

Miguel A. Martínez
miguelam@cps.ucm.es

Paper presented at the International RC21 conference 2011 [The struggle to belong. Dealing with diversity in 21st century urban settings. Amsterdam, 7-9 July 2011]

**The Squatters' Movement in Europe:
A Durable Struggle for Social Autonomy in Urban Politics**

Abstract

Squatting empty properties for living or to develop public activities has lasted in European cities for more than three decades. Although local and national contexts differ significantly, there are also some general trends and patterns that deserve careful attention. When squatting occasionally appears in public debates, controversy is generated and many gaps open between academic, social and political perceptions. In this article I use evidence from several European cities to argue that the squatters' movement has produced an original impact in urban politics. The main feature of this impact has been to legitimate a relatively wide autonomous and mainly non-institutional mode of citizen participation, protest and self-management. How has this been possible? Which are the specific contributions made by this urban movement? These are questions that both scholars and activists continuously claim to be relevant, so that this research attempts to offer some general answers based on detailed comparisons and experiences.

Key words

Squatting, urban movements, urban politics, Europe

Introduction

The occupation of empty buildings and houses in order to satisfy housing needs or to develop social activities, has been a widely spread practice all over Europe since the 1970s, although it also occurred occasionally in the past (Bailey 1973, Wates et al. 1980, Colin 2010). Various authors identified this wave of squatting during the last four decades as a new urban movement (Lowe 1986, Ruggiero 2000, Pruijt 2003, Martinez 2007) rather than as isolated social practices characterised by: a) its mostly illegal nature (squatting as a violation of private property); b) the subcultural aspects of squatters' dress, discourse and lifestyle; and c) exclusively involving youngsters.

In the next sections I shall describe some of the most salient features of the squatters' movement in order to distinguish it from other urban movements. An early transnational orientation and regular connections among squatters all over Europe indicate broader motivations than those of the movements exclusively attached to local politics. As a matter of fact, political radicalism (made up of leftist, autonomist and libertarian principles) has fed multiple fields of expression and protest beyond the squatting of empty buildings. The strong emphasis that squatters put on their autonomous way of involvement in urban politics and affairs (Katsiaficas 2006) will be referred to as a crucial contribution to the experience of urban movements.

Instead of looking at the specific unintended consequences of squatting in some processes of urban renewal and gentrification (Uitermark 2004a, Holm and Kuhn 2010), or at other internal contradictions in terms of segregation, the reproduction of inequalities and the tendencies to self-ghettoization (Lowe 1986, Adilkno 1994, Martinez 2002, Owens 2009, Aguilera 2010), in this paper I will explain the development of European squatting as a paradigmatic autonomous urban movement according to two basic sets of socio-spatial relations. On the one hand, I will focus on the conditions of possibility that mainly made squatting possible. On the other hand, I will discuss the most prominent social *benefits*, among other impacts, squatting has produced (and still produces) for both the people involved and for urban politics in general.

The purpose of this research is to identify general trends and similar socio-spatial dynamics among the experiences of squatters in different European cities. Given the constraints of the present synthetic account, I do not pretend to draw a full picture of squatting in Europe, although a systematic comparison of particular aspects had been necessarily underlying this endeavour. Far

away from avoiding a critical approach to squatting, the emphasis on those two specific questions is due to the political debates currently going on in different countries, these facing either the last attempts to ban squatting where it was legal (The Netherlands and UK) or the persistent initiatives of squatting where it remains illegal.

As we shall see later, squatting as a movement involves mainly the constitution of squatted social centres and (usually collective) squatted homes in urban settings, though rural and occasional squatting are sometimes closely related to the former. Previous research (Pruijt 2004) have distinguished five general types of squatting in which 'political squatting' appears as only one of the possible configurations. In this paper I try to go a step further. By focusing on the particular beneficial impacts of squatting I suggest that they can be achieved, with different proportions and combinations, at any general type of squatting. In addition, I consider that the squatted social centres had played a key political role in the squatting movement of any European city in which squatting has been relevant¹. This means that they served as an essential socio-spatial infrastructure for the coordination and public expression of the squatting movement as a political urban agent, although some non-squatted social centres helped squatting at large too. Nonetheless, I contend that squatted houses just for living were also basic resources for many activists or turned dwellers into activists, thus establishing political networks able to assemble the different configurations of squatting.

A short remark on methodology: I have been researching on squatting since 1998 (initially in Spain, but also in many European cities along the years), collecting documents, interviewing activists, attending activities in squats and participating myself as an activist in several squatted social centres. I contributed to launch the activist-research network SQEK (Squatting Europe Kollektive) who started to hold meetings in 2009 and is still very active after seven encounters (Madrid, Milan, London, Berlin, Paris, Amsterdam and Copenhagen). This group includes more than 40 members with different profiles. The research made by them is presented and discussed at the regular meetings, these being also excellent opportunities to visit local squats, to talk to activists and to know better specific stories and circumstances. The first publication of SQEK was both a political manifesto and a research agenda (www.acme-journal.org/vol9/SQEKeng2010.pdf), and the group is also promoting the distribution of articles around squatting. The SQEK meetings, then, provided me

1 Contentious politics (Tarrow 1998), agonistic dissent (Mouffe 1993) and the struggle for a just city (Young 1990) may be regarded here, for the sake of brevity, as some of the principal axis of the squatters' non-institutional modes of political participation. Anarchist and autonomist heritages have been very influential in the squatting movement of Italy (Mudu 2009) as well as in other European squatters.

with the contrast of data and interpretations of squatting with other scholars and activists across Europe. My present depiction of a few patterns of the squatters' movement in European cities partially stems from this inspiring activist, theoretical and field-work experience.

Squatting as an urban movement

As an urban movement, squatting began to grow in European countries like Netherlands, Germany, United Kingdom, France, Switzerland and Italy from the late 1960s and early 1970s onwards. Despite particular cycles of evolution in different cities, the tide of squatting rolled through other countries in the coming decades such as Denmark, Spain, Greece, Poland, etc. There is good evidence (Koopmans 1995, Martinez 2002, Herreros 2004, Pruijt 2004a) that this expansion was due to transnational imitation and multiple personal connections which constituted diffuse social and political networks.

Since the 1980s, there took place political meetings with the attendance of squatters from several countries. These events were continuously replicated during the 1990s and 2000s. For instance, in June 2010, an activist conference called “European Squatting Meeting” was held in Barcelona, basically facing comparative and cross-country legal issues. Spanish squatters told in public debates they travelled frequently to Germany and Italy early after Dutch squatters came to Madrid in the mid 1980s to talk about their experiences and to show their self-made videotapes. 'International diffusion' is also claimed by Koopmans (1995: 171) arguing that there was an increase of squatting in West German cities after the riots around squatted buildings in Amsterdam and Zurich were widely publicized. Since 1997, international email lists and websites, such as squat.net and indymedia centres, provided immediate tools of communication among the European squatters.

These activists would easily fit what Tarrow (2005) called 'rooted cosmopolitans' even before the times of cheap flights and the wave of protests in the no-global summits. For example, The No Olympics Games Committee (Nolympics) promoted by Amsterdam's squatters successfully opposed the city's government plans for 1992 (Adilkno 1994: 129-147, Owens 2009: 238). Few years after the Zapatista uprising in México, in 1994, Spanish and Italian squatted Social Centres organised international encounters and debates against neoliberal policies and in support of that new alter-global indigenous movement. Recently, since 2005, the Intersquat Festival was promoted by Paris' squatters and artists with an explicit European scope. As a consequence, it has been imitated

in Berlin and Rome, in spite of the absence of proper illegal squats, as it is the case in Berlin. The activist-research network SQEK (Squatting Europe Kollektive) also contributed to gather people interested or involved in squatting, and to promote self-reflective and public debates about this issue. Above all, travelling around and being hosted in squats all over Europe have been the most usual behaviours of activists in order to keep alive an informal network of mutual learning and help, without losing the local roots of the everyday practices of squatting. Christiania in Copenhagen, for instance, offered free temporary residence to those world-wide activists willing to research on any branch of squatting (Thörn et al. 2011).

Since the seminal work of Castells (1983), debates on the definition of urban movements have been ongoing (Pickvance 2003, Mayer 2006). While Castells emphasized the effects of movements on 'structural social change' and 'urban meaning', other authors focused more, for instance, on constraints coming from a wider context, organisational resources and internal dynamics (Villasante 1984; Pickvance 1985, 1986; Fainstein and Hirst 1995). According to Pruijt (2007), for example, "urban movements are social movements through which citizens attempt to achieve some control over their urban environment. The urban environment comprises the built environment, the social fabric of the city, and the local political process." Furthermore, urban movements "participate actively in urban policies and may do so in relation to any public policy in specific parts of the city or at municipal, metropolitan or regional level, although their effects or mutual articulation may have national or international scope" (Martínez 2011: 154).

What are, then, the main features of squatting as an urban movement? Firstly, squatting of empty buildings encompasses both hidden and visible actions in the eyes of neighbours, mass media and authorities. The latter emerge when a set of organised groups makes public claims for the legitimacy of squatting --banners and flags on the walls, or leaflets distributed to neighbours are frequent indicators. Both long-lasting political organizations for whom squatting is a central struggle and coordination platforms set up by squats at city wide or district levels, are also proofs of the consistency of social networks linking squatters with each other. In addition, many invisible squatters are helped by political activists and make use of informal ties that allow them to squat, remain, and oppose threats of eviction. Secondly, beyond the immediate satisfaction of squatters' material needs, a more general political frame underlies every wave of squatting initiatives. According to this frame, squatting challenges housing shortages, urban speculation, absolute private property rights, and the capitalist production of urban space as it is conducted by the State and private interests. Thus, squatting fits into the broad category of left-libertarian social movements

(Della Porta and Rucht 1995).

Squatting is an urban movement in which there is a close connection between a broad range of political activities (meetings, demonstrations, direct actions, campaigning, etc.) and a practical development of collective self-management on many dimensions of life. These include the rehabilitation of buildings, the sharing of food and various resources, the ethics of do-it-yourself and mutual-aid, the promotion of counter-cultural expressions and radical left ideas, etc. (McKay 1998, Notes from Nowhere 2003) This connection indicates the constitution of a persistent *autonomous* and *radical* urban movement with a pragmatic orientation, although some institutional bonds and constraints can also play a significant role in its expansion.

Strong repression and generalised attempts to legalise squats, for instance, can reduce the autonomy and radicalism of the squatters' movement (Mikkelsen and Karpantschhof 2001). Privatization and outsourcing of collective consumption can also threaten the influential model of self-organisation at squatted social centres, this being one of the main lines of internal division among Italian squatters (Moroni et al. 1996, Membretti 2007). According to Castells (1983: 322), autonomy means, basically, a neat separation of activists from institutionalised actors like political parties and unions. This also implies serious attempts to set up both movements' own cultural identity and political, local, decentralised, and self-managed institutions. Movements' ideological and organizational autonomy cannot avoid connection to the society at large through some institutional actors, professionals and communication media. Since some authors have criticized the term 'autonomy' because it is charged with the burden of a liberal and individualistic affiliation (Bookchin 1998), the expression 'social autonomy' can still preserve the emphasis on the dialectic dependence of individuals upon society, and viceversa, which is familiar to 'social anarchism' as the setting up of an anti-capitalist urban communities of equals (ibid.; see also Graeber 2004: 2, 65-66). Social autonomy also recalls the Italian Operaist refusal of an institutional representation of class struggles (Mitropoulos 2007), the Situationists' claims for a *total participation* in urban affairs (Knabb 1997), and the *Autonomist* organisations with a left-libertarian orientation who practised squatting as one of their preferred political arenas to challenge the post-fordist capitalism (see, for example, Adilkno 1990, Koopmans 1999, Wilhelmi 2000, Mikkelsen and Karpantschhof 2001). Katsiaficas (2006, chapter 1) has brilliantly explained the tipping point that European autonomous movements represented in comparison to the New Left and extra-parliamentary politics around 1968:

“By 1980, a movement existed which was clearly more radical and bigger than that of the sixties.

The new movement was more diverse and unpredictable and less theoretical and organized than was the New Left. Despite their differences, they shared a number of characteristics: anti-authoritarianism; independence from existing political parties; decentralized organizational forms; emphasis on direct action; and combination of culture and politics as means for the creation of a new person and new forms for living through the transformation of everyday life. (...) More than anything else, the new radicals are distinguished from the New Left by their orientation to themselves -- to a "politics of the first person" -- not to the "proletariat" or the "wretched of the earth." (...) In contrast to the centralized decisions and hierarchical authority structures of modern institutions, autonomous social movements involve people directly in decisions affecting their everyday lives. They seek to expand democracy and to help individuals break free of political structures and behavior patterns imposed from the outside. Rather than pursue careers and create patriarchal families, participants in autonomous movements live in groups to negate the isolation of individuals imposed by consumerism. They seek to decolonize everyday life."

I agree with Katsiaficas' definition of autonomy which also includes "direct-democratic forms of decision-making", "self-managed consensus" and "spontaneous forms of militant resistance" to domination in all the domains of life, society and politics (Holloway 2006). These principles expanded from the experience of squatters as well as from the new feminist and anti-nuclear movements which appeared in Europe during the 1980s. Later on, Zapatistas' uprisings, alter-globalization struggles and, recently, "occupy the squares" movement follow similar insights.

Squatting can be understood also as an *immediatist* struggle in the sense that Foucault means it: "In such struggles people criticize instances of power which are the closest to them, those which exercise their action on individuals. They do not look for the 'chief enemy' but for the immediate enemy. Nor do they expect to find a solution to their problem at a future date (that is, liberations, revolutions, end of class struggle)." (Foucault 1982) Squatting is, above all, direct action aimed to satisfy a collective need through social disobedience against the oppressive protection of property rights. The mostly temporary appropriation of abandoned spaces is a partial attack on the unjust distribution of urban goods, but it is also a grassroots political intervention at the core of urban politics. Squatters defy the rules of the urban growth machine both for the sake of their own needs and to promote citizens' protests that can be easily imitated until the last vacant space is reclaimed by those who are dispossessed (Piven and Cloward 1979, Alford and Friedland 1985, Vitale 2007).

What makes squatting possible?

The aim of this section is to identify some of the most relevant socio-spatial conditions of possibility for the occurrence and development of squatting. They are summarised in Table 1 but none of them can be understood without regarding the historical and spatial contexts in which they exist and, simultaneously, can be interpreted and used as opportunities (or constraints) by individuals and groups. Political experience, cultural differences and material conditions of living enable squatters with all kind of resources to act within these structural frameworks. Thus, each one of the following conditions of possibility demands specific analysis on its own and the way that interacts with the other ones in order to be regarded as both necessary and sufficient. For example, the cases of squatting in contexts where there is no critical housing shortage, like Gothenburg (Thörn 2008) and Vienna (see the recently evicted Epizentrum: <http://epizentrum.noblogs.org/>) need to be explained more according to some conditions (for instance, alter-globalisation and anti-neoliberal ideology, or autonomy from the control of the State and political parties) than to others.

Above all, squatting consists of a set of collective actions aimed to use empty or abandoned properties for housing purposes and/or for the promotion of social activities. The kind of owner and the duration of vacancy varies. The important condition here is the existence of a sufficient amount of buildings able to be occupied directly or after light works of rehabilitation. Squatters tend to do a serious research on the specific legal and economic situation of each, apparently in disuse, building. Frequently, neighbours are the best source of information. Higher proportions of vacancy correlate with several factors apart from the otherwise indispensable activists' wishes: economic crisis and slumping construction, reduction in rental housing stock, privatization of formerly public houses, increasing levels of private ownership of housing, changes of use in specific buildings, decline of industrial activities, urban renewal processes, etc. Accordingly, the opportunities for squatters seeking a place depend upon these macro dynamics to provide a quantity of effective spaces ready to be squatted.

Fortunately for squatters, capitalist urban speculation is based, among other things, on a convenient stock of empty buildings which allows owners to delay works or sales for a certain period of time, while negotiating the better price. The ideal speculator wants his or her ownership to be renewed, sold or rented at the highest price and at the earliest moment, but he/she can wait a certain period of time if there is a expected profit, and relatively high, to gain. Only in case of a total occupation of

the built environment in a given moment, without any loss or waste of owned space, squatting would be impossible. Quite the contrary, that ideal situation never occurs and permanent black holes within private and public real-estate markets are usually protected by laws. As a consequence, all the information that squatters obtain about that essential gap and tensions within the process of capitalist accumulation (Harvey 1985: 150), will open a window for going ahead with squatting actions (Martínez 2004, Péchu 2006).

The profitable management of vacancy is only one of the possible sources of urban speculation, but the most direct one squatters can fight against. This does not imply that the simple increase of the stock of vacant buildings, as it is the case in the so called shrinking cities, will determine the emergence of a squatting movement. If homeless population and organised activists are also diminishing, the likeliness of squatting will decrease. Moreover, the indispensable availability of empty properties to be occupied should be constructively intertwined with the lack of effectiveness of police repression and the previous political experience of potential squatters. For example, in Valencia (Spain) one old neighbourhood (Cabanyal) under the threat of a very contested renewal operation had a lot of empty houses but the wave of squatting in that area only started once the neighbours opposed firmly the city plans and, at the same time, the evictions of squatters were effective in other parts of the city, such as the now rehabilitated historical centre with less evident vacancy (Collado 2007). Private defence of empty buildings has also developed as a very profitable business not only for traditional companies of surveillance and private guards, but also for the new anti-squat companies who were born in the Netherlands during the 1990s (Buchholz 2011). These prevent squatting through the allocation of renters who pay a low prize but lack the conventional rights of renters so that they are forced to leave at any moment, whenever the owner claims for it.

The crucial condition of emptiness often depends upon urban planning and restructuring of specific areas. Displacement of industrial factories, vacant schools or public facilities which have moved to a different location, residential units subject to new regulations -all often occur when a whole area has been designed for accomplishing new functions. Authorities, planners and investors would argue that old-fashioned areas, poverty, crime, ruins, sub-standard housing and pollution demand a transformation of public space and, simultaneously, of the residential buildings and existing population there in. New roads or mega projects (like museums, stadiums, waterfronts, commercial malls, etc.) may also account for the elites-driven vacancy of a great part of dwellings in a particular urban area (Fainstein 1994²). The slower is the rhythm of these reconfigurations, the higher are the

2 See also Chatterton's (2002) analysis: "Rather than being rooted in the specificities of place, such corporate

opportunities for squatting and campaigning against the plans. Old owners and tenants appear as the natural allies of squatters opposing the authoritarian (or even the restricted participatory) manner of these urban interventions.

Many of the experiences of squatting in the last 1970s in Milano (Martin and Moroni 2007: 178) and Berlin (Mayer 1993, Holm and Kuhn 2010) took place in working-class and industrial areas where different political groups beside the squatters (renters, countercultural artists, environmentalists, autonomist and libertarian organisations, etc.) confronted the official urban plans. Old schools that did not suit the new regulations in Spain at the first 1990s were one of the favourite and more feasible targets of squatters in Spain at that period (Martinez 2004). In former industrial areas like Bilbao, before and after “the Guggenheim effect”, many factories and residential buildings around them were widely squatted since the mid 1980s. One famous case has been the social centre and houses of Kukutza, an abandoned industrial building which is located in the popular neighbourhood of Rekalde (Bilbao) and has been evicted in 2011 after 13 years of squatting while enjoying a great social support (<http://kukutza.blogspot.com/>).

Concerning the legal issues there are, theoretically, three options: a) strong criminal persecution, b) light criminal persecution, c) specific legal requirements that permit squatting occasionally. When the first option applies and authorities³ work hard to implement that legislation, squatting becomes too difficult, marginal and infrequent, although not absolutely impossible. Denmark, Germany and Sweden, for example, are the national contexts where this policy rules. However, it is important to note that the squatted community of Christiania in Copenhagen survived in a difficult environment where almost all squatting was repressed without concessions (Mikkelsen and Karpantschhof 2001, Hellström 2006, Fox 2010, Thörn et al. 2011). In Germany the squatters' movement gained great strength during its first phases, and could preserve part of its radical identity and self-managed practices after waves of either hard repression or comprehensive negotiation took place (in the early 1980s in general and in the early 1990s also in Berlin) (Mayer 1993, Sabaté 2007, Holm and Kuhn 2010⁴). Legislation and quick repression of attempts to squat have prevented the emergence of a

entertainment infrastructures create nonplace 'corporate playscapes' in cities dedicated to servicing a highly mobile professional service class. Moreover, the increasing corporatisation, purification and privatisation of city centres and their consumption spaces raise concerns for issues of inclusion, diversity and equality. The casualties of this turn towards the corporate entertainment city are the less 'desirable' denizens of urban life -the homeless, the skaters, the goths and punks, the kids hanging out- those, in general, whose do not have consumerism as their main reason for participation in the city.”

3 Most of the legal regulations about squatting have a national scope, but particular stories of repression and negotiation have more to do with the rules and policies of local authorities (Martinez 2002: 234, Common Place 2008, Aguilera 2010).

4 Holm and Kuhn (2010: 6), however, argue that “the legalizations were only a partial success: by the end of 1984 the

squatters' movement in Sweden where, notwithstanding, social housing was easily accessible for the majority of population (Thörn 2008).

Spain and France experienced criminal prosecution of squatting with significantly different outcomes. While the French case is close to the German one due to the urgent negotiations imposed by authorities after every squatting occurs, some special conditions apply such as a legal exception that avoids evictions during the winter term (Aguilera 2010, Colin 2010). An equivalent *light* restriction applies in Spain when judges are not able to clearly identify who have effectively squatted and who has the *will* to remain in order to obtain the possession of the squatted building (Baucells 1999, Martinez 2002: 84-94). Thus, even when evictions increased after 1995 (when the criminal law was passed on), few people was finally sentenced to jail. The Netherlands is experiencing a new situation after the criminalization of squatting in 2010. Nowadays squatting is still possible and encouraged by political organizations (KSU / *Kraakspreekuur*) which were, on the other hand, more abundant and active in the past (Uitermark 2004b). However, new squats are more rapidly evicted by authorities. There, squatters enjoy the heritage of thousands of squatted places took over in the past decades when there was a greater tolerance. Squatting was legal in the case of *liveable* buildings left vacant for more than one year and, crucially, in case the owner had no ready-to-act plan for the building. This legacy, the accumulation of experiences, can be sharply reduced but cannot be easily destroyed in the short run (Owens 2009, Puijt 2010). The United Kingdom is the sole European country that still fits the third category, although the coalition of conservatives and liberals in the central government intends to legislate against squatting following the path of the Dutch government (Squash 2011). Yet squatting is encouraging by veteran organisations like the Advisory Service for Squatters, based in London, who currently publishes updated versions of the celebrated *Squatters Handbook* (<http://www.squatter.org.uk/>). In addition, not only should the legal framework be not too restrictive (conditions 'b' and 'c') in order to allow a certain degree of squatting (to open a building and remain for some weeks or months, at least), but also the judicial machine and the police repression must not act too fast and in an inefficient manner so that squatters can risk part of their assets to defy the law.

Since I contend that squatting in Europe is deployed as an urban movement and this is more than the sum of individual squatting actions, I suggest a fourth condition of possibility which, in fact,

squatter movement was finally crushed, or rather, 'pacified'. Only a few legalized houses enjoyed financial support under the 'self-help' programme launched in 1982. In spite of everything, spaces for collective and alternative lifestyles remained a marginal phenomenon. At the same time, the legalization of houses established the division of the movement, making it easier to criminalize the autonomist 'non-negotiators'. (...) The legalization of houses ultimately signified the end of any political dimension to the squats beyond the scope of housing policy.”

points out to a specific feature of this movement: the connection to other social movements. To some extent, squatters take advantage of the experience of previous social movements (hippies, *provos*, anarchists, punks, environmentalists, citizen struggles, etc.) as well as they join many different social movements at the current moment (animal rights, hacktivism, solidarity with migrants and precarious workers, queer and trans-feminism, biking, antifascism, activism, urban ecology, etc.). This occurs more likely in the squatted social centres, but housing activists are often engaged into those political networks too. These ties allow the emergence of squatting as an urban movement beyond isolated episodes of squatting because push squatters to pursue multiple goals of social change beyond the right to a free or affordable (mostly urban) space. This is a common ingredient of radical left and *countercultural* movements (Rucht 1990, Koopmas 1995:21, 32-35) in contrast to the single-issue orientation attributed to other new social movements such as environmentalists, women and pacifists (Offe 1985).

Global (or, better, alter-global) concerns and the contestation of liberal democracies and capitalism are usually claimed by squatters (Wakefield 1995, Notes from Nowhere 2003, Martinez 2007). This implies a coexistence of both local and global perspectives. Each squat has local-urban roots in a specific neighbourhood. Squatting is, thus, an end itself once is publicly claimed and defended. Without losing this local ground, squatting is also a means to foster other local protests, but some more general class and global struggles too. Tactics and strategy, then, reinforce each other. This discourse pervades the public face of most political squatters, but it is not necessarily accepted or reproduced by many of the different groups who squat or participate in squats. Among the internal diversity of squatters, some can emphasize squatting only as an ends, while others emphasize squatting solely as a means. In addition, these different political identities within the movement are imbricated with context factors relating to the city or the world at large. The easiest way of discovering this imbrication is attending to the multiple connections that squatters have with other alternative or counter-cultural social movements (see Figure 1). The latter, as I will argue later, is well proven when 'social centres' acquire a prominent visibility within and outside the movement (Martinez 2004, Mudu 2004, Hodkinson and Chatterton 2006, Membretti 2007).

A final strand of the constitution of an *autonomous* urban movement is independence from political parties, labour unions, formal organisations, private companies, State bureaucracies, professionals and mass media (Castells 1983, Mayer 2006, Toret et al 2008). This does not mean a complete impermeability or the absence of any mutual links. Every group of squatters has the power to define a proper strategy in order to defend their stay (Martinez 2010). To pay an attorney is a typical

forced participation in the State apparatus, even though some squatters also refuse to do it. Alternative and independent media are preferred over commercial media, but all means are likely to be used when tension is at its peak. In case of negotiations, punctual contacts with and support from friendly political parties and civil society associations can be extremely helpful. The effective autonomy of the movement, then, resides in this unstable balance. On the one hand, squatters need to strength on the internal cooperation among activists and sympathisers, and the transmission of experience from pioneers to newcomers. On the other hand, the weakness of ties and resources of the core group - -although surrounded by thousands of participants, users, visitors, friends, other movements' militants and supporters (Moroni et al. 1996)-- requires occasional alliance with more stable social structures (Tarrow 1998).

Accordingly, a regular and not too aggressive mass media coverage, even if it treats squatters with some unfair stereotypes, can legitimate the autonomy and purposes of this struggle in the eyes of a wide audience. Thus, this conventional connection to the society around (which can be enhanced through independent media, graffiti, stencils, banners and face-to-face communication) is identified as a condition of possibility of squatting because its contribution to the manifold process of identity formation of squatters while it is rooted in the specific practices of the squatters' autonomy and their connections to other social movements (due to their pursuit of multiple goals). Autonomy itself requires evidences not less than communicative, though controversial, tools.

Table 1. What makes squatting possible?

Conditions of possibility	Specific favourable conditions	Underlying advantages
Empty / abandoned properties	Not too damaged nor too defended	Vacant spaces used for speculative purposes
Urban renewal and restructuring	Slow rhythm	Neighbours as allies
Light or permissive legal framework	Not too restricted nor repressive	Defence of housing rights
Connection to other social movements	Local and global claims	Multiple goals, alliances and legitimacy
Independent and mass media coverage	Not too aggressive (the latter)	Evidence and examples of autonomy


Source: author

What is squatting for?

In this section I want to look briefly at the *beneficial* consequences of squatting for squatters themselves, but also for other social groups and for the democratic quality of urban politics in general.

Following Pruijt's (2004a) classification I have associated the *autonomy* and *radicalism* of the squatters' movement with the strategic, persistent, networked and openness tendencies of the initiatives and *circles* of people involved (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Types of squatting and autonomous-radical orientation of the squatters' movement



Source: author.

Squatted social centres are placed in the centre of the graph because they accomplish two crucial functions⁵ for the constitution of the squatters' movement: a) they provide a public resource for meetings, information, leisure, expression and sociability which are essential both to get in touch

⁵ When referring to 'functions' I am not pretending to establish a causal or linear relationship between squatted social centres and the rest of relevant social phenomena within squatting. Rather, I just want to emphasise the central node of the social centres within the squatters' movement. Social legitimacy, visible activities, primary access and sociability are better and more likely achieved through social centres, but they are also possible to be performed solely through few cases or through a coordinated network of squatted houses. Usually, both squatted social centres and houses reinforce each other and the movement can easily rise. In Spain, for example, while most of the squatted houses remained highly invisible for the neighbours and mass media, the squatted social centres offered publicly the major features and news of squatting as a broadly extended political urban struggle.

with kindred people and to launch new squats; b) beyond its value as a material infrastructure for activists, squatted social centres are the most visible examples of squatting (for public opinion, mass media, local authorities and neighbours), and the most open to recruit new activists, and attract participants, visitors and sympathisers with lesser degrees of commitment. As mentioned above, some of the buildings working as social centres host many political discourses and events closely related to other social movements (migrants' and precarious workers' rights, hacktivism and activism, urban gardens and organic food, etc.). They also offer their facilities to different social and political organisations. Some others combine weaker political concerns with a stronger dedication to organising music concerts, workshops or cheap meals and drinks. Artists, militants and several social groups mix together in most of the counter-cultural or *entrepreneurial* social centres, but they can also split off into more specialised venues. In the case of successful self-employment initiatives (for example, a brewery in an Amsterdam squat or a hand-made craft of jewellery in a Barcelona squat) they tend to move out of the squats and to run their own businesses. The documentary film 'Creativity and the Capitalist City' (www.creativecapitalistcity.org) shows several examples of the 'breeding places' policies in Amsterdam through which some squats were legalised in order to provide work space for artists.

Conservational squatting reclaims and preserves historical sites or urban areas so that squatting of houses, events at the public space and social centres can be combined as in other types of squatted buildings. When residence and social centre coexist within the same building, a neat separation of both activities tends to be established, although the latter usually plays the most visible role in the symbolic legitimation and promotion of squatting as a radical tool for grassroots urban intervention. In Italy, Spain and the UK, activists and scholars sometimes refer to a 'social centres movement' (Mudu 2004, Hodkinson and Chatterton 2006, Toret et al. 2008, Common Place 2008) more than to an ambiguous squatters' movement as such. Even when social centres are not squatted any more, they can be considered part of the autonomous and squatters' movement / scene if they continue with a similar style of self-management and political priorities.

Social centres often substitute for the lack of established organisations and city coordination of squats. Social networks of activists arise from demonstrations and informal encounters, but social centres add a direct and tangible example of how things can be managed collectively and, hopefully without paying a rent. These valuable outcomes are more difficult to attain for the squats which are taken just for living space. The less well connected squatters are among them and with the nodal point of social centres, the less probability to stand by each other, and to create a cohesive and

powerful movement. Public visibility is also a bigger challenge for squatted houses than for squatted social centres. These needs can be filled by housing formal organisations who occasionally support squatting, but they also quit supporting that tactic as soon as they get subsidies or accessible social housing for their members (Bailey 1973, Corr 1999, Pruijt 2003, Aguilera 2010).

Radical squatters do not always expect to squat during the entirety of their lives; this is, in fact, very unlikely (Wakefield 1995, Llobet 2005, De Sario 2009, Owens 2009). For most people who squat for living, squatting is a stage along the way to a permanent residence. The more deprived they are in the housing market, the more they are likely to consider squatting as a tactic political tool or means (illegal immigrants in France, for example: Bouillon 2009). Groups, organizations and networks of radical activists consider squatting strategically when squatting is for them both means and end. Long-lasting squats, either houses or social centres, offer solid and strategic examples, symbols, of the movement's success, although abundant flows of communication among activists and with the rest of society (i.e. visibility and networking) equally enhance the squatters' social portrait. The *Witboek* (White Book) published by Dutch squatters before the ban on squatting in 2010, and a recent publication made by English squatters facing a similar threat (SQUASH 2011), constitute excellent responses to the strategic challenge of communicating the goal that nurtures the core of this movement.

With the centrality of squatted, and some non-squatted, social centres and the emerging structures of coordination of squatted houses, we can see some of the least known contributions of squatting to shaping an autonomous arena in urban politics. First of all, squats provide spaces where activists belonging to different social movements can meet. This provision is administered through collective principles of horizontal and direct democracy, self-management, non-bureaucratic regulation or State control (Piazza 2011), and free or cheap access to goods and services. Recycling, dumpster diving and sharing resources show how to live at low cost and to be environmentally friendly in urban settings. Moreover, social centres and squatters' organizations encourage people to experiment with alternative and communal modes of living which are outside of the mainstream of culture, politics, economy and social relationships. Squatting offers immediate results in the practice of direct action and social disobedience against the unjust distribution of wealth. Both by means of creative cultural expressions, and through organized opposition around broadly censored issues (police brutality, political corruption, current situation in jails, unfair global trade, etc.), squatted places expand the consciousness of their participants into the realm of dissidence, resistance, temporality and uncertainty. According to one publication put out by Barcelona squatters

(VVAA 2004), squatted social centres involve: “struggles against the destruction of neighbourhoods by speculators”, “workshops for collective learning without money”, “raising funds for the social centre and other projects”, “popular culture”, “non-commercial leisure”, “assemblies and meetings”, “networks of affects and solidarity”, “independent and horizontal media communication”, and “constructive resistance”.

For the homeless, deprived, under-privileged, working-class, unemployed and dropouts of the institutional systems - -education, asylums, juvenile homes, etc.--, squatting forms a key survival tactic and sometimes strategy. Not only can an affordable shelter be conquered, but also one can be actively involved in the satisfaction of basic needs. This is usually achieved thanks to the interaction with wealthier and more skilled individuals, resulting in a clear increase of social capital and mutual learning for all. Most of those engaged in squatting benefit from the empowerment, skills, opportunities and self-confidence that these collective actions entail (Wakefield 1995, Martinez 2002, Pruijt 2004, Llobet 2005, Hellström 2006, Bouillon 2009). It has not been widely recognised that, in comparison to other forms of activism, squatting comprises almost the whole everyday life of the people involved. Domestic tasks, gender relations and the emotional dimensions of activism are regularly tackled, obliging squatters to transform their previous approaches to these questions. Among the skills squatters gain is the capability to deal with their own physical space in the context of urban affairs of the local neighbourhood, the city and the metropolitan area. Private life and communal living demands as much effort as public life and urban struggle, especially in relations with the city councils, officials, politicians, judges, lawyers, private owners, companies, real estate developers, journalists, researchers and all kinds of neighbours, be they in favour of squatters, against them, or seemingly indifferent.

Table 2. What is squatting for?

Impact	Types of squatting	Benefits
Spatial infrastructure	Social Centres, communal houses	Provision of affordable / free space for meetings, information, non-commercial leisure, expression and sociability
Squatting practices	Visible SC and houses	Provides examples of successful and failed squatting, attraction of users, recruitment of activists, legitimacy
Culture & politics	Leftist and entrepreneurial SC	Organisation of talks, solidarity events, connection with social movements, artistic shows, workshops, cheap meals and drinks
Urban preservation	Conservational squatting of houses and SC	Preservation of historical, environmental and social sites / buildings / urban areas, struggles against speculators

Housing	Hidden and visible houses, some SC with residents	Affordable / free access to empty houses
Democratic participation	SC and some collective houses	Horizontal and direct democracy, self-management, non-bureaucratic regulation, direct action and social disobedience
Natural and urban environment	Most, especially political squatting	Rehabilitation of buildings, recycling of food and trash, dumpster diving, sharing resources, living at low cost
Social and cultural capital	Most, especially visible and political squatting	Empowerment to solve own needs, self-help, mutual aid, DIY, care for domestic life and gender relations, skills to deal with authorities / institutions / media / neighbours

Source: author

As shown, squatted social centres and houses can generate positive social impacts in different proportions and with different combinations, but usually they reinforce each other. While all the cases of squatting share directly a political network, sometimes the squatting movement can also include non-squatted social centres with similar styles of autonomous self-management. These are subjected to different legal and economic constraints than those experienced by squatted social centres and houses, but the former can also help squatters to meet, self-organise and squat. This is in particular the case of anarchists venues own by individuals or activists (*Fundación Aurora Intermitente* in Madrid, for example, during the 1980s and 1990s, or the London Action Resource Centre in the present) (Wilhelmi 2000, Common Place 2008). Coherence between political ends and means is better achieved in squats, but the stability (and availability) of legal autonomous spaces may be a valuable means for preparing illegal takes over empty buildings. On the other hand, former squats (for example, some of those more arts-oriented in Paris: Aguilera 2010), may reduce the range of their social benefits when they turn into a legal status and, simultaneously, explicitly tend to separate themselves from any type of squatting. Some squatted social centres aiming to get a legal status can both keep close relationships with active squatters and squatting actions, and with legal autonomous social centres as well. This is the case of Patio Maravillas in Madrid, linked to both an autonomist network RES (*Rompamos el Silencio*) who promoted squatting, and to more stable autonomous and non-squatted social centres (Candela in Terrassa, Casa Invisible in Málaga, and Tabacalera in Madrid, for example) (Martínez 2010: 88-95).

Conclusions

The main argument in this paper is that the squatters' movement has evolved in Europe during the

last four decades as a genuine autonomous urban movement. Its practices around collective consumption, housing shortages and alter-global movements, contributed to the satisfaction of social needs and to strive for the legitimization of a radical democratic approach to urban politics.

Along the last decades, most of the European countries have approved legislation that forbids squatting, with Holland and United Kingdom until recently the most tolerant. At the same time this general prosecution of squatting opened room for institutional arrangements allowing some cases to be legalized. However, as I have argued above, favourable legal windows and the particular repressive policies over squatting, are only some of the conditions that may allow squatting to emerge. They need to be combined with other favourable conditions such as a sufficient amount of abandoned properties, the slow rhythm of restructuring and renewal of urban areas, connections and fruitful exchanges with alternative social movements, appeal to rights and exceptions within the legal frameworks and a not too critical coverage by mass media. Autonomy, then, is obtained through the squatters' responses to this socio-spatial framework of opportunities and constraints, by means of their organisational strength, cooperation and internal cohesion.

In addition, the squatters' movement has spread out according to different configurations. Social centres and political squatting, mainly, provided public visibility, political legitimization and strategic urban locations capable of interconnecting the different and specialised forms of squatting. Networks involve both squatted social centres and houses, but also non-squatted autonomous social centres, rural squatting and tactical squatting in general (the occupation of squares, for example). Although ties with other movement organisations tend to be weak, the persistence of the whole network indicates a significant strength based on specific impacts on the urban politics of each city. In particular, squatted social centres constitute accessible, free and independent meeting spaces for many individuals, groups and movements. Besides, the whole domain of everyday life is affected by the collective practices of self-management. Not the least, squatting for living purposes offers affordable housing and empowers people with new skills of self-help and social cooperation, specially if they practice alternative and communal ways of living.

All of these transnational patterns deserve more careful and systematic research. Relevant internal differentiation, the side effects of squatting in urban politics and specific local coalitions with other citizens' and broader social movements, can set the future agenda. Nonetheless, new political issues and innovative repertoires of action confronting the ongoing wave of neoliberal urban governance, also pave the way for more in-depth insights on the conditions and impacts of the squatters'

movement.

References

- ADILKNO 1994 [1990] *Cracking the movement. Squatting beyond the media*. New Cork: Autonomedia.
- AGUILERA, Thomas (2010) *Gouverner l'illegal : les politiques urbaines face aux squats à Paris*. Mémoire de recherche, Master Stratégies Territoriales et Urbaines. Paris: SciencePo.
- ALFORD, Robert R., FRIEDLAND, Roger (1985) *Powers of Theory. Capitalism, the State, and Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BAILEY, Ron (1973) *The Squatters*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- BAUCELLS, J. (1999) L'ocupació d'immobles en el nou Codi Penal. In ASSEMBLEA D'OKUPES DE TERRASSA (ed.) *Okupació, repressió i moviments socials*. Barcelona: Kasa de la Muntanya-Diatriba.
- BOOKCHIN, Murray (1998) *Social Anarchism or Lifestyle Anarchism: An Unbridgeable Chasm*. San Francisco: AK Press.
- BOUILLON, Florence (2009) *Squats. Un autre point de vue sur les migrants*. Paris: Alternatives.
- BUCHHOLZ, Tino (2011) *Creativity and the Capitalist City. The struggle for affordable space in Amsterdam*. [www.creativecapitalistcity.org]
- CASTELLS, Manuel (1983) *The City and the Grassroots. A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- CHATTERTON, Paul (2002) "Squatting is Still Legal, Necessary and Free": A Brief Intervention in the Corporate City. *Antipode* 34(1) 1-7.
- COLIN, Baptiste (2010) « Pas de quartier pour les squatters ! » L'espace controversé des squatts : repères de militance ou repaire de militants ? In Barbara Aiosa, Faïza Naït-Bouda et Marie Thévenon (dir.): *Repères et Espace(s). De la pluralité à la polysémie*. Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble, 252-266.
- COLLADO, Francisco (2007) *Abriendo puertas. Okupaciones en València 1988-2006*. Valencia: La Burbuja.
- COMMON PLACE (2008) *What's this place? Stories from Radical Social Centres in the UK & Ireland*. Leeds: University of Leeds [www.socialcentrestories.org.uk]
- CORR, Andrew (1999) *No trespassing. Squatting, rent strikes and land struggles worldwide*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- DE SARIO, Beppe (2009) *Resistenze innaturali. Attivismo radicale nell'Italia degli anni '80*. Milan: Agenzia X.
- DELLA PORTA, Donatella; RUCHT, Dieter (1995) Left-Libertarian Movements in Context: a comparison of Italy and West Germany 1965-1990. En JENKINS, J.C.; KLANDERMANS, B. (eds.) *The politics of social protest. Comparative perspectives on states and social movements*, London: UCL Press.
- FAINSTEIN, Susan S. (1994) *The City Builders: Property, Politics, and Planning in London and New York*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- FAINSTEIN, Susan S. & C. HIRST (1995) Urban social movements. In D.JUDGE et al (ed.) *Theories of Urban Politics*. London: Sage.

- FOUCAULT, Michel (1982) The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry* (8) 4.
- FOX, Porter (2010) The Last Stand of Free Town. *The Believer* (8) 5: 3-11.
- GRAEBER, David (2004) *Fragments of an Anarchist Anthropology*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm.
- HARVEY, David (1985) The Geopolitics of Capitalism. In Gregory, DEREK, John URRY (ed.) *Social Relations and Spatial Structure*. London: Macmillan. 128-163.
- HELLSTRÖM, Maria (2006) *Steal this Place. The Aesthetics of Tactical Formlessness and "The Free Town of Christiania"*. Alnarp: Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences [PhD Thesis].
- HERREROS, Tomás (2004) Movimiento de las okupaciones y movimientos sociales: elementos de análisis para el caso de Cataluña. In Adell, R., Martínez, M. (eds.). *¿Dónde están las llaves? El movimiento okupa: prácticas y contextos sociales*. Madrid: La Catarata, 129-149.
- HODKINSON, Stuart, CHATTERTON, Paul (2006) Autonomy in the City? Reflections on the social centres movement in the UK. *City* 10, 3, pp. 305-315.
- HOLM, Andrej, KUHN, Armin (2010) Squatting and Urban Renewal: The Interaction of Squatter Movements and Strategies of Urban Restructuring in Berlin. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2427.2010.001009.x.
- HOLLOWAY, John (2006) Negative and Positivism Autonomism or Why Adorno? In John Holloway, Fernando Matamoros and Sergio Tischler. *Negativity and Revolution: Adorno and Political Activism*. London: Pluto, 95-100. [<http://www.johnholloway.com.mx/2011/07/30/negative-and-positive-autonomism/>]
- KATSIAFICAS, George (2006) *The Subversion of Politics: European Autonomous Social Movements and the Decolonization of Everyday Life*. Oakland: AK Press, 2006. [<http://www.erosseffect.com>]
- KNABB, Ken (1997) *The Joy of Revolution*. <http://www.bopsecrets.org/PS/index.htm>
- KOOPMANS, R. (1995) *Democracy from Below. New Social Movements and Political System in West Germany*. Colorado: Westview.
- LLOBET, Marta (2005) *L'okupació com espai-s de creativitat social*. Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona [PhD Thesis].
- LOWE, S. (1986) *Urban Social Movements. The City after Castells*. London: Macmillan.
- MARTIN, John N., MORONI, Primo (2007) *La luna sotto casa. Milano tr rivolta esistenziale e movimenti politici*. Milano: Shake.
- MARTÍNEZ, Miguel (2002) *Okupaciones de viviendas y centros sociales. Autogestión, contracultura y conflictos urbanos*, Barcelona: Virus.
- MARTÍNEZ, Miguel (2004) Del urbanismo a la autogestión: una historia posible del movimiento de okupación en España. In ADELL, Ramón, MARTÍNEZ, Miguel (coords.). *¿Dónde están las llaves? El movimiento okupa: prácticas y contextos sociales*. Madrid: La Catarata.
- MARTÍNEZ, Miguel (2007) The Squatters' Movement: Urban Counter-Culture and Alter-Globalization Dynamics. *South European Society and Politics*, 12:3, 379 – 398.
- MARTÍNEZ, Miguel (2010) Los procesos de institucionalización en el movimiento de okupaciones. Estrategias, discursos y experiencias. In DOMÍNGUEZ, Mario, MARTÍNEZ, Miguel, LORENZI, Elisabeth (2010) *Okupaciones en movimiento. Derivas, estrategias y prácticas*. Madrid: Tierra de Nadie.
- MARTÍNEZ, Miguel (2011) The Citizen Participation of Urban Movements in Spatial Planning: A Comparison between Vigo and Porto. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35.1, 147-171.

- MAYER, Margit (1993) The career of urban social movements in West Germany. In FISHER, R., KLING, J. (eds.) *Mobilizing the community: local politics in the era of the global city*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- MAYER, Margit (2003) The Onward Sweep of Social Capital: Causes and Consequences for Understanding Cities, Communities and Urban Movements. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 27-1.
- MAYER, Margit (2006) Manuel Castells' *The City and the Grassroots*. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30-1, 202-206.
- MCKAY, G. (ed.) (1998) *DiY Culture. Party & Protest in Nineties Britain*. London, Verso.
- MEMBRETTI, Andrea (2007) Centro Sociale Loncavallo. Building Citizenship as an innovative service. *European urban and Regional Studies* 14(3), pp. 255-266.
- MIKKELSEN, Flemming; KARPANTSCHOF, Rene (2001) Youth as a political movement: Development of Squatters' and Autonomous Movement in Copenhagen, 1981-95, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 25 (3), 609-628.
- MITROPOULOS, Angela (2007) Autonomy, Recognition, Movement. In Stevphen Shukaitis and David Graeber (ed.) *Constituent Imagination. Militant Investigations // Collective Theorization*. Oakland: AK Press, 127-136.
- MORONI P. et al. (1996) *Centri Sociali: Geografie del desiderio. Dati, statistiche, progetti, mappe, divenire*. Milano: Shake.
- MOUFFE, Chantal (1993) *The Return of the Political*. London: Verso.
- MUDU, Pierpaolo (2004) Resisting and Challenging Neoliberalism: The Development of Italian Social Centers. *Antipode* 36(5), 917-941.
- MUDU, Pierpaolo (2009) Where is Hardt and Negri's Multitude? Real Networks in Open Spaces. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies* 8(2), 211-244.
- NOTES FROM NOWHERE (2003) *We are everywhere. The irresistible rise of global anticapitalism*. London: Verso.
- OFFE, Claus (1985) New Social Movements: Challenging the boundaries of institutional politics. *Social Research* 52, 4: 817-68.
- OWENS, Lynn (2009) *Cracking Under Pressure. Narrating the Decline of the Amsterdam Squatters' Movement*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- PÉCHU, Cécile (2006) *Droit Au Logement, genèse et sociologie d'une mobilisation*. Paris: Dalloz.
- PIAZZA, Gianni (2011) *Which models of democracy? Internal and external decision-making processes of Italian Social Centres in a comparative study*. Center of Studies on Politics and Society – WP Series, Vol. 1, n. 1, pp.3-54.
- PICKVANCE, Christopher (1985) The rise and fall of urban movements and the role of comparative analysis. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 3.
- PICKVANCE, Christopher (1986) Concepts, contexts and comparison in the study of urban movements: a reply to M. Castells. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 4.
- PICKVANCE, Christopher (2003) From Urban Social Movements to Urban Movements, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27-1, 102-109.
- PIVEN, Francis F.; CLOWARD, Richard A. (1979) *Poor People's Movements. Why they succeed, how they fail*. New York: Vintage.
- PRUIJT, Hans (2003) Is the institutionalisation of urban movements inevitable? A comparison of the opportunities for sustained squatting in New York City and Amsterdam. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 27, 133-157.

- PRUIJT, Hans (2004a) Okupar en Europa. En ADELL, Ramón, MARTÍNEZ, Miguel (coords.). *¿Dónde están las llaves? El movimiento okupa: prácticas y contextos sociales*. Madrid: La Catarata.
- PRUIJT, Hans (2004b) Squatters in the Creative City: Rejoinder to Justus Uitermark. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28.3, pp. 699-705.
- PRUIJT, Hans (2007) Urban movements. In Ritzer, George (ed) (2007) *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. Malden: Blackwell, 5115-5119
- PRUIJT, Hans (2010) The creative city, revanchism, moral panics and culture wars. Geographic dimensions of legitimacy and institutionalization in the case of Dutch anti-squatting legislation. *XVII ISA World Congress of Sociology*, Gothenburg.
- RUCHT, Dieter (1990) Estrategias y formas de acción de los nuevos movimientos sociales. En DALTON, R.J., KUECHLER, M. (comp.). *Los nuevos movimientos sociales. Un reto al orden político*. Valencia: Alfons el Magnànim.
- RUGGIERO, V. (2000) New social movements and the 'centri sociali' in Milan. *Sociological Review* 48(3) 167-185.
- SABATÉ, Irene (2009) *Ein Zuhause. Etnografía del aprovisionamiento de vivienda en el barrio berlinés de Friedrichshain*, Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona [PhD Thesis].
[http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TESIS_UB/AVAILABLE/TDX-0420109-110715/01.ISM_TESIS.pdf]
- SQUASH (Squatters' Action for Secure Homes) (2011) *Criminalising the vulnerable. Why we can't criminalise our way out of a housing crisis. A Parliamentary briefing*. <http://www.squashcampaign.org>
- TARROW, Sidney (1998) *Power in Movement: Social movements and contentious politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TARROW, Sidney (2005) *The New Transnational Activism*. New York: Cambridge University.
- THÖRN, Catharina (2008) Intervention or The Need For a New Cultural Critique. *Art Monitor* 5, 48-66.
- THÖRN, Hakan, WASSHEDE, Cathrin, NILSON, Tomas (ed.) *Space for Urban Alternatives? Christiania 1971-2011*. Vilnius: Gidlungs Förlag. [www.gupea.ub.gu.se]
- TORET, Javier et al. (eds.) (2008) *Autonomía y metrópolis. Del movimiento okupa a los centros sociales de segunda generación*, Málaga: ULEX y Diputación Provincial de Málaga.
- UITERMARK, Justus (2004a) The Co-optation of Squatters in Amsterdam and the Emergence of a Movement Meritocracy: A Critical Reply to Pruijt. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 28.3, pp. 687-98.
- UITERMARK, Justus (2004b) Framing Urban Injustices: The Case of the Amsterdam Squatter Movement. *Space and Polity* 8(2), 227-244.
- VARIOUS AUTHORS (2004) *Centres Socials Okupats. Una historia de restències, vides i lluides*. Barcelona: underground edition.
- VILLASANTE, T. R. (1984) *Comunidades locales. Análisis, movimientos sociales y alternativas*. IEAL, Madrid.
- VITALE, Tommaso (ed.) (2007) *In nome di chi? Partecipazione e rappresentanza nelle mobilitazioni locali*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- WAKEFIELD, Stacy, GRRRT (1995) *Not for Rent. Conversations with Creative Activists in the U.K.* New York: Evil Twin.
- WATES, Norman; WOLMAR, C. (eds.) (1980) *Squatting. The real story*, London: Bay Leaf Books.

WILHELMI, Gonzalo. 2000. *Armarse sobre las ruinas. Historia del movimiento autónomo en Madrid (1985-1999)*. Madrid: Potencial Hardcore.

YOUNG, Iris M. (1990) *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.