gentrification requires police action against the poor people who live and work in the area, usually under very bad conditions. My main reason, though, was that some of the organizers of the artistic project publicly defended the project in online debates using the discourse of private property. In particular, they insisted that the poor people who live around this area were degrading the property and the work embedded in the artistic private spaces.

One of the organizers complained publicly about homeless poor people living on the streets and against sex workers working in the same area where the artistic event is taking place. She clearly did not like their lifestyle, although she focused on issues of hygiene. Another organizer wrote in public that she would be happy to see the poor homeless people persecuted and displaced to other areas. Nevertheless, I stuck with the case once I read the written statement of another organizer that ‘nothing belongs to the “people” (and to their beloved “immigrants”), much less in the name of their misery, and nothing belongs to Art in the name of Art’.

I included this case study as a shadow case, in the sense of the Jungian shadow of archetypes (Jung 1972: 94–5, Lietaer 2011: 37–54, 119–21). In other words I treated it as an opposite, or as the mentality against which the organizers in the first two case studies try to fight back. That is, they try to stand against the prevailing power of private property in structuring public space, or at least this is what they differentiate themselves from. The organizers of the artistic event (all the three who publicly expressed such views were women) were furious with poor people because they used the streets and the public space to live in, while the private property owners needed that same public space to make their private business and space accessible to the wider public, sponsors and the mass media.

### **Beyond property in urban space?**

#### ***Private property’s aggressiveness towards non-property-demanding practices***

It seems that, in general, the private/public divide still works for private companies and businesses. Private property is private, while public property serves



profit-making private agents (Atkinson 2003). This stance has been adopted by the local authorities in all three case studies: they seem to support the idea that public space is better fitted to be used by private, often profit-making, businesses rather than by all city dwellers. This stance is also very problematic in practice, because the commons and public resources are in every community the last resort of the least advantaged who in many cases face not only poverty, but also gendered poverty (Bayat 2000; Baland and Francois 2005; Platteau 2006; see also chapter 15 by Manase Chiwese).

Therefore, the property discourse works both as public property and as private property, against the public spaces and urban commons (Zick 2006) and, in real terms, against those people and/or groups who have no property of their own or have very limited material resources within the urban space (Atkinson 2003). As a result, the contrast becomes evident between, on the one hand, institutional and legal rights which frame social relations through the paradigm of property, and on the other hand, the grassroots perceptions of using urban space, which implicitly or explicitly reject such paradigms.

The three case studies also make evident that the policy summarized as 'there is no space' for grassroots initiatives and everyday survival enforces the constructed scarcity of urban space, which in turn is linked to the shadow archetype of the suppressed producer (mother goddess). I have already mentioned in the theoretical section how the archetype of mother goddess is the archetype of producers, and what its suppression means for our societies. The social kitchen and the free bazaar shake up our programmed behaviour to seek property and entitlement for everything: anyone, irrespective of their economic or political status, can participate in one way or another in the sharing. Contrary to this, the people who run the gentrification artistic project perceive that there is not enough urban space for all, much less enough for the most disadvantaged.

As a result, even if practices like the ones described in the first two case studies might not have emerged as a direct resistance to capitalism, they might form a type of deep resistance to capitalism and patriarchy, and to all those connotations working together in favour of an old and complex system of injustice. Such practices are negotiated and persist, even when displaced, without arguments over property entitlement. They are at the same time a practical attempt to de-stereotype poor people and all activity that takes place without the rule of obligatory payment or reciprocity. They decolonize alternative practices of resource use and sharing from being signs of poverty, ignorance and marginal lifestyles (Thelen 2011), (re)constructing them as signs of abundance, inventive thinking and solidarity among different people and social groups. In other words, the two first case studies reveal that abundance exists where poverty does not, making possible such a thing as a free meal and a free book (Lietaer 2011: 55–126).

At the same time, we can see from all the case studies that the shadowy property archetype continues to exert aggression and to expand to colonize every aspect of associational urban life. Capitalism displaces people in the city and suppresses collective coping strategies attempting to recolonize it, both as living proofs of lower status or even as activity which devalues and destabilizes

the prosperity of privatized urban space. The persecution of such practices takes place through property discourse and violence institutions (typically the state or municipal police), and it in the process reproduces and increases poverty and scarcity (Atkinson 2003).

First, we need to take into account the systemic violence by property owners using a public discourse of 'being attacked' by the poor people who just use the urban space for dwelling or survival. Second, we need to notice the support this discourse receives from official associations and authorities (Blomley 2003; Garnett 2009). Both aspects combined make us see that private property becomes weirdly, incommensurately aggressive to people and activities which apparently do not demand or attack property. This is increasingly the case in cities, where the commodification and privatization of space and life often reaches its most overt and intolerant expression.

### ***The revival of a suppressed archetype as possible collective subversion of private property***

What could be underneath this aggressiveness? As already mentioned, *homo economicus* and privatization are institutionally normalized shadows which attack humans, urban space and communities under the TINA (there is no alternative) assumption of neoliberal policies. Every practice that conscientiously revives the suppressed archetype of compassion, creativity, sharing, abundance, sociality and justice without entitlement and ownership shakes the shadow (suppression of the archetype) and disturbs the psychological programming that capitalism and private property institutions have imposed over the urban space and its inhabitants.

However, just as material claims over the communal resources are not enough to achieve communal life, it also takes loads of collective conscientious effort to refurbish, develop and free the archetypes that are not shadowy and aggressive (Jung 1972: 36–97). The extremity of official retribution and persecution towards those practices mirrors some very interesting features of the grassroots sharing schemes:

- *Scarcity and greed as institutional results of private property.* A first conclusion is that grassroots sharing schemes reveal that there is some potential to reverse the situation of believing that scarcity and greed are normal behaviours or human instincts against which it is impossible to fight (Lietaer 2011: 345–92). Both the social kitchen and free-exchange bazaar case studies expose how scarcity and greed are institutionally created and sustained. The third (shadow) case study shows that the perception of public space as something that should serve private property and its owners is not based on any instinct but on the deeply ingrained archetype of private property itself. The tautology which is implied in the third case study discourse is that 'as a private property owner I have the right to decide about public property too, and this right does not exist for the people who have no private property in the area where I have private property'. This tautology or circular argument

reveals the class aggressiveness that can be publicly and unapologetically exerted in the public domain, and also how and why property owners feel entitled to ask for more rights over the rest of urban dwellers.

- *The practicality of small, grassroots, marginal experiments.* A second observation emanating from the previous analysis is that grassroots initiatives which are organized beyond institutional structures and beyond property agreements seem to have the potential for new conditions to be created for social and economic collective action (Fafchamps 1992; see also chapter 20 by Ferne Edwards). Food is secured for people in the first case study. This does not only ensure their survival within a framework of harsh capitalist conditions, no matter whether they are examples of *homo economicus* or not; it also reinforces their potential to think of resources and human effort in a way far from the individualist approach of the ‘survival of the fittest’ and ‘the winner takes all’. The first two case studies show that reproduction of humane living conditions stems from collective arrangements that function beyond strict reciprocity which is actually linked to the ideas that what we need to reproduce ourselves as social beings (food, books, etc.) is scarce and that all humans are greedy if they are not restrained by a pay-back rule. Securing this biological and social reproduction requires complex arrangements that small experiments can try to improve and educate communities about (Weiner 1980). As argued by Jung (1972: 94), securing a main reproduction resource every day creates a collective condition where the collective shadow of scarcity is gradually disempowered.
- *Private property cannot really work if it is not absolute.* Privatization of everything is ideally what capitalism (and the suppressed shadowy producer archetype) wants (Demsetz 1964; Webster 2007). The case studies analysed indicate that total privatization is not only about destroying the lives of humans and natural resources, but also about eliminating any human creativity which might be able to resist this absolutism. Public spaces are then renamed and reconstructed as addenda to private property, and they get privatized in the name of the people who cannot access them. The negative stance adopted by the authorities and private business, and their discourse in all three cases, show that even small-scale demonstrations that people can survive in many ways other than by negotiating with private owners can be detrimental to the capitalist privatization project.
- While privatization of urban space expands, *the free archetype of the mother goddess who is not a private property owner is remembered and practised.* According to the Jungian analysis, the archetype re-emerges not only to reverse destruction but to create from scratch new resources, spaces and communities (Lietaer 2011: 55–139). Women prevail in this type of grassroots practices, in the first two case studies as both members and coordinators, and so do they in most similar schemes across Greek cities (Sotiropoulou 2014). The interesting thing is that in the third case study, the ideology of

aggressive property ownership was also promoted by women [artists running the artistic event]. However, just as capitalist patriarchy is not only about suppressing women and people from outside Europe, the mother goddess archetype of prosperity and abundance refers to all people, regardless of their gender. While private property attempts to eliminate the inventiveness and the resources of people trying to survive, the ideas that stand for collective arrangements based on common resources and spaces proliferate and become more resilient than expected.

## **Conclusion**

Returning to the title of this chapter, it could be argued that subversion is too narrow a notion to describe social forces and everyday practices working outside the paradigm of private property in contemporary cities. Moreover, it might be premature to put this label on the grassroots everyday sharing schemes analysed in this chapter. Nevertheless, the emergence of abundance, non-property-sharing and feminine archetype practices such as the ones explored here show that those same practices are not for mere survival only. The people of the schemes negotiate and resist publicly the property discourse, showing that what they do exceeds the limits of property thinking and the institutional frameworks which regulate public space and other commons within cities.

Whether such practices will eventually become subversive in the future against the shadows and capitalism itself is not known. That is of course the very nature of the ‘untamed’, which means that control by the powerful is not entirely succeeding in the first place, without, at the same time, anyone being able to foresee what the resisting groups will decide to do after that. Further research could explore and reveal their potential, or at least it could refuse to turn a blind eye to the attacks those practices face and to the reasons for those attacks.

## **Acknowledgements**

I am grateful to the people who run and participate in the social kitchen and the free-exchange bazaar, Mr Panagiotis Koustas who brought into my attention the public online discussion concerning the banning of the free bazaar, and Mr Panagiotis Chatzistefanou and his Facebook page guests for their extensive debates on gentrification. I would like to thank all teachers and fellows from the Quito WSS workshop, particularly the Quito WSS Freeing Alternatives group, the group leader Ferne Edwards, the group editor Adriana Allen, our editing coordinator Sharon Verwoerd and our language editor Susan Curran for giving generously the inspiration for this topic, their comments, support and ideas. The data concerning the social kitchen was gathered for a team research project titled ‘Covering immediate needs with solidarity economy and redefining the role of trade unions’, conducted for and funded by the Labour Institute of Athens.

## Note

1 In late May and the entire summer of 2011, people were gathering in the main square of big cities in Greece demanding the cancellation of austerity policies, discussing alternatives, organizing demonstrations and other events, and opening the political space to people who were until then quite far from collective efforts. The entire movement has been called the 'movement of the squares', and concerning Athens it has been brutally suppressed. By the end of summer 2011 the entire effort started to mutate into other collective initiatives.

## References

- Agathangelou, A. M. and Ling, L. H. M. 2006. Fear and property: why a liberal social ontology fails postcolonial states. International Affairs Working Paper 2006–07. Paper for a panel on 'Contesting modern state: stateness in the postcolonial world', International Studies Association, 22–26 March 2006, San Diego, CA.
- Atkinson, R. 2003. Domestication by cappuccino or a revenge on urban space? Control and empowerment in the management of public spaces. *Urban Studies*, 40(9): 1829–43.
- Baland, J.-M. and François, P. 2005. Commons as insurance and the welfare impact of privatization. *Journal of Public Economics*, 89: 211–31.
- Bayat, A. 2000. From 'dangerous classes' to 'quiet rebels' – politics of the urban subaltern in the urban South. *International Sociology*, 15(3): 533–57.
- Beverley, J. 2004. El subalterno y los limites del saber academico. *Revista Actual Marx*, 2 (August), trans. M. Beiza and S. Villalobos-Ruminott.
- Bhandar, B. 2011. Plasticity and post-colonial recognition: 'owning, knowing and being'. *Law Critique*, 22: 227–49.
- Blomley, N. 2003. Law, property and the geography of violence: the frontier, the survey and the grid. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 93(1): 121–41.
- Chatzistefanou, P. 2013. [The shame that is self-named contemporary art stage in Greece], IEFimerida online magazine, 15.10.2013, <http://www.iefimerida.gr>
- Demsetz, H. 1964. The exchange and enforcement of property rights. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 7 (October): 11–26.
- Fafchamps, M. 1992. Solidarity networks in preindustrial societies: rational peasants with a moral economy. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 41(1): 147–74.
- Fitzpatrick, D. 2006. Evolution and chaos in property rights systems: the Third World tragedy of contested access. *Yale Law Journal*, 155: 996–1048.
- Garnett, N. S. 2009. Private norms and public spaces. *William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal*, 18(1), Article 7: 183–98.
- Icaza, R. and Vazquez, R. 2013. Social struggles as epistemic struggles. *Development and Change*, 44(3): 683–704.
- Jung, C. 1912. *« » . [Analytical Psychology: I – Psychology of the Unconscious, II – Relations Between Ego and Unconscious] . . μ μ . Athens: [Govosti Publishing].*
- 1972. *[The Integration of the Personality]* . . Athens.
- 1980. *μ : . μ : . μ . . Athens: [Arsenidi Publishing].*

- 1988. — , μ , [Four Archetypes – Mother, Rebirth, Spirit, Trickster]. . Athens: μ [Iamvlihos Publishing].
- Liettaer, B. 2011. *Au Coeur de la monnaie – Systemes monetaires, inconscient collectif, archetypes et taboos*, trans. M. Ickx. Gap, France: Editions Yves Michel.
- Mayes, E. 2005. Private property, the private subject and women – can women truly be owners of capital? In: M. Albertson Fineman and T. Dougherty (eds), *Feminism Confronts Homo Economicus – Gender, Law and Society*. Ithaca, NY, and London: Cornell University Press, pp. 117–128.
- Pateman, C. 1988. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Platteau, J.-P. 2006. Solidarity norms and institutions in village societies: static and dynamic considerations. In: S. Kolm and J. Mercier-Ythier (eds), *Handbook on Gift Giving, Reciprocity and Altruism*. North Holland: Elsevier.
- Richardson, J. 2010. Feminism, property in the person and concepts of self. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 12: 56–71.
- San Miguel, P. 2011. Sobre el subalterno, su conocimiento (local y global), su ‘traductor’ y el exotismo. *A Contra Corriente – Una revista de historia social literatura de America Latina*, 8(2): 298–310.
- Sotiropoulou, I. 2012. *Exchange Networks and Parallel Currencies in Greece: Theoretical Approaches and the Case of Greece*. PhD dissertation, Department of Economics, University of Crete.
- 2014. Women in alternative economy – or, what do women do without official currency? *Women’s Studies International Forum*, 47: 339–348.
- Talpade Mohanty, C. 2002. ‘Under Western Eyes’ revisited: feminist solidarity through anticapitalist struggles. *Signs*, 28(2): 499–538.
- Thelen, T. 2011. Shortage, fuzzy property and other dead ends in the anthropological analysis of (post)socialism. *Critique of Anthropology*, 31(1): 43–61.
- Webster, C. 2007. Property right, public space and urban design. *Town Planning Review*, 78(1): 81–101.
- Weiner, A. 1980. Reproduction: a replacement for reciprocity. *American Ethnologist*, 7(1): 71–85.
- Zick, T. 2006. Property, place and public discourse. *Washington University Journal of Law and Policy*, 21: 173–223.