Introduction

'Argh! I need a beer – that meeting just went on forever', says Aske with a deep sigh as we walk along a snowy street in Copenhagen looking for a pub. For the past three hours, we have been sitting, together with some 200 climate activists, on a cold floor in an abandoned municipal building in order to evaluate a mass action known as Reclaim Power, which produced a spectacular confrontation between activists and the police during the Copenhagen Climate Summit in 2009. Nevertheless, most people, including Aske and I, had left the meeting when the agenda moved from shared reflections on the successes and failures of the action to 'future movement building'.

Aske, a 24-year-old activist from Copenhagen, has fallen behind a group of activists from Climate Justice Action (CJA). He shivers slightly in his big coat and confesses to have been kind of depressed for the past few months, that is, ever since the eviction and deportation of a group of Iraqi refugees from a squatted church in the neighbourhood. Aske had been involved in this action for several months as an organizer, but then he disappeared, saying he was depressed and burned out. 'So, it was nice to be back on the streets', he says now, with a boyish smile. The aim of the Reclaim Power action had been to push our way through a fence and an imposing line of riot police around the official summit venue in order to hold a 'people's assembly' on climate issues somewhere inside. Aske had followed the front line from the sound truck, which was accompanying the action, and comments: 'It was actually amazing how close we were. They [the police] were overwhelmed by

that first push, and we were so close to getting through. I could see it from the truck: it was just like one big body acting together. All this talk about forming a new movement: in these situations, you *are* the movement'. I nod and make a mental note of this recurrent theme, namely the emergence of a collective body in the moment of confrontation with the police – an issue that has figured repeatedly during my research on the form politics takes among Left radical activists. We reach the door of a typical local pub: 'Push! Push!' we laugh, mimicking the battle cry of the action, while trying to open the heavy wooden door. In the bar, the exchange of views about tactics continues over cheap beers after all those assembled have aired their frustration with the poor facilitation of the evaluation meeting. Iza, an experienced action trainer from the US gets our full attention when she argues: 'I know that you Danes have good experiences with this tactic of pushing, but we were too few for it to work in a summit context. Swarming is better. People move faster in smaller groups, so it is much less predictable'.

My thoughts wander off. There had been a moment of hesitation when the so-called blue bloc[1] reached the perimeter of the Bella Centre summit venue. Nobody took immediate initiative to storm the police line. People were urged to move left of the truck accompanying the action, which was decorated with an oversize bolt cutter. From the truck there is a countdown: '10, 9, 8 … Push! Push!' a woman cried. There was some serious chaos, screaming and pushing for around twenty minutes as activists used their bodies to push their way into the summit area. As a consequence, a tight pack – of rebel clowns, Italian Ya Basta activists, British climate-campers and Swedish, German and Danish Left radical activists – was created between the truck and the police line. Some participants had padded up their bodies to endure the beating of the riot police who had formed a ring around the fence. Only a few activists from the so-called bike bloc, who had transformed discarded bikes into elaborate 'machines of resistance', had made it across a muddy stream into the summit area on air mattresses. Another group had pressed themselves against the police line with a big inflatable rubber dingy while chanting, 'This is not a riot!' Sitting in the pub, I was still puzzled about what kind of statement this was. In the end, the protesters had settled for holding the peoples' assembly on climate change right there in the snowy street.

Back in the nicotine-stained bar, somebody fetches another round of beer while Iza concludes: 'What I have been most concerned about is the level of infiltration. The surveillance has a very negative effect; people get scared, and you cannot talk or plan together. Instead, we should try to be radically open'. We continue exchanging stories, mixed with

exhilarated planning of a street party, practical concerns about what to do with the leftover vegetables from the soup kitchens and whether the climate assembly on the street could qualify 'as a new thing', as well as the legal perspectives of the charges against the arrested spokespersons, even though we are exhausted after months of preparation.

* * *

This situation from the Climate Summit in 2009 speaks to the main concern addressed in the following pages, namely the forms that politics takes among Left radical activists in Northern Europe. This book sets out to describe how activists perceive the possibilities of radical change in the context of the emerging economic crisis that peaked between 2007 and 2009, as well as the different forms of political action in daily life and during larger actions, such as the one described above. I describe the troubled relationship between activists and the police, highlighting the importance of bodily confrontation for the success of an action.

The central argument is that the forms of action must be understood within an analytical perspective relating to time and the future. I argue that the various forms of action have effects of their own, insofar as they often succeed in giving determinate form to an indeterminate future. This is what I will call 'figurations of the future'. In this book I espouse a perspectivist model of time inspired by the theorization of Amerindian perspectivism (Viveiros de Castro 1992, 1998) and more recent anthropological theory on time (Guyer 2007; Hodges 2008; Miyazaki 2004; Robbins 2001, 2007a), which implies that the future is not conceptualized as a future point in linear time, but as a co-present bodily perspective. This stems from the way activists associate their activism with bodily vitality and absorption in common activity. The collective body that often emerges during actions and confrontations with the police momentarily becomes the site of such a bodily perspective – a state of active time – which is 'at a right angle' (see Viveiros de Castro 1998: 476) of what we conventionally think of as a continuum between the past, the present and the future. By taking its point of departure in the body, time becomes a question of simultaneous angle or perspective rather than continuum or sequence.

The empirical centre of gravity for my work is Copenhagen in Denmark, and southern Sweden, with excursions to other northern European cities such as Berlin and Strasbourg. The abstract question about the relationship between form and time is investigated through a number of ethnographic cases: the struggle over a local social centre known as Ungdomshuset (the Youth House), and summit protests and

other direct action in Copenhagen and Strasbourg, in addition to more mundane food practices such as 'dumpster diving' (collecting food discarded in supermarket containers) and eating vegan food. Finally, the European Social Forum in Malmö, Sweden, is also examined. The European Social Forum is an offspring of the World Social Forum; the latter was established as a supplement to summit protesting and focuses on formulating concrete alternatives to capitalism under the slogan 'Another World is Possible' (De Angelis 2006; De Soosa Santos 2006; Juris 2008; Leite et al. 2007; Osterweil 2004; Sen 2004a, 2004b).

'Left radical' is an umbrella term used by activists in Northern Europe to refer to people on the extra-parliamentarian Left of an anarchist, autonomist and anti-capitalist bent. In Denmark, they were previously referred to as squatters or *autonome* (autonomous activists). After the protests against the summit of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in Seattle in 1999, the same tendencies have also been characterized as the radical strain of the alterglobalization movement (see also Graeber 2002, 2009; Juris 2008; Maeckelbergh 2009; Sullivan 2005).[2] In recent years this has taken a new turn, resulting in expressions such as the Indignados in Spain and other southern European countries (Castañada 2012; Della Porta and Andretta 2013) and the Occupy movement across the US and 951 cities in 82 countries (Della Porta and Andretta 2013: 24; Juris 2012; Razsa and Kurnik 2012), which pivot on the exercise of direct democracy in public space, thereby turning the logic of previous protest practices inside out. Radical in the emic sense refers here to someone who advocates radical change, or in other words, a change from the roots of capitalist society. How this is envisioned and practised is, as I shall return to in a more detailed discussion below, strikingly different from most other Marxist-inspired revolutionary movements in Europe. I show that the radicalism of northern European activists is as much related to a second, albeit related, sense of radicalism: the 'going to the origin' of widespread values about equality, autonomy, popular participation in democracy and social 'spaciousness'.

In anthropology, the study of social movements and so-called everyday resistance has revealed valuable insights into how people create meaning and come together to form collective actors (Alvarez et al. 1998; Della Porta 2006, 2007; Melucci 2003; Scott 1985; Starn 1992). However, the alterglobalization movement, and Left radical activists in particular, does not work on the basis of a shared identity or a single vision of social change (Maeckelbergh 2009: 6–7; see also Eschle 2011). One of the key contributions of the present work is to offer a way of thinking about activism, which does not rely on the constitutive power of an intentional agent, their prior motives or ideologies. Instead, the

approach will highlight the unchosen quality of activism. By this, I do not mean that activists are forced or lured into participating in actions, but rather that what we conventionally think of as intentionality and political ideologies are possible effects of participation, not the motivating factors. Activists tend to describe themselves as people 'engaged in' or 'absorbed by' common activity, and I believe that this should have ramifications for how action and activism are conceptualized. In this book, the attention is, therefore, on political action *as* form, and what the form engenders.

In the media, Left radical activists are often associated with pictures of youth wearing black, hurling stones at the police and burning cars, and protesters pushing against police lines inside a cloud of tear gas. Several anthropologists have analysed this representation and its effects (de Jong, Shaw and Stammers 2005; Graeber 2009; Juris 2008; Sullivan 2005), and found that the public are seldom offered much of an explanation as to why the protests play out the way they do. On the contrary, it is often concluded that these actions are entirely devoid of content and not worthy of being recognized as reasonable in public. Hence, what concerns me here is the need to understand the logic of this particular way of protesting, and to illuminate why politics takes on this particular form.

In Chapter 1, I describe the European Social Forum in Malmö, and instead of ideology I use the concept of cosmology heuristically to denote both how capitalism is a world inhabited by different forces, and how activists experience their place within it. Through an activist optic, capitalism has nothing 'outside' or 'after' it, but may potentially embody and offer interstices of other times and worlds. The political cosmology of activists hence lacks the holism usually associated with the concept of cosmology (Handelman 2008; Schrempp 1992). Towards the end of the book, I show how it is the forms of action that engender a political cosmology rather than the other way around (cf. Sneath et al. 2009; Willerslev and Pedersen 2010) which entail that cosmology is understood as a kind of secondary effect.

Activists' acute interest in forms and choreographies of action, tactics of confronting the police and elaborate ideas about style is one of the characteristics of Left radical protesting that has puzzled me the most while being in the field. Here I describe the logics and effects of the various forms of action, and argue that style is a 'native' concept that encompasses and is used to assess the appropriateness, effectiveness and persuasiveness of form. This concept of style hence points to the inseparability of form and content in Left radical politics. Building on this concept of style for theoretical purposes, I argue that it neither makes sense to uphold a division between form and content in politics, nor

to tie the political to individual plans and intentions. I propose instead to think of politics as mediated manifestations of intentionality, which means that it is the forms that materialize intentions and produce time. I show that a good style – that is, an appropriate form for the situation at hand – calls forth particular figurations of time. These figurations, different patterns of active time and dead time, repeat themselves across different scales, from the exceptional to the mundane, and what we, for lack of better options, tend to call the local and the global.

Transient Fields and Landscapes of Activism

A few years ago, an acquaintance of mine, who was involved in launching the Danish activist network Globale Rødder,[3] tried to explain the difference between Left radical activists and the traditional Marxist Left in Europe to me by comparing the former's view of the future with Islam's aniconism (prohibition against images). 'By avoiding painting pictures of the future, we want to avoid the idolatry and sectarianism that has characterized the Marxist Left, and which inevitably follow from defining one's endpoint', he explained at a meeting in a study circle where we were reading Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's work *Empire* (2000), which describes the emergence of a new global regime without temporal boundaries. My acquaintance believed that the future must remain 'an open question'. Our conversation, which became the point of departure for the present project and its particular focus on the relationship between form and future, sparked my initial puzzlement: How is it possible to do politics without stating one's intentions, let alone formulating ideological programmes? And how can this particular relationship between form and future be made sense of?

Whereas the strategy in revolutionary Marxist movements is historically based on a linear mobilization of the masses and accumulation of revolutionary force in mass movements until the awaiting workers and soldiers could finally 'storm the Winter Palace' (Maeckelbergh 2009), Left radical activists are preoccupied by revolts and direct actions in relation to a diversity of issues, and as much by the politicization of the routines of daily life like eating and other living habits, modelling social and gender relations, as by so-called 'do-it-yourself' practices.[4]

Whereas all ethnographic fieldwork is marked by temporality and transience, this is, in my experience, particularly true when it comes to this field: demonstrations, direct actions and meetings are phenomena of a relatively short duration, and the provisional protest camps set up in the context of summit protests often only stand for a couple of weeks.

Likewise, organizational 'identities' such as Globale Rødder seldom exist for more than a few years, whereas some, like the international activist network Revolt, only crops up temporarily around summit mobilizations. Even apparently durable social centres are evicted, whereby activities are displaced onto the street. The organizational anchorage of Left radical activism seemingly consisted of a loose network of activists stretched across the globe, which led me to experience an initial doubt about how to 'cut the network', as Strathern (1996; see also 2004) puts it. Instead of focusing on how relationships are created in a world of seemingly unbounded networks, Strathern seeks, in an implicit critique of actor–network theory, to illuminate how some phenomena – for example, relations of power and control such as property ownership – create a break or a cut in the network. Among activists it is the ability to become involved and endure that may sever social relations, and which from an analytical point of view served as a way to delimit the field. When I started working on this book, the Left radical scene in Copenhagen was locked into a struggle for the maintenance of a local social centre known as Ungdomshuset. At the same time, the sense of renewal and energy associated with the Social Forum process seemed to be coming to an end, while summit mobilizations were expected to abate, becoming replaced by more 'sustained' forms of activism, for example around social centres and other local struggles (Eschle 2005: 1767–68; Juris 2008: 158–59). Traversing the landscape of Left radical activism in Nørrebro highlights all the issues of transience and continuities inherent to the scene.

Nørrebro is the most densely populated neighbourhood in Denmark, being located just outside the ramparts of the historical centre of Copenhagen. Apart from Freetown Christiania,[5] located in the opposite direction from the city centre, Nørrebro is the part of Copenhagen with the largest concentration of relatively durable activist spaces such as social centres, activist-driven cafés and co-ops, collectives and other 'amicable places', like community centres and friendly churches. Every street is steeped in activist history, while the backyards and alleyways open themselves up as escape routes that allow one to evade an arrest or a pincer movement by the police during an action or demonstration.

Cruising from the inner city down Nørrebrogade, the main street in the neighbourhood, one passes Queen Louise's Bridge, the site of innumerable clashes between activists and the police, and the place where the tradition of street parties on New Year's eve was started by Left radical activists. After passing buildings housing several large cooperatives, one reaches a side street named Ravnsborggade that runs into Ryesgade, where squatters in 1986 took the defence of a squatted

house to the streets. This event was the culmination of a wave of evictions of squatted houses in the area (such as Allotria, Den Lille Fjer and Bazooka), as activists blocked the street with massive homemade barricades and beat off police attacks over nine days (Heinemann 1995).[6]

Continuing along Nørrebrogade, one crosses Blågårdsgade, the centre of what in the 1970s and 1980s was known as *den sorte firkant* (the black rectangle) – a popular name deriving from the black demarcation around the area in the municipality's slum clearance plan of 1971. At the time, this traditional working-class area was scruffy and run down, and many inhabitants lived in poverty or suffered from other social problems. As a result, it became the focus of the city council's large-scale and, in the view of many, heavy-handed reconstruction while local inhabitants, organized as the Nørrebro Beboeraktion (Nørrebro Tenants' Action Group), vainly argued for their increased involvement in decision-making and implementation (see Heinemann 1995).

Inspired by young squatters in other European cities, particularly Amsterdam and Zurich, a group of young socialists, including youngsters from Christiania and students from the Free Gymnasium,[7] started squatting empty buildings that were ripe for demolition (Mikkelsen and Karpantschof 2001: 615). Their demands were twofold: the provision of accommodation for young people that would allow collective dwelling, and a self-managed social centre for cultural and political activities. The Ini'tive (*sic*) Group for a Youth House was formed, but negotiations with the municipality about the provision of a space of their own were at first fruitless. After several occupations and evictions, which turned increasingly violent, the municipality signed an agreement with 'the users' on the running of Ungdomshuset in 1982.[8]

In recent years, the area around Blågårdsgade and the adjacent Blågårds Plads has received intense media coverage due to the activities of 'young troublemakers of immigrant descent', many of whom moved into the new public housing that was constructed during the demolition of the area. Several clashes between these young adults and the police have taken place in the area, most heatedly in February 2008, triggered by the police's body search of an elderly citizen of immigrant descent. After the attempted 'normalization' and clearance of Pusher Street in Christiania in 2004,[9] this part of the city has become the object of a struggle over the control of the marijuana market, and many activists feel that the police guard in a particularly zealous manner the so-called visitation zones, where people living in or passing through a particular zone can be searched without prior suspicion of a criminal offence. Along Blågårdsgade there is also a 'hack lab' – used by a community of hackers and computer activists – as well as an activist art space and a

community centre, which was used as a convergence space during the Climate Summit in Copenhagen in 2009, as well as an anti-fascist café and information shop.

The next street on the right-hand side is Fælledvej, and several Left radical collectives are (still) located here, despite the sky-rocketing real-estate prices that have occurred since the mid 1990s (something that in activist circles is referred to as the second wave of gentrification), which led to an inflow of more well-off middle-class families and young professionals.[10] Fælledvej was the site of violent clashes between activists and the police after a second Danish referendum about the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty on 18 May 1993. The police lost control of the street, allegedly because they could not find the key for the locker holding tear gas canisters. They ended up firing 113 shots at the protesters, who had blocked the street near the Sankt Hans Square and were hurling stones at the police, who were approaching in an insecure shield formation in order to support a colleague who had called for back-up (Heinemann 1995: 217–24).

The night resulted in eleven activists being wounded from live ammunition, more than 100 police officers with greater or lesser wounds, and public critique of the police's handling of the event. As a consequence, the police changed the tactics of their interception force, and particularly their strategy for crowd control (Vittrup 2002). The new mobile concept of engagement (*indsatskoncept*), which I shall return to in Chapter 4, also required the acquisition of new uniforms, weaponry and armoured vehicles, whereby the force could give up the defensive use of shields as a means of riot control. After this, it has proved more difficult for activists to enter into the near-symmetrical conflicts with the police that had characterized the 1980s, and large-scale confrontations in the streets of Copenhagen became less frequent (Karpantschof and Mikkelsen 2009: 33–34) until the conflict over Ungdomshuset. That said, the events on 18 May 1993 led to a dawning recognition among activists of the expediency of entering into near-symmetrical confrontations with the police.

If one continues a bit further along Nørrebrogade, the street Griffenfeldsgade follows on the left, where the former activist-driven co-op Spidsroden was located, as well as an underground music venue and the premises of the Front of Socialist Youth and International Forum. In between Griffenfeldsgade and Stengade streets lie Folkets Park and Folkets Hus (People's Park and People's House). Folkets Hus was squatted in 1971, shortly after the more famous squatting of Christiania, and it still continues as a self-managed social centre. The house was revitalized after the eviction from Ungdomshuset in 2007, and now counts on a well-attended café named Café Under Construction, with frequent,

popular soup kitchens and meeting spaces. Folkets Park outside the house has a playground and is used for music sessions, meetings and general hanging around. The present day park is what is left of what was known as Byggeren (slang for 'a place to build'), an activity playground established by local inhabitants and activists in 1973. In 1980, the clearance of Byggeren was the object of the first major clashes between activists and police in the area. Folkets Park Initiativet (People's Park Initiative), a group consisting of local inhabitants and activists, has re-emerged several times since then to reconstruct and defend this green space.

Following Nørrebrogade, one passes by Assistens Kirkegården (Assistant Graveyard), established in 1790 where a number of national luminaries are buried, such as Hans Christian Andersen, Søren Kirkegaard and Niels Bohr. Due to there being few green spaces in the neighbourhood, local inhabitants use the graveyard in the same way as they would any other public park, and the graffiti on the long yellow wall surrounding it is the place to take 'the temperature' of the activist scene in Copenhagen. On the next corner of Jagtvej, one can still see the empty hole in the block where the social centre Ungdomshuset was located until its demolition in March 2007.

In the eyes of the Danish public, Left radical activists have been associated with Ungdomshuset, although several other activist spaces, as we have seen, are located in the area. Ungdomshuset was the most unequivocally anarchist-inspired place, and was frequented by people with a strong interest in punk music, and/or a propensity for alternative lifestyles. The café known as Kafax has in some periods been a base for anti-fascist groups, while the planning of large actions has taken place at Folkets Hus, which is popular with activists inspired by the autonomist movement in Italy. However, all these activists have a shared anti-capitalist platform, and it would be wrong to confine particular groups and individuals to particular places, and thereby understand place-based belonging as the underlying logic. Instead, the places are the framework for a variety of activities that activists are (temporarily) absorbed by. Activists think of these places as autonomous spaces where it is possible to experiment with norms, values and forms of being together at a (internal) distance from the surrounding society (cf. Chritchley 2007: 113).

The activist scene in Copenhagen can best be understood as a complex network of people involved for stretches of time in more or less stable affinity groups and in temporary organizational structures. The term 'affinity group' is thought to have its origin in the *grupos de afinidad* of the Spanish Civil War, which were characterized as groups of friends that simultaneously made up the basic organizational units of the anarchist federation (Graeber 2009: 288). Affinity groups are still

usually thought of as groups of friends who remain connected for a long period of time, and are engaged in politics together and/or have a social life outside political action, for example by living together in a collective.

In addition to the above meaning, the term affinity group is also used to refer to ad hoc groups (alliances) organized for shorter periods around a common task, for example during an action. Either way, the groups are expected to be based on mutual trust and to look out for each other during actions. Affinity groups are brought together during the planning of a large action, or across several actions, in temporary organizational structures.

The best way to describe the form of organization found among Left radical activists is probably with reference to Evans-Prichard's idea of ordered anarchy among the Nuer, who were organized in egalitarian segmentary groups (Evans-Prichard 1940: 147), that is, a system of relatively equal and small autonomous groups, which periodically come together to form larger communities. Along similar lines, the activist milieu does not have a central authority or organization, and the size of the political community depends to a large extent on the activity, the nature of the conflict and the power to mobilize peer affinity groups and network relations around particular events or causes. Activists identify themselves more with the activities they are or have been engaged in than with ideological identities such as anarchist, autonomist or Left radical. In this sense, it is the activity of 'doing something together' that delimits the seemingly unbound network (Strathern 1996), and the question about how many Left radical activists there are in Denmark, Northern Europe or elsewhere does not really make sense in absolute terms or outside the context of specific actions. In spite of all this, relatively stable social relations exist in the context of affinity groups, and around the so-called autonomous spaces, which can be understood here as particular, temporal configurations of social relations (Jiménez 2003: 140).

Becoming involved in Left radical activism transforms one's view of the neighbourhood; one begins to move within a different landscape, recognizing the large number of activist spaces, the virtual pasts and the unactualized futures embedded in the urban topography. The temporary and transient quality of the phenomenon under study significantly contributed to my insight about the importance of time for understanding the logic of this particular form of politics. In Chapter 2 I will return to how autonomy is configured in these spaces, something which serves to illuminate how what I call figurations of the future always have a spatial dimension, even if of varying durability.

Willingly or not, my work has come to resonate with the prominent trend of multi-sited fieldwork which, from the mid 1990s, has seen

anthropologists move beyond the bounded field site in order to come to terms with the interconnected and unbounded world system (Marcus 1995). In practice, this demanded recurrent requests for access and repeated attempts at establishing close relations with various activist groups. While in the field, I came to realize that my initial research was characterized by what Matei Candea has called 'a problematic reconfiguration of holism' (Candea 2007: 169): I was seeking to uncover the totality, or at least a representative sample, of Left radical forms of action, while feeling haunted by a sense of incompleteness. I became acutely aware that the strategy pursued, which implied an imaginary ability to increase the complexity of the phenomenon via magnification, also entailed a loss of detail. In other words, the amount of data actually remained the same (Strathern 2004: xiv–xv).

Along the way, my attention was drawn to a figure that seemed to replicate itself through all the changes of scale (cf. Wagner 1991: 166). This self-scaling figure is what I call the figuration of the future. It operates across different scales, where each moment or figure of time mirrors all other such moments, in such a way that they come to serve as contexts for each other. In this mirroring, the relation between the figures harbours powers of digression, which sometimes contributes to a horizontal reinvention of form without relying on a master plan or ideological programme (Krøijer 2015; Massumi 2002: 16–17). One of the most desired objects of activism being newness, activists are continuously involved in planning new actions, which build on and adapt previous activities. In Chapter 5 I return to the concept of style that is deeply embedded in this reinvention of form, and I attend to how a figure is repeated, which momentarily gives determinate form to the indeterminate.

It is fair to say, therefore, that my primary field became these actually existing moments and figures that gathered the 'whole' network of relations into themselves. In principle, had I studied only one such brief moment it would be as complex as what would have been revealed through an attempt at enfolding the whole through a multi-sited approach. This realization has guided my form of writing and the structure of the book; different events and situations come to mirror and replicate each other, hopefully letting 'meaning' emerge along the way.

Form as Object

By 1990, the Danish police had evicted almost all squatted houses in Copenhagen, which led to a weakening of the squatters' movement

and a reorientation among activists towards new causes, such as the fight against anti-racism and anti-fascism in the cities of Kollund and Kværs in southern Denmark. Moreover, the period saw a turn toward environmental issues, which was played out in the protests against the building of Øresundsbroen, a bridge connecting Denmark and southern Sweden, and in the upsurge of Critical Mass and Reclaim the Street actions, inspired by anti-road protests in Britain (Jordan 1998; McKay 1998), as well as in the initiation of urban guerrilla gardening, a kind of political gardening where activists take over a plot of land or even cracks in the pavement to grow their own food or flowers, and co-op shops, selling cheap, locally produced and organic foods and linking farmers and consumers. While Ungdomshuset had relatively slack years in the 1990s, the mobilizations around international summits and the upsurge of the so-called alterglobalization movement at the dawn of the twenty-first century provided a new impetus, in Denmark as elsewhere. Not only did Danish activists participate in summit protests, particularly in Prague in 2000 and at the EU summit protest in Göteborg in 2001, but the activist network, Globale Rødder, was also formed, becoming the Danish expression of the radical strain of the alterglobalization movement. Inspiration was drawn from the new forms of actions employed by the Tute Bianche (White Overalls) in Italy, and from the Zapatista rebellion in Chiapas, to mention a few.

During the EU summit in Copenhagen in 2002, a division within the Left radical scene in Copenhagen became evident. While there was agreement on opposing and confronting the meeting of ministers at the Bella Centre, there was disagreement about the tactics. A Danish Anarchist Federation was formed in the context of the summit, which favoured black bloc demonstrations – a form of action developed by German Left radicals in the 1980s, where people attending a protest give the demonstration a militant expression by wearing black clothes and masks and forming a tight bloc by locking arms to avoid identification and arrest. The tactic sometimes includes vandalism and street riots (see also Katsiaficas 2006; Graeber 2009). Globale Rødder, on the other hand, organized what was supposed to be a confrontational action of civil disobedience inspired by the Italian Tute Bianche, who also participated in the action at the Bella Centre in 2002, but under their later identity as the Disobedienti (the Disobedient). Activists who were involved in Globale Rødder consider this action to be a first attempt at adapting Tute Bianche's confrontational style of civil disobedience to a Danish context in order to move beyond the violence/non-violence dichotomy that continues to characterize the public debate about street protests. Many found that the action at the Bella Centre in Copenhagen

was too ‘symbolic’, as they called it, and failed to ‘expose the conflicts’ underlying the European project.

Jumping ahead in time to the protests following the evictions from Ungdomshuset (2007–8), the contradictions there were partly overcome by adopting a new, ‘diversity of tactics’ approach to protesting. Diversity of tactics had been a successful way of agglutinating the different tendencies on the extra-parliamentarian Left when employed to block the G8 meeting in Heiligendamm in Germany, in summer 2007. Groups with different tactical preferences could work together in a common ‘choreography of action’ via a division into different colour-coded blocs, each developing its own tactics in pursuing the common goal of blockading the entrances to the summit area.

Danish activists participated in the protests in Rostock and Heiligendamm where the large blockade of the G8 summit was organized in five strands or ‘fingers’. They later adapted the diversity of tactics in order to swarm a building in Copenhagen in October 2007, which they had picked out as their new social centre. Following this, new ways of combining forms of action and modes of entering into confrontation with the police have continued to develop in Copenhagen, which have allowed for the participation of activists with different tactical preferences. An example of this is Shut Down the Camp, a direct action against a retention centre for refugees outside Copenhagen, which I shall return to in Chapters 3 and 5.

From this discussion it becomes evident that forms of action travel – from the squatters’ movement to the protests against the economic politics of the G8, the WTO and the World Bank; similarly, agendas change, from environmental and anti-racist agendas to a concern for global climate change. Along the way, the forms of action are adapted and altered, and new forms are invented. The newly invented bike bloc during the Climate Summit protests in Copenhagen is a fine example of this: not only did the British climate activists add a new kind of bloc to the protest choreography, but a fraction of the bloc also echoed the Danish action theatre group Solvognen’s Santa Claus Army of 1974 when, all dressed as Santa Claus, they swarmed the summit venue on homemade ‘warrior bikes’, which are discarded bikes welded together with inventive features such as loudspeakers playing the sound of a marching crowd or with catapults that allow bikers to jump over a fence.

Taking the forms of the political among Left radical activists as the object of study also compels a broader attention to the significance of form. Contrary to older meaning-centred approaches, where bodily postures, costumes and material objects are legible objects full of symbolic meaning, newer approaches have highlighted how the relation

between signs and their possible objects of signification is both complex and subject to change. Things and forms of action are not just passive transporters of human intentions, agency or identity, because not only is meaning almost inevitably transformed along the way, but things also have qualities of their own. It is key to the approach taken here that things and forms of action have effects regardless of how they are interpreted (Keane 2006: 186; Gell 1998; Henare et al. 2007). In Chapter 3 I shall return to this in an analysis of how large puppets at demonstrations (aspire to) become agentive subjects, whereas single activists seek to avoid becoming identified as instigators of action. The central issue in Chapter 4 is a concern with how activists and police alike struggle to interpret signs and assume indexicality (a connection between the sign and object of signification). What is important here, not least for my proposition about seeing activist forms of action as figurations of time, is that reality is not *pre*formed, or scripted beforehand, but *per*formed (Sjørslev 2007: 17), which, in my view, implies a constant reconfiguration of social relations.

A final point that must be made here in connection to activists' acute interest in and continuous experimentation with forms of action is that meaning does not primarily reside in one action or protest event, but relies on the internal relationship (Riles 1998) between various events.[11] Among activists, judgment about the success of an action relies more on the shrewd orchestration of a confrontation, in the light of all other such confrontations, than on actually obtaining the stated goal of an action (for example shutting down a retention centre for refugees). Piling up protests and political actions – as I will also continue to do throughout this book as part of my experiment with form – establishes relations in time. This is not only the work of historians or anthropologists, but also something activists actively engage in. It was their 'piling up' of events that led me to consider, from an analytical point of view, how time is reconfigured in activists' political practices, and how a meaningful direction seems to emerge from the relationship between them.

From Talk to Action

I already had a relationship with the Left radical scene before initiating my fieldwork. In the mid 1990s, a group of friends and I were involved in direct actions in opposition to the building of Øresundsbroen, as well as in Reclaim the Street actions and guerrilla gardening projects in Copenhagen.[12] After some years of being away, I touched base in the aforementioned study circle with friends who had been active in

Globale Rødder. This study circle, among others, became the originator of the Danish file-sharing initiative Piratgruppen (the Pirate Group), the EuroMayDay project concerned with migrant and precarious labour rights,[13] and was actively involved in importing the Social Forum process to Denmark in 2003. The first World Social Forum I attended was the one in Porto Alegre, Brazil, in 2004, and I participated in the organization and programme planning of the Danish Social Forum in 2007, this time with a view to initiating ethnographic fieldwork. It is therefore hard to determine exactly when activism ended and my ethnographic fieldwork began. In practice, my prior knowledge has been actualized as fieldwork when placed in dialogue with anthropological knowledge and modes of contextualizing experiences.

The Danish media has repeatedly represented the Left radical milieu in Copenhagen, and particularly Ungdomshuset, as closed to the public and inhospitable to newcomers. This is imprecise at best, but nevertheless influenced my own contact with activists around Ungdomshuset in the wake of the 2007 eviction. Based on activists' own stories, I have found that people have tended to get engaged in Left radical activism in one of two ways: either they are taken along by friends with whom they start hanging around a place where activists gather, whereupon they may become involved in concrete tasks; or they turn up at one of the frequent information meetings held to mobilize people for larger actions, again often in the company of friends. In accessing the field, I tried to follow analogous strategies of either getting to know people and being taken along, or attending meetings and expressing my interest in getting involved as researcher and activist. These strategies worked out fairly well in a Danish context, where it was, furthermore, also possible for activists to check up on my background.

I had planned to start fieldwork through a series of taped interviews with activists involved in the struggle around Ungdomshuset, because I expected that this would give me insights into their motivation for getting involved and perception of the political practices they were engaged in. I interviewed people who had been activists of Ungdomshuset for many years, and activists from other parts of the milieu who gathered around Ungdomshuset as the eviction approached, as well as young people who had been drawn to the struggle after the eviction. This developed into repeated conversations about getting involved, detailed descriptions of the organization of demonstrations, reflection on forms of action and tactics for dealing with the police when in the street, as well as dilemmas about how to face the municipality of Copenhagen (the former owner of the house). The interviews also served as a means of getting to know people and of making connections that I could build on later. In this

sense, the interviews became a valuable way of accessing people who would later take me along to different activities.

Much to my surprise, and contrary to claims in the literature (see Rubow 2000: 21), I found that the interviews and more informal conversations (that is, language) were not the best way to get insight into topics like feelings, hopes and dreams for the future, and even less were they a means to grasp the special experiences of excitement and bodily intensity during direct actions. It is not that activists refrain from talking – talk is plentiful, for example, in the long planning meetings before actions – but their ideas about the future were not articulated in language. After trying different techniques, I realized that I had to take the activists' dictum about 'not to waste time talking' seriously (see Chapter 1) and turn to participation in actions. Through my participation in the field, I slowly came to realize that it is the forms of actions, rather than individuals, that are entities carrying motives and intentions, which also explains why it is so difficult to articulate these issues in language.

From the conflict over Ungdomshuset, my fieldwork proceeded by focusing on the European Social Forum held in Malmö in September 2008. I got in touch with the Nordic organizing committee and a couple of people working in the secretariat of the European Social Forum (ESF) in Malmö. I did not participate in the daily work, the dilemmas and conflicts, around which I had plenty of experiences from the Danish Social Forum. Instead, I undertook repeated interviews with two organizers, and followed the meetings of the European Preparatory Assembly (EPA), which is the body that follows and takes decisions on the ESF 'process' at the Europe level.[14] This was particularly insightful for coming to grips with how different people around Europe looked upon the ESF – as a process of change or as a momentary instantiation of what they were fighting for. As already hinted at, this was an occasion for stark differences of opinion to emerge between actors on the extra-parliamentarian left.

In addition, I contacted Action Network, an initiative of Swedish Left radical activists on the margins of the ESF, through which I hoped to illuminate the different ways that Left radical activists, NGOs, trade unions and the traditional Marxist left engage in the ESF. They organized a parallel and 'autonomous forum' at a newly inaugurated social centre in Malmö named Utkanten (the outskirt or margin). I interviewed three Swedish activists before and after the three-day event about their motivations, the activities they were involved in and their views of the official forum. In the beginning, they were overtly suspicious of me, or maybe of the questions I asked, thinking their answers might incriminate them,

and they only agreed to meet up in public spaces such as parks and cafés. However, two of them invited me into their homes after the first encounter, which might not only be a corollary of activists' fear of police surveillance or of my having gained their confidence, but it may also, as I shall return to shortly, say something about the home as research site in Scandinavia.

During the social forum in Malmö, I followed both official and parallel activities of the autonomous forum, such as the official inauguration and the large joint demonstration aimed at displaying 'the strength' of the movement, as well as a number of workshops and talks, and attended a Reclaim the Street party organized by a loosely organized network simply called the Action Network. Few Danes were involved in planning, but many of my interlocutors involved in the Ungdomshuset case travelled to and participated in the four-day event.

Later, I followed several processes, but my focus was largely on participant observation, both in the planning and celebration of direct actions, particularly Shut Down the Camp in October 2008, planning for the NATO summit in Strasbourg in April 2009 and the preparations for the Climate Summit in Copenhagen in December 2009. This involved engaging early on in the planning of actions and logistics, participating in many meetings and taking on concrete organizational tasks together with others. After the conflict over Ungdomshuset, which was solved when the municipality of Copenhagen gave the activists a new social centre in June 2008, several of my key interlocutors started a network called Openhagen, which focused on gentrification and the privatization of public space. I followed their activities only sporadically, except for the so-called Undoing the City festival, a Reclaim the Street party in the inner city, which has found its way into these pages.

My sustained participation in the planning process around the NATO summit in Strasbourg and the Climate Summit in Copenhagen in 2009 made it possible for me to follow groups of people for stretches of time in order to penetrate the more spectacular protest performances in the street and view them from several angles. Nevertheless, it is impossible to gain a complete overview of all the preparations made for large actions; besides the large coordination meetings, a myriad of working groups crop up for taking care of action planning, media strategy and relations, alliance building and mobilization, financial management and logistics; this sometimes necessitates organizing accommodation and food for thousands of people. Several hundred can be involved during intense periods of planning in the months or weeks prior to an action, and many overlapping meetings are held each day. I have followed different routes, for example by focusing either on action planning or

on logistics, which always involved participant observation in and of meetings (Jiménez 2007; Maeckelbergh 2009; Schwartzman 1987). I often found it difficult to follow the frenzied pace of the activities, in itself a reason why people sometimes 'drop out' of activism, claiming to have 'burned out'. In other words, my own experience of the exhausting tempo alerted me to both the sense of urgency and the fatigue that activists experience from time to time.

While the protests around summits or the eviction of social centres are highly visible events, sometimes involving spectacular riots or protests in the street, other modes of doing politics and forms of sociality remain invisible (or even secret), such as decision-making procedures, networking practices and the culture of security around actions, as well as the more mundane 'do-it-yourself' practices involved in concert planning or workshops on knitting and bike repair, dumpster diving and food consumption. I only became interested in the political activities that took place in activists' homes relatively late in the project, and they have, in consequence, received far less attention than they deserve. Probably because I had presented my research as focused on actions (in public space), people did not invite me to their homes, except for interviews, or when, during trips to Berlin and Strasbourg, I was considered a guest in need of a place to roll out my sleeping bag. As relationships evolved, I was more frequently invited to meetings in people's homes in Copenhagen, which sometimes allowed me to talk to people about domestic routines, eating and dwelling habits, and so on, but my access to social events in the home would have required a status as a close friend (or a different research strategy altogether).

According to Marianne Gullestad, Scandinavians tend to associate the home with closeness, intimacy, wholeness, authenticity and equality, and most social life with friends and family is home-centred (Gullestad 1992: 50–53). Yet, research in the home might not only rely on the character of the relationship, but also on the researcher's 'route' to the home. In this book I discuss a few examples of 'everyday forms of politics', not because I consider the home more real or authentic than the street, but because activists themselves consider these mundane forms of political action to be 'as important' as protesting. The practices break down the distinction between the everyday and the festive or sacred inherent to much performative theory (Gullestad 1992: 54–55; Leach 1985; Mitchell 2006), and point to the body as the site of politics.

My choosing to approach activism from different methodological angles also holds for my participation in protest events. In Shut Down the Camp and in Strasbourg, I participated without much concern about

safety, being part of affinity groups with key interlocutors. This kind of participation did not only provide me with an experience of the affective side of protesting; in other circumstances, I have chosen to observe the choreography and sequencing of actions and demonstrations, or focused on talking to people about their undertakings. Finally, I have interviewed Danish police officers, supplemented with observation of the police on the street, readings on the operational tactics of the police in Denmark (Vittrup 2002) and EU policy documents concerned with security around major events. This has given me important insights into what kind of threat protests and activists are considered to be, and how the police seek to procure security via tactics of insecurity and unpredictability. Along the way, I have drawn on a number of additional sources such as YouTube videos circulating before and after protests, documentary films, an autobiography, activists' written flyers and 'zines' (small homemade publications of small circulation), accounts from protests posted on the internet and so on. I have also read through all Danish newspaper articles between 2006 and 2008 on Ungdomshuset, consulted the minutes from the municipal council of Copenhagen in relation to the case, and benefited from the booming literature on the subject (Hansen 2008; Karpantschof and Lindblom 2009; Karker 2007; Rasmussen 2008).

Access, Position, Ethics

In the Danish context, I had the experience of passing almost insensibly into the various activities I wished to study, although not having close friendships within the new generation of activists meant that I was seldom part of the more informal social gatherings where new ideas for actions are engendered. This seemingly unproblematic access was explained by one of my gatekeepers as a quality of my immediate appearance: 'People can simply tell by the way you look that you are okay', she said. I think that there is little doubt that, in a Scandinavian context, signalling equality via sameness in terms of looks, language and personal carriage (Gullestad 1992: 292) is important for being accepted. My prior experience as an activist enabled my success in this regard. But my gatekeeper's way of phrasing the idea also points to an issue that I shall return to later, namely how politics is seen as embedded in and elicited by the right form.

However, when I tried to gain access to the preparations for the NATO summit in Strasbourg, this trust proved to be insufficient, not least because my access was negotiated via e-mail. I will describe here the negotiation

over access at some length because it not only illustrates the importance of personal ties, trust and knowledge of activist 'security culture' for gaining access (Robinson 2008), but also shows how the negotiations left me with only one available position within the field, namely that of a fully-fledged participant. In the early phases of my work, I registered on international listservs and frequently followed various homepages, in order to follow internal debates and activists' writings about forms of protesting, and to receive international 'calls for action' announcing, among other things, mobilizations for summit protests. Around the end of November 2008, I received the following:

> *NATO invites itself to the center of Europe in April 2009!*
> The 3rd and 4th of April, representatives of the countries members of NATO will meet again to celebrate their 60 years of domination, but also in order to develop their new plan to 'defend freedom' and quoting the terms of their own generals: 'A great strategy for an uncertain world'. From the 1st to the 5th April 2009 we will be present in Strasbourg and we'll oppose their 'globalization by force' with the creativity of our actions of resistance: direct actions, blockades, civil disobedience, demonstrations, meetings, debates, alternative village, convergence centers…

The same e-mail announced an international planning meeting to be held in Strasbourg, and I wrote to the organizers to ask if I could take part as a researcher, not failing to mention my interest in the European security architecture around major events and its consequences for the possibilities of protest as well as my prior involvement as an activist. A week later, I received an e-mail from a different quarter that recommended some readings on the subject, but when I wrote back insisting that I would like to participate, I received a brief rejection (and a possible opening) in an e-mail that only said: 'Mhm, to be honest: researcher interests are sure not welcome at the meeting. Don't know how to proceed?' The email was not signed with a name, but came from a relatively well-known network working on police repression during summits. I remembered that a person from this network had been giving a talk at a 'radical assembly' at Utkanten during the ESF in Malmö, which had been organized by one of my Swedish interlocutors. I therefore contacted her and asked if she would put in a good word for me, and subsequently wrote to my unnamed gatekeeper again trying to convince them of my good intentions with assurances of anonymity and protection of raw data, and promising not to write about the meeting until after the summit event. I received the reply: 'She wrote me already;) think you will find a way to come. Will you pass Berlin before maybe?' Later, when we were discussing my trip to Berlin, which I understood as a way to vet

me before the meeting, the issue of trust was underlined together with an indication of my possible position in the field:

> I would say, I leave it up to you to decide to come to the meeting or with which 'identity' you participate. Friends say they trust you, so do I then ;) I'm just normally a bit uncomfortable with being 'watched', but if you also come to help then its fine, I think. But, if you like to come to Berlin in advance you are very welcome. Maybe we can then go with the train together. Write again if you need accommodation in Berlin.

I shall return to the particular story of my encounter with my gatekeeper, Jürgen, in Berlin, who until that point remained anonymous; what interests me here is rather how our e-mail correspondence reflects my encounter with a widespread uneasiness concerning my role as a researcher. I was usually explicitly asked to 'help out', 'lend a hand' and involve myself in practical organizing, sometimes even as a condition of my presence. When I went to Berlin, for example, it was set out explicitly that I should help facilitate the meeting, take notes and assist in the kitchen. Though I felt relatively comfortable with this, it also had ethical implications.

The particular position I was offered – together with the fact that my fieldwork was often undertaken in public spaces, or at other mass gatherings such as large meetings and protest camps (with several hundred or thousands of participants) – implied that not everyone present was aware of my role as an anthropologist. As I have described above, I was pushed in the direction of an activist role, inevitably leading to others being observed by me without their knowledge. I could with good reason have been denounced as a spy (Bulmer 1982: 3), something which was thrown into relief by two interlocutors who were revealed as undercover police agents by the press a couple of years later.[15] I handled this ethical problem about research consent (Hammersley and Atkinson 1995: 264) and the pitfalls of covert research (Scheper-Hughes 2004) by always introducing myself as an anthropologist when entering into conversations with people, following and describing only those who had been made aware of my research endeavours, and by making those not aware fade into the background in the text.

This position, along with widespread suspicions of surveillance (which are not completely unfounded) and legal actions against activists, have influenced my presentation of the ethnographic material. Generally, all names have been made up by me, and in addition I have sometimes found it necessary to alter details of people's life stories, their age, gender or occupation in the interests of anonymity. Due to court cases in the aftermath of the Climate Summit in Copenhagen, I have

found it necessary to let one person appear under two different names in the text. For the same reason, a few ethnographic details have been left intentionally vague.

In the recent past, three ethnographies on the alterglobalization movement have been published, namely Jeffrey Juris's *Networking Futures: The Movements Against Corporate Globalization* (2008), Marianne Maeckelbergh's *The Will of the Many*: *How the Alterglobalization Movement is Changing the Face of Democracy* (2009) and David Graeber's *Direct Action: An Ethnography* (2009), which all resonate with my concern about time and take up the issue of positioning and engaged anthropology. All three authors describe themselves as different varieties of activist-researchers. Graeber positions himself first of all as an anarchist, a critical insider, who could not help writing an ethnography about his experiences with the hope of furthering the movement's goals (Graeber 2009: 12). Maeckelbergh talks of engaged anthropology, which for her implies a double role as interpreter and active participant. Taking on the role as an active participant has also been experienced by Maeckelbergh as a precondition for doing fieldwork in this area (Maeckelbergh 2009: 24). Jeffrey Juris, on the other hand, calls himself a militant ethnographer, which implies being an active participant while in the field in terms of organizing, participating in tactical debate, engaging in collective analysis and 'putting one's body on the line during direct actions' (Juris 2008: 20).

I could probably qualify as a militant ethnographer under these criteria, not least because the position I was offered while in the field was that of an active participant, but I am uncomfortable with the label. As Juris also recognizes (ibid.: 21), it does not bridge the gap between the time in the field and the time of academic writing, which is inherent in the analytical process of anthropology, nor does it address the issue of how the research is put to work, among activists, in courts or in public debate.[16] To me, there are several unanswered questions about the 'militant' label: Should one omit the 'dark side' of activism, such as experiences of fatigue or paranoia or internal hierarchies, to further movement goals? Is it a requirement that our work is a relevant tool for those we study, both while in the field and afterwards? And, in a context where many activists theorize about their own practices, should we be more than another voice in the chorus?

I do not have a final answer, but I am convinced that a position as an activist is the only one available if one wishes to undertake thorough ethnographic fieldwork in this context. As Maeckelbergh phrases it, gaining access depends on 'having engagement' (Maeckelbergh 2009: 24). Nevertheless, I prefer to think of myself as an anthropologist

who keeps in mind Viveiros de Castro's words about anthropology's cardinal value, namely 'working to create the conceptual, ontological, self-determination of people' (Viveiros de Castro in Carrithers et al. 2010: 152–53). For me, this means taking seriously the claim made by some activists that a different world can emerge within this one, without trying to explain the claim away, and accepting the less spectacular talk about dead time, in order to imitate the 'native's' concepts and conceptions for theoretical purposes (Holbraad 2004). In my view, placing activists' concepts and perceptions of the world on a par with existing theoretical ideas within anthropology, understanding them as analytical insights that might challenge those of anthropology, is at least as militant as the endeavours of former generations of 'militant' anthropology (Juris 2009; Scheper-Hughes 1995). So while I am generally sympathetic to Nancy Scheper-Hughes's call for anthropologists to engage themselves in questions of power and ethics, having been called on as 'expert witness' in critical cases and debates myself, I do not share the view that theoretical abstractions are a way to keep human misery at a distance (Scheper-Hughes 1995: 416). On the contrary, I believe that theories that take their point of departure in people's own concepts and conceptions are an extension of their self-determination and can contribute to changing mainstream configurations of ethics and power.

Movement and Time

On a more theoretical note, one of the ambitions of this book is to shatter the concern for identity prevalent in contemporary studies of social movements. New Social Movement theory argues that environmental, anti-war, feminist and indigenous movements are different from the class-based movements of the past, in being preoccupied with the process of the construction of a common identity (Alvarez et al. 1998; Melucci 1996; 2003: 42). This is an expedient argument, yet a lopsided one. In *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age*, Alberto Melucci (1996) criticizes the conceptualization of movements as analytical wholes. In his view, movements need to be understood as constituted by a multitude of different meanings, forms of organization and modes of organizing (ibid.: 13). He argues that social scientists should pay attention to how actors construct their action, and hence how unity and holism come about. For Melucci, 'the world is not just a physical location, but has become a unified social space, which is culturally and symbolically perceived' (ibid.: 8).

While Melucci rightly questions the expediency of conceptualizing a movement as 'a whole', his analysis relies on parts, that is, on primordially existing actors, who constitute, perceive and ascribe meaning to the world. As has been convincingly argued elsewhere, the alterglobalization movement, and Left radical activists in particular, do not work on the basis of a shared identity or a single vision of social change (Maeckelbergh 2009: 6–7). Even though identity does not seem to be the main organizing principle, this obviously does not entail that a shared analysis of the ills of global capitalism cannot bind people together in certain circumstances, or that some groups within the movement (women, indigenous peoples) may also pursue 'projects of collective identity' (Eschle 2011: 373). My point is that politics in the present context seems to rely far less on the constitutive power of individual actors than New Social Movement theory envisages. Therefore I have taken my point of departure in movement, that is, in the forms of action in their unfolding, implying that relations are prior to individuals and their social positions (Massumi 2002: 8–9; Strathern 2004). In so doing, I wish to come closer to understanding of how 'being movement' is also a particular way of being in and 'doing' time.

Over the years, several works in anthropology have questioned the temporal ontology underlying anthropological analysis (Fabian 1983: 10; Hodges 2008: 401; Munn 1992: 93; Robbins 2007b: 10–11). Time has been described as a chronological temporal flow, a historical flux or process, they argue, thereby implying both movement and direction. In the light of this critique, several anthropologists have in recent years developed non-chronological arguments about the working of time and the future. Here I draw on Joel Robbins's arguments about discontinuous time and moments of radical change among Protestants in Papua New Guinea and the United States (Robbins 2001, 2007a), and Jane Guyer's provocative thoughts on the punctuation of time and the near future (Guyer 2007), which resonate with activists' concerns for producing radical change while simultaneously refraining from planning for future turning points. Miyazaki's investigation of the relationship between hope and knowledge among Suvavou people in Fiji (Miyazaki 2004) is of particular relevance to my idea about figurations of the future, as he points to how time itself contains an open and indeterminate dimension. Building on Ernest Bloch's writings on hope, Miyazaki argues that hope is characterized by indeterminacy, and that the Suvavou people's orientation to the future is marked by openness (ibid.: 7). The present is conceptualized as the 'nascent state between the determinate and indeterminate' (ibid.: 4). In my view, time cannot be perceived as something which is forward moving from the past to the present and the future;

on the contrary, our attention must be on how times appear and are produced in the present. This is also where activists' work on the body/bodies comes into the picture, as it is simultaneously a work on time that gives determinate form to the indeterminate.

The three works on the alterglobalization movement mentioned above address time and activists' relation to the future in different ways, and this is where my work enters into theoretical dialogue with theirs. The three authors focus on different aspects of the movement, and engage with their subject in different geographical settings and at different points in time after the alterglobalization movement first seized the global political stage during the Seattle protests in 1999. David Graeber's extensive ethnography, *Direct Action* (2009), focused on the North America-based movement, contains detailed descriptions from the long preparations for the Summit of the Americas in Quebec, Canada, and a thorough analysis of activists' relationships with the media. Graeber argues that the movement is fundamentally about constructing new forms of democracy; he traces its anarchist underpinnings and discusses the dilemmas connected to the activists' middle-class backgrounds. He locates the transformational power of activism in what he calls 'the political ontology of the imagination', that is, in a different set of assumptions about what is really real (ibid.: 512). Citing Agamben, he defines imagination as 'the zone of passage between reality and reason' (ibid.: 512). Graeber argues that this is an immanent conception of imagination, a kind of collective creativity, which is caught up in action (ibid.: 521), and in so doing his work echoes Cornelius Castoriadis's writings on the indeterminate character of the imagination (Castoriadis 1987). The strength of the book is undoubtedly its ethnographic detail and rich description, which heightened my attention to the ubiquitous concern for creativity, newness and reinvention of forms of action within the movement. Unlike Graeber, I take point of departure in the (potential) reality of multiple worlds that temporarily emerge for example during confrontations with the police.

In *Networking Futures* (2008), Jeffrey Juris has followed Spanish-based activist networks through summit protests in Prague and Genoa with a focus on their networking practices. He argues that values such as horizontality and equality, which activists associate with their networking practices, are embodied during mass direct actions (ibid.: 5). To understand street protests, Juris draws on performance theory, and particularly Victor Turner's theorization of the ritual process, to account for the emotional response and affective solidarity that emerges among activists during protests (ibid.: 139). He concludes that the decentralized networks 'prefigure the utopian worlds they are struggling to create'

(ibid.: 9). His attention to bodily techniques parallels my own work, even though our ways part at a more theoretical level, namely the extent to which a Turnerian argument about the liminality of protests is the best way to grasp public protests, which I return to below.

In *The Will of the Many* (2009), Marianne Maeckelbergh has studied the forms of consensus democracy in spaces of decision making within the movement in the context of the G8 protest in Gleneagles (2005) and the European Social Forum in London (2004). Maeckelbergh rejects talk of utopias, but argues that the forms of democracy pertaining to these spaces are 'prefigurations of process', where process is 'a practice, a fluid action, an ongoing activity' (ibid.: 21). In her view, practising prefigurations means, on the one hand, that we are 'always trying to make the process we use to achieve our immediate goals an embodiment of our ultimate goals', thereby collapsing the temporal distinction between present and future (ibid.: 66–67); on the other hand, she argues, the decision-making practices within the movement offer a 'progressive realization of future possibilities' (ibid.: 228). Her argument is subjected to more thorough analysis in Chapter 3, but in my view her use of the concept of prefiguration does not accomplish the task of grasping the non-chronological nature of time that is at play in activists' political practices. Etymologically, prefiguration is derived from *pre* ('before') and *figurare* ('to form or shape'),[17] and hence refers to making a figure of the future in its anticipation. My own argument has obvious affinities with this, but Maeckelberg ascribes the prefigurative practices to the conscious intent of human actors, and therefore her attention to the prefiguration of process arises from an ontology of linear time,[18] which does not permit us to adequately understand the radically open and indeterminate elements of activist practices. In other words, there is an underlying assumption about process as having a direction, and about time as flowing between the past, the present and the future.

While the two latter studies thus address activist epistemologies of time, they fail to make explicit their own ontology of time. In contrast, I seek to develop a non-linear argument about time that highlights how time among activists has different temporal ontologies, which hinge on the body. In developing this argument, through the empirical investigation of activist modes of being in and making time, I draw on Viveiros de Castro's theorization of Amerindian perspectivism (Viveiros de Castro 1992, 1998, 2004). Through a discussion of activists' relationship to the present and to the near and distant future, I describe how the body, and the collective body in particular, produces an oscillation between 'dead time' and 'active time'. Based on this, I advance a perspectivist model of time, the implications of which are that the

future is not thought of as a point ahead in linear time, but as a coexisting bodily perspective.

Performative Appearances

According to Mitchell, the concept of performance has gained a foothold in anthropology via two routes (Mitchell 2006: 384). Goffman's work on self-representation, in which he argues that social life is essentially performative (Goffman 1959: 72), has had an impact on the work of various scholars, such as Judith Butler's theory about the performativity of the gendered body (Butler 1999) and the Birmingham School's studies of youth culture. The Birmingham School's insights about sub-cultural groups and how they express an oppositional identity via performative modification of mainstream culture (Clark 2004; Clarke et al. 2006; Hebdige 2006; Krogstad 1986) is part and parcel of how most people understand the activities of Left radical groups. The second route relates to the cross-fertilization between theatre practitioners interested in rituals, and Victor Turner, who became interested in theatre after first having studied rituals (Mitchell 2006: 384; Turner 1987).

I believe it is fair to say that it was Victor Turner who developed the anthropological concept of performance through an attention to liminoid phenomena in 'modern' societies, while simultaneously preserving a dialogue with classical studies of ritual and liminality (Sjørslev 2007: 15–16; Turner 1982: 29–32). Turner characterized his work as comparative symbology, which refers to the interpretation of symbols as well as to the study of expressions by means of symbols (Turner 1982: 20). In his early work, Turner had adopted a processual view of rites of passage from Van Gennep, according to which the ritual process was divided into three phases: separation, transition – a state of social limbo out of secular time that generates a strong sense of communitas among participants – and reincorporation (ibid.: 24; see also Turner 1987: 34). He stresses the integrative function of ritual, thereby reproducing Emile Durkheim's basic thesis about the function of symbols in ritual, namely that they first and foremost reaffirm the sentiments upon which the group is based (Durkheim 1954: 216).[19] Later on, Turner highlighted the transformative and potential quality of the liminal and liminoid phase of transition which, as he put it, 'can generate and store a plurality of alternative models for living, from utopias to programs' (Turner 1982: 33; see also Kapferer 2006: 137). Turner's allusion to the existence of such other immanent models or worlds that may appear during ritual and performance points to the heart of what is also at stake here, but the

ontology of linear time underlying the ritual process, even in Turner's version, is a major stumbling block, together with his focus on single events that, as mentioned earlier, excludes the dynamics between them.

After Turner, various anthropologists have pointed to the limitations of symbolic analysis. Edward Schieffelin has argued for a move from looking at rituals as systems of representation to seeing them as processes of practice. 'When human beings come into the presence of one another they do so expressively, establishing consensus about who they are and what their situation is about through voice, gestures, facial expressions, bodily postures and action' (Schieffelin 1997: 195). Citing Bruce Kapferer, Schieffelin criticizes the idea that participants undergo a transformation just by being exposed to symbolic meaning (Schieffelin 1985: 708). Schieffelin thus proposes that the non-discursive dimensions of ritual should be studied, and argues that it is in the relationship between performers and audience that the construction of reality takes place (ibid.: 712; Schieffelin 1997: 200–2). Kapferer later amended this view, arguing that performances are not primarily expressive of meaning, but should be looked upon in terms of their effectiveness (Kapferer 2005). I build on this idea of performative effectiveness as it resonates with activists' concept of style and the distinctions they maintain between symbolic and effective direct actions.

Framing is the final aspect of the performance literature that must be considered here, particularly as it might enable us to reach a definition of 'event'. According to Bateson, the frame is a meta-communicative message, which indicates how a statement or action is to be interpreted. The most well-known examples are the statement 'This is play', as well as the more complex question 'Is this play?', which establishes a more paradoxical frame (Bateson 1972: 181–91). In the present context, the repetitive chant 'This is not a riot!' during the Reclaim Power action at the Climate Summit in Copenhagen, referred to at the outset of this introduction, can be interpreted as such a particular way of playing with the frame, and of intensifying a certain aspect of reality (see Sjørslev 2007: 18). Furthermore, one could argue that it is the framing that defines an intensified moment, or what we, in a more contemporary language, would call an event.

Yet the idea of framing, and especially the emphasis on the symbolic and communicative aspects of performance, is somewhat 'out of sync' with the approach to political protests taken here, which seeks to accentuate the effects and not the meaning of an event. This point can be further clarified with reference to Judith Butler's distinction between illocutionary and perlocutionary speech acts, which are based on J.L. Austin's philosophy of language. Perlocutionary speech acts are

characterized by initiating a series of consequences, but the speech act and the consequences are temporally distinct. Illocutionary speech acts entail that what is said is considered to be an act in itself; it performs its deed in the moment of utterance (Butler 1997: 17). According to Butler, language is a form of action and not simply an expressive tool. In my view, protests are performed to have an effect, and direct actions are, furthermore, actions that aim at producing an effect without any delay in time. Following this, what would constitute an event in the present context is not so much defined by prior framing (the calling of a demonstration timed to coincide with a more formal summit event for example), as by the subsequent valuation of the situation's intensity and the form's ability to spur effects. This is reflected in the structure of the book, which is built around a selection of key ethnographic events.

In recent years the interest in performance has re-emerged in connection with the study of materiality and the agency of material objects (see Gell 1998; Keane 2006; Sjørslev 2007). The material turn in anthropology has been an inspiration, though it is the materiality of the body that is of primary interest here. In other words, I retain the concept of performance, and the particular attention to form it entails, but I aim at stripping away its constructivist legacy.

Informed and inspired by Marilyn Strathern's relational ontology, one of the implications of which is that the world is always already made up of social relations, I want to follow a somewhat different path to performative protests. In Strathern's view, performances are 'appearances' that make particular relations visible (Strathern 1988: 277–78, 324). In *The Gender of the Gift* (ibid.), it is the ceremonial exchange of pigs between male members of society that renders gendered relations visible. At the most simple level, the pig is the objectification of the unmediated exchange between men and women.[20] This objectification – that is, appearance of relations – is guided by aesthetics (ibid.: 160; Gell 1999: 37).[21] In Strathern's view, aesthetics does not refer to abstract beauty but, as I shall return to in my rethinking of the concept of style in Chapter 5, is much more closely related to appropriateness and persuasiveness (Strathern 2004: 10; see also Riles 1998). This means that only certain performances can make the relations they objectify properly appear (Strathern 1988: 181). In sum, through skilful and effective performance, otherwise invisible social relations gain a visible form. My interest here is both in the forms of these appearances – that is, the various forms politics take – and the relations that are rendered visible, for example in the moments of bodily confrontation between activists and the police. The key question is what relations the collective body, which Aske talked about on the street after the Reclaim Power action, is an appearance of?

In relation to the phenomena under study, exchanges are not gift exchanges as in Strathern's Mount Hagen but, I argue, bodily exchanges. I also argue that bodily confrontation is as much about cutting social relations as about constructing or forging them, as performative approaches inspired by Durkheim and Turner have usually held. In my writing on the body, I will draw on Marcel Mauss's classic analysis, which describes 'the way in which, from society to society, men [*sic*] know how to use their body' (Mauss 1992: 455). The comparative endeavour aside, Mauss is helpful in understanding how activists learn to use their bodies through action training so that synchronization of movement and a skilful performance is obtained.

Mauss's view of the body as an instrument, as both means and technical object (ibid.: 461), echoes the materiality and affect of the body in more recent contributions (Massumi 2002; Mitchell 2006). According to Massumi, affect is an experience of intensity, that is, a moment of unformed potentiality that cannot be captured in language (Massumi 2002: 30). Massumi defines affect as a 'prepersonal intensity corresponding to the passage from one experiential state of the body to another and implying an augmentation or diminution of the body's capacity to act' (Massumi 1987: xvi). What interests me in the collective body is not communitas or affective solidarity, but the intensity of the body and its synchronization, because this will enable me to illuminate, in a subsequent chapter, how the body engenders time.

Looking for politics in the body is not a new undertaking. Over the past forty years anthropologists inspired by theories of feminism and philosophy have interrogated the nature/culture and mind/body dualities, and pointed to the social and discursive production of sex, gender and bodies (Lock 1993: 135; Povinelli 2006; Vilaça 2005). According to Elizabeth Povinelli, the much-needed critique of the Western metaphysics of substance has, however, also led to the abandonment of the material aspects of the body as an unfortunate side effect.[22] As I shall discuss in greater detail later, activists' bodies are transformed through protests, but also through nutrition and abstention; however, this attention to the materiality of the body does not prevent it from being considered highly unstable (cf. Vilaça 2005).

In sum, through the study of these intensified moments of political action and protest, I show how it is the body that engenders time. Paraphrasing Povinelli, it is the body that is the source of 'the otherwise' (Povinelli 2011: 109), or, in Viveiros de Castro's words, the body is 'the site of a differentiating perspective' (Viveiros de Castro 1998: 480–82). During protests, different techniques – such as masks, colours, music, repetition or performative styles – are employed to engage participants

and engender certain effects (see Mitchell 2006; Sneath et al. 2009: 12). Bodily confrontation implies, not multiple epistemologies of time, but various temporal ontologies. I therefore think of performances as acts in themselves that organize time and space; that is, as activist's temporal incarnation of another future. These moments when an indeterminate future gains determinate form is what I call 'figuration of the future'.

Outline of the Book

The chapters develop an exploration of the relationship between form and time in the context of the political practices of Left radical activists. In each chapter, I discuss recent contributions to an anthropology of the future, drawing on explanatory models of radical change, generation and prefiguration while I slowly set forth an understanding of a particular kind of body politics and settle for a perspectivist model of time.

In Chapter 1 I describe the political cosmology of Left radical activists by taking as a point of departure a description of the European Social Forum celebrated in Malmö under the slogan 'Another World is Possible' and YouTube videos circulating on the internet prior to summit protests. The aim of the chapter is to describe the activists' views of the capitalist world, its dynamics and the forces that inhabit it, as well as their experiences of temporal discontinuity and the logic of radical change.

Turning to the Scandinavian context in Chapter 2, I attempt to answer the question: Is Left radical activism an expression of young people's desire to rebel against the establishment, and therefore a 'natural' part of attaining social adulthood? Here I focus on the public debate around the eviction of Ungdomshuset in Copenhagen. I argue that the public debate surrounding this event represents activists as enmeshed in the difficult process of becoming adult, self-authoring individuals (cf. Povinelli 2006). Through a description of how Ungdomshuset was used and perceived by activists themselves, I point to a different, collective sense of autonomy embedded in how activism is about 'becoming active' and absorbed in common activities. I also argue that the body is turned into the chief realm of politics, and the site of differentiation between dead time and active time.

Chapter 3 turns to direct action planning and action training, and explores how Left radical activists deal with intentions for the near future. It is argued that intentions are considered dangerous and that, during planning meetings, they are distributed (Gell 1998) to various non-human forms, such as puppets. The question is raised about how relatively well-coordinated protest performances come about, and in

answer to this, techniques of bodily synchronization are explored. Maeckelberg's conceptualization of activist meetings as being prefigurative of the future (Maeckelbergh 2009) is discussed and, to rectify what I see as the misleading ontology of linear time that underlies her argument, I advance the idea of figuration; figuration is what gives determinate form to an indeterminate future.

The security measures around summit events, the enmity between activists and the police and the intersection of different times of security are explored in Chapter 4. I dwell on activist paranoia and fear of surveillance, and their perception of the police as slipping in and out of humanity. Inspired by Viveiros de Castro's work on Amerindian cosmology and enmity among the Arawéte (Viveiros de Castro 1992, 2004), I argue that humans, animals and police share a common culture, but they come in different 'clothes' or bodily appearances. A particular symmetry (in how they see each other) emerges from the analysis together with a set of common categories to describe the enemy that revolve around a perception of each other's unpredictability and bodily transformability. Both parties argue for a necessary play with invisibility and disguise, which is substituted by spectacular appearance in public space.

In Chapter 5 I finally turn to the appearance of activists during direct actions in Copenhagen and during international summits. The 'native' understanding of style, as integrating a concern with the appropriateness, persuasiveness and effectiveness of action, is built upon to develop an anthropological concept of style. Building on the arguments of the previous chapters, I argue that a 'good style' elicits a temporal, bodily point of view in the moment of confrontation with the police. By transposing Viveiros de Castro's theorization of Amerindian perspectivism (Viveiros de Castro 1998, 2004) to the context of Left radical politics, it is argued that the ability to create cosmological differentiation between active time and dead time, and 'see' a different world within this one, depends on the ability to establish a different corporal mode of being.

Notes

1. Summit protests are usually divided into different colour-coded blocs, which each represent a different tactic of engagement. The Reclaim Power action was organized into a Blue, Green and a newly invented Bike Bloc. Other frequently found blocs are the Black Bloc (activists wear black clothing to appear as a mass) and the Pink Bloc (activists dressed up as clowns and fairies).
2. In 1999, the mass actions in Seattle, where approximately 50,000 people blocked the summit of the World Trade Organization (WTO), marked the beginning of a storm of protests against meetings of the global political and financial institutions

such as the WTO, EU, G8, World Bank and IMF. The dynamo of the protests was a 'movement of movements', that is, a swarm of groups, organizations and ad hoc networks with different political motives, projects and forms of organizing (Graeber 2002; Katsiaficas 2006; Maeckelbergh 2009). This 'movement of movements' was known as the anti-globalization movement during the Seattle protests (Graeber 2002: 63). Other frequently used names are the 'global justice movement' and the 'alterglobalization movement' (Eschle 2005: 1767–68; Rupert 2005: 36–37), each name highlighting different characteristics of the movement as well as the political and theoretical position of the writer.

3. Globale Rødder (Global Roots/Troublemakers) is a name playing on the double meaning in Danish of *rødder* as 'root' and 'troublemaker' or 'tough'. The network was created in 2001 in view of the upcoming EU summit in 2002, hosted by Denmark, as an expression of the radical strain of the alterglobalization movement, inspired by the Italian Tute Bianche. After the summit, activists from Globale Rødder were involved in actions concerned with Danish participation in the war in Iraq. The network was dissolved around 2003, but activists from Globale Rødder were subsequently involved in establishing the Danish Social Forum and Piratgruppen (the Pirate Group), combating the intellectual property rights regime, as well as in the EuroMayDay project, which focused on precarious relations of work. Much later, in 2007 and 2008, similar modes of action were reconfigured in the context of the G13 action (a mass civil disobedience action after evictions from the social centre, Ungdomshuset), which I describe in Chapter 2, and Shut Down the Camp (against a Danish detention centre for refugees), described in Chapter 5.
4. 'Do-it-yourself' (DIY) is used by activists to denote practices in daily life aimed at creating self-reliance and independence from market-based capitalism. The idea is that societal transformation can be brought about through concrete actions here and now (cf. McKay 1998).
5. Christiania is an area of former military barracks in the centre of Copenhagen, which was squatted in 1971 and transformed into a self-governed space. Christiania has approximately 1,000 inhabitants, and is an autonomous space that has most consistently developed its own economy, system of democratic decision making and activist infrastructure. For more information, see the Christiana website: www.christiania.org. Last accessed 26 December 2014.
6. The solution suggested by the squatters involved a local foundation (Himmelblå Fonden) purchasing the building from the owner, Ungbo (a society renting out cheap youth residences), in order to donate it to the municipality, under the condition that the municipality would turn the right of use (usufruct) over to the squatters (Heinemann 1995: 129–30). This model was later reiterated in the case of Ungdomshuset, where a private foundation offered to buy the building from Faderhuset (lit. Father House, a Christian sect) on the condition that its usufruct rights would be handed over to the young activists for one Danish krone (US$ 0.20).
7. The Free Gymnasium is an alternative secondary school founded in 1970 that focuses on the development of direct, consensus democracy among students and teachers.
8. The agreement was signed by 'forhandlingsgruppen for BZ-brigaden' (the squatting brigade's team of negotiators), but in the contract they were referred to as 'the users' (*brugerne*). Under the agreement, the users were responsible for the management, while the municipality paid 90 per cent of the running costs. The agreement could be cancelled by the municipality if the house was not kept 'open', had too few activities, the buildings were not maintained, the house was used for accommodation or if

drugs were found on the premises. As I describe in Chapter 2, these requirements were cited later in the public debate to argue for the cancellation of the contract (see US and FBZB 1982). In 1997, the contract was cancelled and replaced with another agreement, which could be cancelled at only three months' notice (KUC 1997).

9. In 2004, the Danish state made an offer to Christiania for 'normalizing' voluntarily. This entailed turning part of the historic ramparts of Copenhagen, presently part of Christiania, into a recreational area, as well as the development of the remainder of Christiania into a mixed residence and commercial area. The relationship between Christiania and the authorities has been marked by conflict-ridden negotiations and a lawsuit by Christiania against the state where they claim usufruct rights over the area. In 2011 an agreement was reached, by which Christiania will now buy the land from the state, and manage it collectively through a foundation. The conflict also concerned the open and undisguised selling of marijuana in so-called Pusher Street, but this was stopped, in part by the inhabitants themselves and through police action in March 2004.
10. Curiously enough, this part of Nørrebro is also considered more safe according to an annual *tryghedsindeks* (safety index) issued by the municipality of Copenhagen, whereas the area on the other side of Nørrebrogade (the former black rectangle) is considered less safe. For the safety index, see http://tryghedsindekset.kk.dk/sites/tryghedsindekset.kk.dk/files/uploaded-files/Resultater%20p%C3%A5%20distrikter%20og%20bydele%202010.pdf. Last accessed 26 December 2014. The visitation zones are, according to the Police Act § 6, a 'security generating measure' (see 'Krim: Københavnske visitationszoner er ulovlige', *Politiken*, 15 December 2007; and 'Ministerium blåstempler politivisitationer', *Ritzau*, 22 March 2010).
11. My inspiration to make this point derives from Annelise Riles (1998), who compares the aesthetics of UN documents with Fijian mats. She argues that the meaning of a UN document is not in the document, but resides in the relationship between documents and between bracketed and non-bracketed text in the documents. One important element in producing a beautiful document, she argues, is the repetition of language, that is, the intertextual references between documents. This implies that the UN documents are 'layered' like Fijian mats, which are piled on top of each other in particular ritual circumstances.
12. I was involved in a mass arrest in connection with recurrent protests against the building of Øresundsbroen in 1995 and 1996. Yet, the Danish High Court found us, the accused, not guilty, because the public prosecutor was unable to establish individual guilt, or in other words, to prove that each of the arrested had violated the law. This concrete experience has a bearing on my interest in how activists decouple individuals and intentions during planning meetings, while the police base their investigations on the assumption of individual motives and intentions (see Chapters 3 and 4).
13. On this issue, see the EuroMayDay website: www.euromayday.org/about.php. Last accessed 18 March 2014.
14. Decisions can be about where the next ESF will take place, or issues of principle about the ESF programme, fees for participation and so on. The EPA also engages in ongoing discussion about how to develop and enhance the ESF. See the ESF website: http://esf2008.org/about/who-organizes-esf/european-preparatory-assembly. Last accessed 7 August 2012.
15. See 'Undercover Police: Officer B Identified as Mark Jacobs', *Guardian*, 19 January 2011.

16. My Ph.D. dissertation was, without my knowing, used both by the prosecution and by the counsel for the defendant in a case about the legality of arresting just under 1,000 participants in a demonstration during the Climate Summit. Moreover, my observations of the activities of a British undercover police officer on Danish soil have been debated in the media, and led to so-called Paragraph 20 questions in the Danish Parliament (which are written questions from a member of parliament to a minister on an issue of public concern) about the activities of foreign police officers in Denmark, to which the Ministry of Justice never managed to provide answers.
17. Etymologies from the Etymonline website: www.etymonline.com. Last accessed 15 April 2012.
18. On this, see also Maeckelbergh (2011). For a critique, see Razsa and Kurnik (2012).
19. Durkheim focused explicitly on forms of religious life. According to Durkheim, however, the true function of the rites performed by Australian clans is not what they (the clan members) understand it to be – to increase their totem species – but to produce socially useful effects. During the rite, the Aborigines experience intense enthusiasm, and as a consequence they are 'transported to another level of reality', which makes them feel they are outside and above normal moral life (Durkheim 1954: 216, 226).
20. In Strathern's later work, this is more consistently developed into a theory of the fractal person, where the relations that we usually consider as external are thought of as internal to the person (Strathern 2004; see also Wagner 1991).
21. Underlying this is the idea that some relations are 'eclipsed', a concept that refers to how relations of a more subordinate order are nested, occluded and latent within relations of a more encompassing order, the consequence being that the subordinate relation is only accessible through the encompassing order (Gell 1999: 41–43).
22. Povinelli (2006: 27–94) describes a sore on her body acquired during her fieldwork among aboriginal Australians. The sore was both discursively produced as 'contact with Dreaming', and as staphylococcus because of the filthiness of indigenous communities. But sores still sicken the body, she argues, and for aboriginal Australians the sores often have the effect that they die much earlier than the non-indigenous population. Povinelli draws a distinction between corporeality, which refers to how forms of power shape materiality, and carnality, which is the material matter, such as a sore.