Radical housing. On the politics of dwelling as difference

Michele Lancione
m.lancione@sheffield.ac.uk

Housing futures do not look bright. As UN-HABITAT and other international agencies report, each year millions of people face forced eviction from their homes, and a staggering 1.6 billion are inadequately housed (UN HABITAT, 2014). Forecasts that consider the increase in global population and rising urbanisation suggest that housing precarity will continue to grow in scale (Kothari, 2015; UN HABITAT, 2016), while commentators and scholars alike agree in stating that 'urban crisis' - in the form of massive displacement, gentrification, and uneven development - is the new normal (Harvey, 1990; Konvitz, 2016; Lees, Shin, & López-Morales, 2016). As Natalie Osborne reminds us, *we have lost*: "[o]ur cities are increasingly inequitable and precarious places" (2018, p. 2), and this tendency is only likely to increase in years to come. What does it mean, then, to write on 'housing futures' when our present condition seems to foreclose possibilities of sustainable provisioning and endurance? What can be done, from the standpoint of intellectual labour, when that same labour seems to be increasingly compromised in its fundamental structuring and processes?

Two things seem more pressing than others: constructing weird alliances and recentering analytical tools. The former consists in working towards what Moten and Harney call the 'undercommons' (Moten & Harney, 2004), that is, the practice of using our institutional positions to open up spaces for contestation and horizontal solidarity across and beyond the academy. The constitution of this series of essays, with a view to discussing housing 'visions and opportunities' through a critical lens, is exemplary in this sense, as it also showed by an assemblage of new efforts that cut across academic and grassroots spaces (such as *Trespass*, the *SQeK* network and the new *Radical Housing Journal*).[1] But it is the second point, the need to recenter our analytical tools, that I want to expand in the remainder of this paper. The current condition of 'crisis as the new normal' represents a fundamental reconfiguration of what 'housing' means for billions of urbanites worldwide.[2] The extent and intensity of housing precarity and of related struggles across geographies is such that it would be foolish not to question our ways of registering, understanding, and then producing economies of knowledge around these processes (Allen & Imrie, 2010). In particular, I think that we could do a better job at understanding the *nuanced* politics of housing and urban precarity. What goes on beyond our *habitual* way of looking at the political (Roy, 2017)?

---

[1] Which I have co-founded and now edit with a collective of around 13 scholars scattered across the globe. Further information and manifesto at www.radicalhousingjournal.org

[2] I will focus mostly on the intersection of housing and the urban form, given the pressing developments worldwide and my own interests.

This invitation, and my tentative answer, emerge from a feminist and decolonial epistemology that does not sit in opposition to established critical approaches, but aims to complement them, if they are willing to be complemented (Oswin, 2018). The gist is that there is more at stake in housing precarity than the humanitarianisms of housing rights seem to suggest; more than traditional political-economy approaches are willing to register; and more than celebratory accounts of the 'resilience' of the urban poor indicate. That 'more' is a *politics of life*, of being and becoming into the world, sometimes in ways that are deemed incompatible with normative ideas of life under capitalism, or that inhabit places that are conventionally defined as quintessentially uninhabitable (Simone, 2016). Yet, they are there, alive and kicking. Lives at the extended margins of our global urban world are pointing at ways of being and becoming that indicate other possible paths, 'still possible worlds' (Osborne, 2018, p. 8), as weird as those might seem from the standpoint of the white middle class Westernized cultural doxas through which we operate. This essay is essentially about advocating a displacement of our epistemologies of housing in recognition of this: a displacement that is feminist because it is grounded in a subjective and embodied take on precarity (Butler, 2011; Haraway, 1988) and decolonial because it quintessentially refuses to define what life at the margins is and might be (de Sousa Santos, 2016; hooks, 1994).

What it proposes is to look for 'radical housing' within everyday practices of dwelling at the margins, where the latter are understood as a site of resistance rather than a place of abnegation (hooks, 1990). This is a call to re-approach housing in its use-value, without foreclosing the possibility of radical theory and practice in the dominant (often generalizing) theorizing around its exchange-value. From the ground of use-value - of what housing *does* for people - the 'radicality' of resistance against housing precarity is not defined a-priori, but traced as it emerges from uncanny places, uninhabitable 'homes' and multiple violent histories. This is a form of 'dwelling as difference' that is able to challenge our compromised 'habitus' of home at its root, from the ground of its everyday propositional unfolding. I argue that only looking within those cracks, and aligning to their politics, new radical housing futures can be built *with* urbanites worldwide. What follows builds on some of my previous work (Lancione, 2013, 2016a, 2017, 2019), but it also takes these in new directions that I hope to expand further in *our common future*.

Housing as a gateway

For progressive housing activists worldwide, the 'housing struggle' is rarely seen solely in terms of exchange value, i.e. efforts to reduce the cost of housing provision in a market, or to turn that entirely under public control. Instead, it is framed, lived, and embodied as a struggle to affirm a different way of being in the world. This is about the 'use value' of housing: about finding ways to enable what home can do for people in the widest possible sense (Glynn, 2009). Movements as disparate as the Spanish PAH (with its call for grassroot solidarities); the US-based Anti-Eviction Mapping Project (with its focus on the ways in which race entangles with capitalist urban development); the *pobladores* urban poor alliance in Chile (cutting across old and new class struggles); the incremental informal urbanism of activists in Ecatepec in Mexico City (with their incremental urbanism and makeshift infrastructures); and radical groups in Eastern Europe (with their decolonial

takes on the 'transition' to capitalism) have this in common: they are united, in their difference, by their effort to use housing *as a gateway* to challenge wider structural forms of violence, including patriarchy, racism, class exploitation, and, of course, deprivation of shelter.

The generative power of many of these radical movements has been brought under scrutiny by a new generation of scholars whose work has gained momentum in the West following the 2008 'crisis' for its attentiveness to practices such as direct housing action, grassroots organising, and squatting (Burgum, 2018; Lees, Annunziata, & Rivas-Alonso, 2018; Madden & Marcuse, 2016; SqEK, 2013, 2014; van der Steen, Katzeff, & van Hoogenhuijze, 2014). What this renewed housing scholarship shows is that housing precarity and housing struggles are both *a product* and *a producer* of the urban political (Lancione, 2017; Vasudevan, 2015c, 2015b). Displacement and related forms of direct action and organizing are therefore not only seen as the effects of uneven urban development but are registered in their capacity to configure alternative modes of being and living in the city (Brickell, Fernandez Arrigoitia, & Vasudevan, 2017). This is what Vasudevan calls, in his fundamental contribution, the 'make+shift' city: the construction of new forms of urbanity from the ground of radical action (2015b, 2015c). This is a line of thinking that comes from a longer tradition, which includes the anarchist approaches to housing developed in the UK and the USA during the 1970s, as well as the work coming out of housing movements across the urban south in the '80s and '90s (Hardoy & Satterthwaite, 1989). Its importance in reframing the housing debate away from top-down policy concerns towards a bottom-up politics of action is yet to be fully explored.

For the most part, the current wave of critical housing scholarship, especially in its European unfolding, pivots around the Marxist-inflected tradition of critical urban studies developed from the '70s onwards on the both side of the Atlantic (Brenner & Theodore, 2005; Harvey, 1990; Smith, 1996). However, notwithstanding the fundamental importance of a traditional political-economy framework in understanding contemporary uneven urban development, this approach has its limitations. Its focus on the exchange value of housing can limit our ability to register what goes on beyond, within, and through it. Actions and struggles that are grounded in housing and home, but that fail to translate immediately into a familiar conceptual framework of capitalist exploitation, can tend to be dismissed as irrelevant; or worse, can be automatically treated as sub-products of the dominant script. These are arguably old debates in the field of urban studies (Gibson-Graham, 1996; Katz, 1996; Massey, 1993; Oswin, 2018)[3] and certainly more progressive radical housing scholars are not unaware of the issues involved (Brickell et al., 2017). However, contributions that are attentive to the everyday makings of housing struggles tend to read those as something more than a route to challenge capitalism. Examples includes the recent volume edited by Mudu and Chattophaday, which successfully (re)approaches contemporary housing and migration struggles as co-constitutive of new political terrains (2016), as well as numerous critical contributions that are infused with an attention to feminist methodologies, political ecology and autonomist housing politics

---

[3] The recent contribution of Natalie Oswin in relation to the framework of 'planetary urbanization' is particular salient in this sense (Oswin, 2018).

(Baxter & Brickell, 2014; Brickell, 2014; Fernandez Arrigoitia, 2014; Huron, 2018; McElroy & Werth, 2019; Polanska & Piotrowski, 2015; Vasudevan, 2015a).

Yet in the mainstream radical left there is still a tendency to single out certain forms of housing struggle as *political*, while neglecting others. The problem is essentially epistemological: it centres on what is made to count as 'politics' and 'resistance' in our Westernized reading of these processes (de Sousa Santos, 2016). Why is it that the efforts of millions of urbanites to assemble decent life conditions in slums across the urban south are read, for the most part, as the effect of large-scale economic restructuring as it is entangled in urbanization, and as a matter of endurance and 'resilience' in the face of overcrowding and environmental threats?[4] Why are the efforts of millions of women fighting to live within their homes relegated to the rubric of 'empowerment' and 'capabilities', or registered only within the remit of feminist debates, rather than being seen as part of a quintessential fight to liberate housing from its patriarchal, masculine, violent ethos? Why is it that homeless people in our cities are still framed as the residual force of the *lumpenproletariat*, bored products of neoliberal entrepreneurialism or grateful bodies used to celebrate supposedly loving acts of care, instead of being seen, in their everyday embodied struggles and occupation of public space, as a primary example of resistance against housing precarity?[5] Or why, in an otherwise excellent volume around squatting in Europe, are we are told that "immigrants, ethnic minorities such as the Roma, [and homeless] people" who are living in squats throughout the continent cannot be taken into consideration in the analysis since their reason for action, their desperation, "has little to do with what is usually called 'political squatting'" (SqEK, 2014)? Why can't they be seen as equally political in their rejection of life in confined 'Roma camps' as a technique for controlling their blackness, and in their occupation of the squat as a new terrain of affirmation?[6]

What all these examples have in common is a tendency to impose Western 'radical' frameworks on the immanent housing politics unfolding on the ground. If there is a common political foundation to the ways in which these slum dwellers, homeless people, beaten women, and black bodies are using housing, this is not registered by such an approach. If there is a politics of liberation in there, within the cracks of those precarious housing struggles, it is not allowed to emerge, but remains silenced by the theoretical canon. But out there, in the extended margins that cut across, through, and beyond our cities in the north and the south, everyday housing struggles take a more complex and nuanced form than that which is imposed by narratives of the 'creative-destructive' force of contemporary capitalism (Brenner & Schmid, 2015). Critical geographers, feminists, critical race scholars, and those adopting decolonial approaches have been demonstrating this for some time, and now is the moment when we need to bring these fragmented

---

[4] Or why, when they are approached in terms of housing struggles, is the scholarship that emerges filed under 'development studies' (or studies of 'urban informality') rather than 'radical housing'?

[5] There are of course excellent exceptions to this reading. See for instance the work of Gowan (2010), Sparks (2017), McCarty (2017) and also my own. None of these is, however, counted as progressive housing scholarship, but is relegated within debates concerned with the anthropology of homelessness.

[6] Again, when this is done, contributions do not fall within the remit of radical housing scholarship (see for instance Maestri, 2017; Grazioli, 2017)

politics into the remit of a new, progressive, radical housing approach. In other words, I argue, taking 'desperation' seriously in the current global urban age – in its embodiment and everyday unfolding – is of quintessential importance if we are to imagine different housing futures: desperation is political. In order to do so, I propose to complement our current 'housing' language with a focus on the (un)makings of *dwelling*.

On dwelling

Dwelling can be understood as our way of being and becoming into the world. As McFarlane reminds us, it is something learnt in a performative way and also something that is always shifting (2011). Dwelling points to a process that is not contained in a given form: it becomes, in a generative way. Fundamentally, dwelling cannot be conceived as a standalone element, in isolation from the historical, economic, and cultural environment that shapes it. It is a matter of embodied experiences and endurances, which are related to histories engraved on our skins and bodies, yet also rooted in structural conditions. Therefore, it is, by default, intersectional, and more capable of capturing what 'housing' is when conceived beyond its exchange value. Thinking about dwelling can provide a more direct way to access the question of *how* housing acts a gateway to a radical politics. As the anarchist architect F. C. Turner pointed out four decades ago, it invites us to ask about "the performance of housing, i.e. what it does *for* people" (1976, p. 61, emphasis in original).

But dwelling cannot be taken at face value. As a notion, it can be used in extremely conservative ways (as some housing scholarship clearly shows, King, 2004). I don't have space to expand on this point here, but it is worth stressing that dwelling is always about both stability and change, *habitus* and *difference*. In terms of stability, dwelling is about endurance, about our ways of constructing our locus of being and meaning in the world. Heidegger is the obligate point of reference here. For him dwelling is about an 'habitual' and creative way of inhabiting the world, which needs to be constructed not through the mere 'building *of* dwelling' but through a form of 'building *as* dwelling'. By that, Heidegger means a form of finding and holding our place into the world *while actively caring about it*: "the basic character of dwelling is to spare, to preserve… dwelling itself is always a staying with things. Dwelling, as preserving, keeps the fourfold in that with which mortals stay: in things" (Heidegger, 1971).

What is, however, built and nurtured in 'building *as* dwelling' is not specified. As Deleuze and Guattari suggest, and as the compromised history of Heidegger clearly shows, one can use dwelling in ways that are self-repressive or oppressive (1977). So, one could argue that there is really no 'building' and no 'caring' if dwelling is just taken as a habitus, as a conserving given. In order to care and to build one needs to be 'concerned with something', that is, to be political about his/her own habitus of dwelling. Analytically, this means to unpack dwelling and take it as contestation, as something that contains within itself the capacity to get beyond its own repression. In other words, to dwell is to hold together, as way of being in the world while caring, both the status quo and the potential to break through it. This is a politics open to determination: one can care and build things that can repress (our current habitus) but one can also, upon the same ground, care and build things that can liberate. Otherwise dwelling would be just about eternally losing, and

yet we know from those fighting oppressive housing situations throughout history that victories are possible (Osborne, 2018).

So, one could say that dwelling is constituted, immanently, by two facets: one points toward stability while another is always, at the same time, ready to rupture habitual modes of being. The strength of the latter sits within habitus. It is not to be found elsewhere, and it does not need to be constrained to specific classifications that determine what 'resistance' is supposed to be. When it comes to the housing question, rupture is *both* what organized movements do (through organized politics), and what individuals under precarious housing conditions do (through mundane propositions): they both use housing as a gateway to contest their given habitus, albeit in different ways. This is a rupture that I would like to call 'dwelling as difference': as the modality that cracks through the status quo, as *the lived and embodied contestation of the habitual ground where life unfolds*. It is important to stress that 'dwelling as difference' does not sit outside of 'dwelling as habitus'. The actualization of one does not exclude the potential of the other to (re)emerge: the potential of dwelling as difference, *of contesting the habitual grounds upon which our ways to become into the world are constructed*, is always there, alive and present even where conditions are bleak (Guattari, 2009). Difference is the light coming *from* the cracks, not from elsewhere, and it is always present, always there to start with (Anzaldua, 2015).

The importance of (re)thinking the housing question through a recentering of dwelling lies in the fact that, through the latter, we are invited to get closer to the place of action. Epistemologically and analytically, the tensioned politics of *dwelling* (habitus/difference) can only be registered through attention to mundane acts of subversion. Small fragments, minor details *matter* (McFarlane, 2018; Roy, 2017; Simone & Pieterse, 2017). An invitation to reapproach the question of dwelling is an invitation to rethink housing from the contested ground of its use value, from what housing does *for* people. This is not a project that is opposed to the important work that shows how use value is transformed into a privatized, financialized, and expendable *habitual* asset for exchange (Fields, 2015; Madden & Marcuse, 2016; Rogers, 2017). It is an invitation to track nuanced forms of resistance from that habitus, and to register their politics in places and in forms that are not visible from traditional standpoints. Crucially, a lot of these everyday splinterings of habitus can be found at the margins, in those in-between spaces unaccounted for by grand theory, provided we are ready to see them as a genuine 'site of resistance' (hooks, 1990). These are 'marginal' spaces because they articulate a politics of the minor – a politics of the in-between – not because they are a minority (Lancione, 2016a).

I don't have space to expand on this point here, but it is important to highlight that in order to access the politics of life at the margins, and to trace its uncanny propositions around 'dwelling *as* difference', an 'ethnographic' approach is not sufficient. 'Ethnography' can indeed be quite conservative, or exploitative, as its history clearly show[7]. What is

---

[7] The last case seems to be that related to the acclaimed work of Desmond, on evictions in the USA context. As Aiello and others have showed (Aiello et al., 2018), what seemed to be a rather in-depth account of evictions in Milwaukee is in reality a study populated by a very problematic use of qualitative

required is a sensibility toward the unfolding of everyday life according to its own remit, demands and, most importantly, politics. The latter cannot be appropriated if one is interested in becoming an *accomplice* to practices, and propositions, of 'dwelling *as* difference' (Vilenica, Forthcoming). The researcher can, at best, become part of the construction of a shared ground of action, which takes then a collective orientation that can only be sustained and nurtured through continous negotiations and re-orientation, and that should never be reduced only to the economy of academic knowledge-production (Haraway, 1988; Katz, 1994; Lancione, 2016b; Lawless, 2000; Rose, 1997). I will now turn to three brief examples, which illustrate the importance of thinking 'dwelling *as* difference', before turning to my conclusions.

Luz en lo Oscuro[8]

In a recent contribution, Saidiya Hartman tells the story of Esther Brown, a young black women living in Harlem at the time of World War I, who "hated to work, the conditions of work as much as the very idea of work" (2018, p. 468). Like other black women and men, Esther resists the disciplinary pressures of everyday life by strolling in the open. In this beautiful, fundamental piece of writing, Hartman tell us that the ways in which bodies move is about more than simple coming and going: in her strolling, Esther constructs a differential modality of being, in Harlem and in the world. She dwells in a way that is crafted to contest the dominant habitus, the demand that her body stays still, works, gets out of the way of white people. The "[w]andering and drifting" of Esther and her peers is not just about survival, but instead represents how "she *engaged* the world and how she perceived it" (2018:468, emphasis my own). That engagement – without organization, without declared politics, without recognition – is political in its precarious embodiment and embodiment of precarity. It is a "revolution in a minor key", a form of resistance that

> "was driven not by uplift or the struggle for recognition or citizenship, but by the vision of a world that would guarantee to every human being free access to earth and full enjoyment of the necessities of life, according to individual desires, tastes, and inclinations." (2018:471)

The body of Esther Brown was not supposed to move in the way it moved. By walking, she traces a *ritornello*, a refrain, which cuts through habitual racialized segregation and displacement in the US city (Gibbons, 2018; Roy, 2019; Shabazz, 2015; Simone, 2018). Eventually, she is captured and thrown into the criminal justice system, in an attempt to institutionalize her freedom, to recapture her within (habitual) modes of erasure and concealment, in a matrix that connects prison to the ghetto and the plantation (Hartman, 2018, p. 476). But Esther and her peers refuse to stay either still or silent. They create so

---

and quantitative data, which ends up undermining the politics of life and liberation underpinning housing precarity and struggles in the USA. Aiello and her colleagues need to be commended for their constructive critique of an otherwise a-critically universally acclaimed research.

[8] I am indebted, in my way of thinking the margins, to the fundamental scholarship of the feminist black Chicana scholar and artist Gloria E. Anzaldúa. Light in the dark/Luz en lo Oscuro is the title of her last book, published after her death. These and other notions will be engaged with further in another publication.

much noise and so much anger in prison that their chant still reverberates in the memories of those who heard it. Yet, as Hartman points out, within the frameworks of both wider society and the academy, both Esther's rebellion and, more fundamentally, Harlem's everyday "choreography of the possible" (2018:468) have been silenced, remaining unheard of, unthought of:

> "*the potentiality of their lives* has remained unthought because no one could imagine young black women as social visionaries, radical thinkers, and innovators in" (2018:470; emphasis is mine)

A second example of our inability to retrieve *the politics of difference* lies in the underground tunnels a few meters away from the main train station of Bucharest, the Gara de Nord. Here, I witnessed the construction of radical dwelling practices on an everyday basis. In underground chambers constructed to maintain the tele-heating system of the city, homeless people and drug users built what they called, without irony, a home or 'casa'. This was a 'casa' subsumed in the circulation and consumption of drugs, and in the coming and going of black and white Romanian bodies above and below ground, often carrying copper wires and scrap metal to sell for recycling in the informal markets of the city. It was a playground populated with a TV, a stereo set, a gas stove, and syringes which were also used as darts, where between 30 and 40 people found their way of being in a world that did not have space for them.

In the violently normative frameworks of modern Bucharest (Chelcea & Druţă, 2016; Popovici & Pop, 2016), as elsewhere, the 'homeless' need to be institutionalized; the drug users cured; the urban hustlers restrained. But in the underground, a radical affirmation of difference was possible. People were helping each other to inject, cooking and sharing food, scavenging and sharing resources. Ileana, who was washing the dishes with a bucket filled with water 3 meters below the surface of the road, explained to me:

> "It's a very good life here, we have food and warmth, and we have everything we need. [...] He [the community's leader, a man nicknamed 'Bruce Lee'] wants to provide a proper future, a warm bed, a warm meal. Each day, from morning to evening. Each morning we have a hot tea, we have tea, and eggs, whatever God offers us. So we eat whatever we have to put on the table. No one is left behind to watch the others eating. We eat together; we are like a family."[9]

This lively 'infrastructure of care' points to something more profound, more radical than 'resilience' (Amin, 2014). It is not about maintaining the status quo but about re-arranging it in ways that are able to sustain these lives *the way they wanted to sustain themselves.* I met people who had lived in the underground more than 15 years: they dreamt and loved there; fought and died there; harassed each other but also cared for each other in ways that would have been impossible above ground, in one of the city's homeless shelters. Just as Esther Brown resisted through strolling, the community of *boschetari* of Gara de Nord refused to 'fit', to be institutionalized as 'homeless', and instead proposed a different way of being at home, of dwelling in the margins. It's a proposition which does not require

---

[9] Audio-recorded conversation, reported in Lancione, 2019

recognition from the outside to stand, because its truth and validity are self-grounding (Lancione, 2019).

Lastly, thinking through dwelling does something beyond the retrieval of the uncanny housing politics of the uninhabitable margins. Take the case of the most studied radical housing movement of the last decade, the *Plataforma de Afectados por la Hipoteca* (PAH)[10]. Dozens of academic and non-academic articles have been written about this movement and what it meant in the fight for the right to housing and to the city in Spain. One key element of that struggle was the successful mobilization of millions of Spaniards, across races and classes, in direct housing actions to prevent thousands of evictions from taking place across Spain (Martinez, 2018). But, as research that is attentive to the everyday makeshift nature of the movement shows (including the beautiful documentary 'Sí se puede'[11]), the PAH was also more of what some scholarship makes of it. Building on the work of Gibson-Graham (1996), Di Feliciantonio has shown how la PAH was able to articulate a politics of language, subjectivity, and collective action which built a new sense of the possible, using affective atmospheres in a way that went beyond (and challenged) the canons of anti-capitalist policy (2017).

Importantly, and in direct contradiction of the work of the popular neo-Marxist Jacques Rancière, the dominant narrative was not entirely able to recapture these energies when the policed status quo was re-established. Instead, as Melissa García-Lamarca has argued, a more nuanced reading of the radicalism of this struggle is required:

> "The experience of the PAH shows that what Rancière sees as rare and intermittent moments of disruption can be sustained in some fashion through collective advising assemblies, as solidarity and equality-based practices where mutual aid and pedagogy occur on a continuous basis." (2017, p. 432)

What unites Esther, the boschetari of Gara de Nord, and the Spaniards of the PAH is not a well-theorised, conscious alliance grounded in their subordinate position within the cogs of the neoliberalizing capitalist machine. Before such an alliance is even possible, one has to recognise that which emerges from the in-between of these very different marginal spaces: a resistance to a historicized, racialized, and financialized habitus, and an everyday commitment to dwelling in difference, from a ground of caring-for-difference.

Openings

I agree with Madden and Marcuse when they state that "[a] truly radical right to housing […] would not be a demand for inclusion within the horizon of housing politics as usual but *an effort to move that horizon*" (2016, p. 197, emphasis my own). What I've argued is that the only way to envision such a new horizon – to envision new housing futures – is to get

---

[10] Platform for People Affected by Mortgages, a grassroots housing group which emerged in the wake of the post-2008 crisis in Spain. It helped to stop thousands of evictions affecting Spaniards at all levels by adopting direct housing actions but also by providing grassroots-led and horizontally-structured group support to its members (at its peak, it had more than 150 active groups across the country). One of the spokespersons of La PAH, Ada Colau, was elected Mayor of Barcelona in 2015.

[11] *Sí se puede. Siete días en PAH Barcelona*, 2014. Available at https://vimeo.com/323297000

closer to housing precarity, to the places where it is lived and felt. This is not a depoliticized ethnographic fetish, but a call to combine our established political-economic analysis with a renewed sensibility to the lived experience of urban and housing precarity. Billions of urbanites worldwide challenge the dwelling habitus around them on an everyday basis, sometimes in ways that cannot be easily reduced to anti-capitalist critique. Their resistance consists in the shifting, frail, and continuous negotiation of in-between forms of (cultural, material, economic) displacement, while finding a way not just to be, but to become, in a manner that lets something emerge from the cracks. This is not simply about being resilient, but fundamentally about articulating modes of being that, in their makings, in their mundane acts of resistance and care, question prevailing forces and modalities.

Those modalities capture and silence bodies; they control articulations; they deny, classify and mark, but the *affects* of alterity nonetheless cut through machines of control: bodies speak, articulations escape, classifications break down, and the many stay put, proposing and elaborating an alternative life outside of the normative. As Simone has clearly shown with his fundamental work (Simone, 2004, 2010, 2018), signalling these 'rhythms of endurance' is not about romanticizing their traumatic becoming, but *about challenging the silencing of their uncanny politics*. Mainstream 'radicalism', through its Western detachment and masculine preoccupation with itself, can try to mute what emerges from below, and to ignore propositions that are not scripted in the holy books of critical theory, but these lives are nonetheless actual, lived, and felt; embodied and performed; made and un-made at the level of everyday dwelling practices (Roy, 2017). I refer to these forms of *dwelling as difference* as a 'politics', because what they have to say is *of concern* for everyone, beyond the usual calls for grand provisioning and grand plans. *They move the horizon*, in asking for infrastructures to sustain collective solidarities, in demanding harm-reduction instead of institutionalization, in asserting the right to being vagrant and free, in advocating blackness as a method, in makeshift autonomous arrangements and locally-based provisioning, and in fostering truly intersectional agendas and dialectical confrontations.

If this attention to the ambivalent nature of dwelling has been the foundation of an anarchist politics of housing for many years (Turner, 1976; Ward, 1976, 1985), housing scholarship still fails to take its message seriously. Movements too often retreat into the established repertoires of housing rights and top-down provisioning. But the practice of treating housing struggles as a gateway, and the epistemology of dwelling as difference allows us to access the multiple possible forms that radical housing politics can take, for the many, in everyday life. Our focus, from the corrupted academic habitus we inhabit, should be to counter the language of rights and grand plans, and to develop an attitude that "will enable millions of people to make their own plans" (Ward, 1985, p. 120). Such a position becomes just a way to construct hotizontal alliances through the margins, a way to listening to their propositions, and re-imagining our political horizon from there.

References

Aiello, D., Bates, L., Graziani, T., Herring, C., Maharawal, M., McElroy, E., … Purser, G. (2018). Eviction Lab Misses the Mark. *Shelter Force*, *August*. Retrieved from https://shelterforce.org/2018/08/22/eviction-lab-misses-the-mark/

Allen, C., & Imrie, R. (Eds.). (2010). *The knowledge business. The commodification or urban and housing research*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Amin, A. (2014). Lively Infrastructure. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *31*(7/8), 137–161. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276414548490

Anzaldua, G. E. (2015). *Light in the dark (Luz en lo oscuro). Rewriting identity, spirituality, reality* (A. Keating, Ed.). Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.

Baxter, R., & Brickell, K. (2014). For home unmaking. *Home Cultures*, *11*(2), 133–143. https://doi.org/10.2752/175174214X13891916944553

Brenner, N., & Schmid, C. (2015). Towards a new epistemology of the urban? *City*, *19*(2–3), 151–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2015.1014712

Brenner, N., & Theodore, N. (2005). Neoliberalism and the urban condition. *City*, *9*(1), 101–107. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604810500092106

Brickell, K. (2014). "The Whole World Is Watching": Intimate Geopolitics of Forced Eviction and Women's Activism in Cambodia. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, *104*(6), 1256–1272. https://doi.org/10.1080/00045608.2014.944452

Brickell, K., Fernandez Arrigoitia, M., & Vasudevan, A. (Eds.). (2017). *Geographies of Forced Eviction. Dispossesion, Violence, Resistance*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Burgum, S. (2018). *Occupying London: Post-Crash Resistance and the Limits of Possibility*. London: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2011). Bodies in Alliance and the Politics of the Street. *Transversal*, 1–15.

Chelcea, L., & Druţǎ, O. (2016). Zombie socialism and the rise of neoliberalism in post-socialist Central and Eastern Europe. *Eurasian Geography and Economics*, *57*(4–5), 521–544. https://doi.org/10.1080/15387216.2016.1266273

de Sousa Santos, B. (2016). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*. London: Routledge.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1977). *Anti Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. New York: Penguin Books.

Di Feliciantonio, C. (2017). Social Movements and Alternative Housing Models: Practicing the "Politics of Possibilities" in Spain. *Housing, Theory and Society*, *34*(1), 38–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2016.1220421

Fernandez Arrigoitia, M. (2014). Unmaking Public HOusing Towars. The Role of Lifts and Stairs in the Demolition of a Puerto Rican Project. *Home Cultures*, *11*(2), 167–196.

Fields, D. (2015). Contesting the Financialization of Urban Space: Community Organizations and the Struggle to Preserve Affordable Rental Housing in New York City. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, *37*(2), 144–165. https://doi.org/10.1111/juaf.12098

García-Lamarca, M. (2017). Creating political subjects: collective knowledge and action to enact housing rights in Spain. *Community Development Journal*, *52*(3), 421–435. https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsx025

Gibbons, A. (2018). *City of Segregation. 100 Years of struggle for housing in Los Angeles*. London; New York: Verso.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. (1996). *The End of Capitalism (as We Knew It): a Feminist Critique of Political Economy*. Oxford, Cambridge: Blackwell.

Glynn, S. (Ed.). (2009). *Where the other half lives. Lower income housing in a neoliberal world.* London; New York: Pluto Press.

Gowan, T. (2010). *Hobos, Hustlers and Back-sliders: Homeless in San Francisco*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Guattari, F. (2009). *Soft Subversion*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Haraway, D. J. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, *14*(3), 575–599. https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066

Hardoy, J., & Satterthwaite, D. (1989). *Squatter Citizen: Life in the Urban Third World*. London: Routledge.

Hartman, S. (2018). The Anarchy of Colored Girls Assembled in a Riotous Manner. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, *117*(3), 465–490. https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-6942093

Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Heidegger, M. (1971). Building Dwelling Thinking. In *Poetry, Language, Thought*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

hooks, bell. (1990). Marginality as site of resistance. In R. Ferguson (Ed.), *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures* (pp. 341–343). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

hooks, bell. (1994). *Outlaw Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Huron, A. (2018). *Carving Out the Commons*. Retrieved from https://www.upress.umn.edu/book-division/books/carving-out-the-commons

Katz, C. (1994). Playing the Field: Questions of Fieldwork in Geography. *The Professional Geographer*, *46*(1), 67–72. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0033-0124.1994.00067.x

Katz, C. (1996). Towards minor theory. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *14*(4), 487–499.

King, P. (2004). *Private Dwelling. Contemplating the use of housing*. London: Routledge.

Konvitz, J. W. (2016). *Cities in Crisis*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kothari, M. (2015). *The global crisis of displacement and evictions*. Retrieved from Roxa Luxemburg Stiftung website: http://www.rosalux-nyc.org/wp-content/files_mf/kothari11.pdf

Lancione, M. (2013). Homeless people and the city of abstract machines. Assemblage thinking and the performative approach to homelessness. *Area*, *45*(3), 358–364.

Lancione, M. (Ed.). (2016a). *Rethinking life at the margins: the assemblage of contexts, subjects and politics*. London ; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Lancione, M. (2016b). The ethnographic novel as activist mode of existence: translating the field with homeless people and beyond. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2016.1231336

Lancione, M. (2017). Revitalising the uncanny: Challenging inertia in the struggle against forced evictions. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *35*(6), 1012–1032. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775817701731

Lancione, M. (2019). Weird exoskeletons: Propositional politics and the making of home in underground Bucharest. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*.

Lawless, E. J. (2000). "Reciprocal" Ethnography: No One Said It Was Easy. *Journal of Folklore Research*, *37*(2/3), 197–205.

Lees, L., Annunziata, S., & Rivas-Alonso, C. (2018). Resisting Planetary Gentrification: The Value of Survivability in the Fight to Stay Put. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, *108*(2), 346–355. https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2017.1365587

Lees, L., Shin, H. B., & López-Morales, E. (Eds.). (2016). *Planetary Gentrification*. Cambridge: Policy Press.

Madden, D. J., & Marcuse, P. (2016). *In defense of housing*. London ; New York: Verso.

Maestri, G. (2017). Are they nomads, travellers or Roma? An analysis of the multiple effects of naming assemblages. *Area*, *49*(1), 18–24. https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12273

Martinez, M. A. (2018). Bitter wins or a long-distance race? Social and political outcomes of the Spanish housing movement. *Housing Studies*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2018.1447094

Massey, D. (1993). Power geometry and a progressive sense of place. In J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, G. Robertson, & L. Tickner (Eds.), *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*. London: Routledge.

McCarthy, L. (2017). (Re)conceptualising the boundaries between home and homelessness: the *unheimlich*. *Housing Studies*, 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2017.1408780

McElroy, E., & Werth, A. (2019). Deracinated Dispossessions: On the Foreclosures of "Gentrification" in Oakland, CA. *Antipode*, anti.12528. https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12528

McFarlane, C. (2011). *Learning the city: knowledge and translocal assemblage*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

McFarlane, C. (2018). Fragment urbanism: Politics at the margins of the city. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 026377581877749. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775818777496

Moten, F., & Harney, S. (2004). The University and the Undercommons. *Social Text*, *22*(2), 101–115. https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-22-2_79-101

Mudu, P., & Chattopadhyay, S. (2016). *Migration, squatting and radical autonomy*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315673301

Osborne, N. (2018). For still possible cities: a politics of failure for the politically depressed. *Australian Geographer*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/00049182.2018.1530717

Oswin, N. (2018). Planetary urbanization: A view from outside. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *36*(3), 540–546. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775816675963

Polanska, D. V., & Piotrowski, G. (2015). The transformative power of cooperation between social movements: Squatting and tenants' movements in Poland. *City*, *19*(2–3), 274–296. https://doi.org/10.1080/13604813.2015.1015267

Popovici, V., & Pop, O. (2016, February 11). From over here, in the periphery: a decolonial method for Romanian cultural and political discourses. Retrieved February 21, 2019, from Lefteast website: http://www.criticatac.ro/lefteast/from-over-here-in-the-periphery-a-decolonial-method-for-romania/

Rogers, D. (2017). *The Geopolitics of Real Estate: Reconfiguring Property, Capital and Rights.* London: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Rose, G. (1997). Situating knowledges: positionality, reflexivities and other tactics. *Progress in Human Geography*, *21*, 305–320. https://doi.org/10.1191/030913297673302122

Roy, A. (2017). Dis/possessive collectivism: Property and personhood at city's end. *Geoforum*, *80*, A1–A11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.12.012

Roy, A. (2019). Racial Banishment. In *Keywords in Radical Geography: Antipode at 50th*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Shabazz, R. (2015). *Spatializing Blackness: Architectures of Confinement and Black Masculinity in Chicago.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Simone, A. (2004). *For the city yet to come. Changing African life in four cities*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Simone, A. (2010). *City Life from Jakarta to Dakar: Movements at the Crossroads*. London: Routledge.

Simone, A. (2016). The Uninhabitable? *Cultural Politics*, *12*(2), 135–154. https://doi.org/10.1215/17432197-3592052

Simone, A. (2018). *Improvised Lives: Rhythms of Endurance in an Urban South*. Cambridge: Polity press.

Simone, A., & Pieterse, E. (2017). *New Urban Worlds: Inhabiting Dissonant Times*. Cambridge: Polity press.

Smith, N. (1996). *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. London: Routledge.

Sparks, T. (2017). Citizens without property: Informality and political agency in a Seattle, Washington homeless encampment. *Environment and Planning A*, *49*(1), 86–103. https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X16665360

SqEK. (2013). *Squatting in Europe. Radical spaces, urban struggles*. Retrieved from www.autonomedia.org

SqEK (Ed.). (2014). *The Squatters' Movement in Europe: Commons and Autonomy as Alternatives to Capitalism*. London: Pluto Press.

Turner, J. F. C. (1976). *Housing by People. Towards Autonomy in Building Environments.* London; New York: Marion Boyars.

UN HABITAT. (2014). *Forced Evictions. Fact Sheet No. 25/Rev.1*. Retrieved from https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/FS25.Rev.1.pdf

UN HABITAT. (2016). *Urbanization and development: Emerging futures. World Cities Report 2016*. Nairobi: United Nations Human Settlements Program.

van der Steen, B., Katzeff, A., & van Hoogenhuijze, L. (Eds.). (2014). *The city is ours. Squatting and autonomous movements in Europe from the 1970s to the present*. Oakland: PM Press.

Vasudevan, A. (2015a). *Metropolitan Preoccupations: The Spatial Politics of Squatting in Berlin*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Vasudevan, A. (2015b). The autonomous city: Towards a critical geography of occupation. *Progress in Human Geography*, *39*(3), 316–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132514531470

Vasudevan, A. (2015c). The makeshift city: Towards a global geography of squatting. *Progress in Human Geography*, *39*(3), 338–359. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132514531471

Vilenica, A. (Forthcoming). Becoming an accomplice in housing struggles on Vulturilor street. A Review of, Lancione, M (2017), "A inceput ploaia - It started raining." *Dialogues in Human Geography*.

Ward, C. (1976). *Housing: an Anarchist approach*. London: Freedom Press.

Ward, C. (1985). *When we build again. Let's have housing that works!* London: Pluto Press.