

Urban Dissensus: Spatial Self-Organisation at Wards Corner

VARDY, Sam <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6418-5575>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/24117/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

VARDY, Sam (2019). Urban Dissensus: Spatial Self-Organisation at Wards Corner. In: FISHER, Jens Kaae, CHIAPPINI, Letizia, PUGALIS, Lee and BRUZZESE, Antonella, (eds.) Enabling Urban Alternatives: Crises, Contestation, and Cooperation. Palgrave, 65-81.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Urban Dissensus
Spatial Self-organisation at Wards Corner

Sam Vardy
Sheffield Hallam University
s.vardy@shu.ac.uk

Urban Dissensus
Spatial Self-organisation at Wards Corner

Introduction
Spatialising Self-organisation

Spatial self-organisation operates in response to urban issues of alienation and inequality through the mobilisation of people, spaces and resources, and I argue, permits new forms of spatiality. The term overlays the political tactic of self-organisation with the production, use and politics of urban space so as to consider a more radical kind of participation within urban practice, drawing into being radical re-politicisations of social relations, through spatial, urban processes of becoming. Across different times and political contexts, the spatialities of self-organisation have undergone transformations of scale, temporality, desire, and physicality. In them, we encounter a wide range of urban practices and processes (some of which include spatial professionals of some kind, architects, artists, designers, planners etc., and many which don't) which constitute a contemporary phenomenon that can be historically situated - for example through the factories of the *autogestion* movements, the Italian autonomists and autonomist feminists who drew self-organisation out of the factories and into the streets and the neighbourhood.

There are many more important examples; the Paris Commune of 1871 offers an early form of spatial self-organisation in which the spatial, political and subjective components are interconnected (Ross, 2008, 2016); South America's factory based *autogestion* movement; the Italian autonomists and their legacy of social centres; and more recently, a range of self-organised cultural spaces, including new varieties of social centres (such as La Casa Invisible in Malaga, Spain, and the *Star and Shadow Cinema* in Newcastle upon Tyne, UK); larger autonomous collectives such as the well-known Christiania in Copenhagen, and the *ZAD* autonomous zone near Nantes in France; networked resistance to gentrification such as the *Park Fiction* project in Hamburg, Germany and the subject of this present chapter; and alternative architectural projects such as those by the atelier d'architecture autogérée in Paris. These diverse projects and places demonstrate the diverse characteristics and potentials of spatial self-organisation to enable alternative urban processes and experiences.

From a theoretical perspective, the notion of spatial self-organisation is indebted to Henri Lefebvre's notion of *autogestion territoriale*, through which he was committed to the principle of the self-management of the city by its 'citadins' (Guilbault, Lefebvre, & Renaudie, 2009, p. 2; Lefebvre, 1995), through radical political decentralisation, grassroots democratic governance, and attention to everyday enactments and experiences of the inhabitants of the

city (and based on core principles of participation in decision-making about urban matters, and the right to *appropriation* - of existing spaces (to access, occupy, use) as well as the ability to create new spaces).

Spatial self-organisation introduces alternative socio-spatial imaginaries into urban contexts, thereby disrupting or reorienting their conventional trajectories. In this chapter I examine processes of spatial self-organisation at Wards Corner in London, and specifically the long-term actions, events, and organisation of the Wards Corner Coalition, a diverse group of residents, traders, spatial professionals and others who have enacted a complex process of what I hope to establish, following the work of Jacques Rancière (2009, 2004) as a form of urban *dissensus*.

Towards an Urban Dissensus

Rancière and a politics of dissensus

Spatial self-organisation and the idea of urban dissensus are constructed in the context of, and in response to, what has been referred to (Mouffe, 2005; Swyngedouw, 2007, 2011) as the contemporary depoliticised, 'post-political' condition, in which the city has seen an 'evacuation of the properly political'. The city as a political space, with genuine opportunities for creative encounter and democratic negotiation, has undergone a transformation to a technocratic regime based on consensus – for Rancière, the very negation of politics. Within what he calls the police-order (what is popularly termed 'politics'), consensual attitudes serve to fix and partition subjects and actions, and assigns them to particularly defined spaces. In Thesis 7 of his ten theses on politics, Rancière says that according to the police-order “society consists of groups dedicated to specific modes of action, [of] places where these occupations are exercised, [and of] modes of being corresponding to these occupations and these places” (Rancière, 2009, p. 36). What is more, there is no space, or 'mode of being' that can accommodate a dissenting position, to challenge the forces of regulation and control that determine what one can do, and how one should think – a locksmith should think like a locksmith, and would not, for example, think like someone in government – therefore they should not *be* in government. The effect of such a police-order is most acutely felt, according to Rancière, by those who are not effectively assigned a role in any 'community' – their political existence is not recognised; they are the *sans-part* (without part).

Politics, for Rancière, in opposition to his term *the police*, is a disturbance, break or rupture in the order of 'legitimacy and domination'; a gap in what he refers to as the *sensible* itself. Here, the *sans-part* work in order to make themselves heard, they struggle to make a claim for 'a place at the table'. This situates any genuinely 'political' act as always being in an antagonistic position in relation to the police-order, and it is here that the fundamental disagreement or *dissensus*, for Rancière, lies, since "democracy implies a practice of

dissensus, one that it keeps re-opening and that that practice of ruling relentlessly plugs" (Rancière, 2009, p. 54). The partitioning and fixing of social roles and expectations of the police-order is thrown into question by a group that is constituted by virtue of their exclusion. It is not a question of *who* is excluded, but of whether that group is thought to have a right to partake in the issue at hand, in the process of defining the commonality of the community.

Spatial Self-organisation as Urban Dissensus

The neo-liberal, post-political city (although Rancière might argue that such a contradictory entity could not call itself a city) that we find in Western European urban contexts such as the one explored below, and its techno-managerial approach to urban transformation, represents the spatial order of the *police*, fixing subjects into predetermined spaces and roles – into their 'proper' place – subjectively and spatially. Conventional practices of urban planning and architecture act as instruments of control that inscribe such fixed and immutable social relations, and as Lahiji has suggested, specifically serve to inhibit rather than promote political subjectivation (Lahiji, 2011).

Spatial self-organisation is however, based on *dissensus*, and this disagreement can take different forms, by throwing into debate different aspects of the police-order in relation to space, its production and use. While space can be an instrument of control and domination, belonging to the order of the police, a spatial reading of Rancière's work suggests that space also belongs to the order of *politics* – a space for egalitarian processes of negotiation and the location of the disruption of the police-order. Rather than, as in the work of Laclau (1990), understanding space as fixed, static and restricting political potential, Massey (2005) reinforces the political potentiality of space, and Dikeç (2005) notes that "Ranciere's politics is made possible by a multiplicity of political subjects configuring, transforming, appropriating space for the manifestation of dissensus, for the coexistence of two worlds in one, becoming political subjects in and through space" (Dikeç, 2005, p. 181). Rancière puts it clearly - "the principle function of politics is the configuration of its own space" (Rancière, 2009, p. 37).

Instruments of inscription (or of consensus) litter the production of urban space by the police-order, and include the functionalism of the planning system, the professionalisation of architecture and other urban disciplines, and the economic basis of most urban development. As an urban form of dissensus, self-organised spatial practices introduce 'impropriety' into the configuration as assumed by the police-order to create a rupture, a gap in the spatial, sensory and experiential reality of the city. By doing this, they make possible alternative forms of urban action that demand new configurations and relationships; Rancière points to the way that dissensual processes challenge inscription within given roles, possibilities, and competences (Rancière, 2009, p. 53). Spatial self-organisation therefore reflects fundamental disagreements against the police-order about how to live in common in the city, how to make decisions about urban transformation, how to be a citizen of the city.

Before looking at an example of urban dissensus to consider the ways in which alternative urban processes might be enabled, it is worth reiterating here the multiplicity of forms and types of organisation and spatialities that exist within what can be called 'spatial self-organisation'. Indeed, trying to define the limits of the term is difficult because of its dissensual nature as an ongoing struggle against the police-order. The task of definition itself affects different realities if carried out within the police mentality rather than that of politics. Rancière discusses this in relation to the idea of subversive art:

Police consists in saying: Here is the definition of subversive art. Politics, on the other hand, says: No, there is no subversive form of art in and of itself; there is a sort of permanent guerrilla war being waged to define the potentialities of forms of art and the political potentialities of anyone at all. (Ranciere, 2007, p. 6)

Spatial self-organisation therefore is a process of becoming; produced each time through the performative enactment of the multiplicity of its occurrences, each contributing something new and unique to its body of knowledge along the way.

A Network of Networks: Urban Dissensus in North London

[insert photo 01.jpg]

Ward's Corner is a mixed use urban block that sits at the point where Seven Sisters Road meets the High Road in Tottenham, North London. The main building on the block, once a department store, has been derelict and vacant since 1972, while the central covered area has become an indoor market for the neighbourhood's Latin American residents. The vacant store and smaller empty spaces have engendered a sense of perpetual uncertainty about the future of the site which, although making the livelihoods of those living and working there precarious, also provided the opportunity for small businesses to become established in the smaller units. There are now range of activities and tenures on the block, including the market, some small businesses facing the street, a few houses, and still some empty spaces.

Wards Corner and the market within it plays an important role as a centre of North London's Latin American population, both despite, and because of, being neglected economically and architecturally. It has, for at least ten years now, been the subject of significant rupture and disagreement, as the local authority, a national government body and a private developer worked together on proposals to develop the site.

[insert mapWC.jpg]

The Wards Corner Coalition

In response to a private regeneration scheme which proposed full demolition of the block to make way for new retail spaces and apartments (plans that were not met favourably with local residents and the traders on the site) a complex and indeterminate group of committed local actors established the Wards Corner Coalition (WCC) in 2008 to challenge the formal proposals, and to think about how to develop alternative processes through which to develop Wards Corner. The WCC is deliberately and consciously self-organised, and grew out of a number of existing active self-organised groups in the area, including market traders and trader associations, residents associations, the Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC), Latin American organisations, and environmental groups. The group is non-hierarchical and describe themselves as a network of networks.

There has been a significant struggle on the part of the WCC and its partners to be accepted as a legitimate actor in the decision making process around the transformation of Ward's Corner. The group has primarily challenged the process by which urban change is being implemented, calling for a more inclusive methodology for making propositions about its future. The campaign has followed a complex route through legal battles and appearances in the High Court. Planning applications made by the developer have been accepted, and others rejected, and the WCC feel that the local authority have been working to support the developer, while failing to treat those that disagree with the proposals in the same regard.

The enactments of the WCC and the diverse actors of their network of networks evolved as an ongoing struggle, a continual process of dissensus that has established the potential for alternative social and spatial trajectories. Their form of spatial self-organisation suggests, as discussed above, other practices and imaginaries of how to make collective decisions about urban transformation. They achieved this through various tactics of urban dissensus that, as we shall see, opened up new political potentialities of local actors.

The dissensus here takes place because a heterogeneous group of people have been working through various methods to make a claim for the right to be part of the decision-making process about the development of their environment; they have struggled against the police-order that determines that these people have no role in making such decisions and that they are not legitimate partners in the debate. The police in this case is not constituted by a single person or authority, but by a number of agents with overlapping interests. The developer (a national private company), the local authority, the planning department, and The Bridge NDC (New Deal for Communities) partnership also formed part of this group, before the national programme of NDC's came to an end.¹

The developer and local authority coordinated the proposed urban transformation and determined its design, including a suggestion of roles and possibilities. The proposed development, if built, would potentially prevent access to the site for the majority of the existing residents and traders, as they dictate who is able to live and work there by making

only a particular type of accommodation and business unit available, with corresponding economic rates. The economically driven motives of the developers are implemented through the control of space, in a way that, as Laclau suggests, is static and conservative; thus space becomes the very material through which the powerful maintain their control of urban transformation and imagination. This mode of development maintains and inscribes fixed and closed social relations, the roles of actors and the very activities and events that are possible – in Rancière's terms they describe a limited and static distribution of the sensible. They are built on an assumption that only certain people are 'qualified' to make real decisions and this assertion then defines the decision-making processes that are followed.

The clearest example of this is the Development Brief document written by the council with the local NDC with which to describe and define the nature of the development and therefore the appointment of the preferred developer. This document was confidential and not made public, yet it determined the very nature of the agreement, of the specific process of procuring urban change, and the nature of the final proposition. It was in other words, a document that defined the limits of the production of desire, and assigned precisely whose desires would be acknowledged. This is a powerful demonstration of the way that the police fixes and limits 'possibilities'; by removing the process of producing and developing desire, of opening the question of urban change to the real constituency of the place. Any offering of information offered from behind closed doors, occurs when the decisions are already made, the positions already fixed, the possibilities already made impossible.

Tactics of Urban Dissensus

The campaigners employed a range of different tactics in their efforts to challenge the formal proposals and to try to become legitimate partners in the decision making process around the future of Wards Corner.

At a very early stage before the WCC was fully established, the traders on the site responded with alternative imaginaries that demonstrated that other processes could be explored, and that such alternatives could be significantly different in terms of both process and material, spatial and economic proposition. The traders' proposals included retaining and developing the existing market and businesses, and introducing new businesses and residents with extensions to the existing buildings. It was a deliberately quick proposal – the group's self-organisation enabled them to respond promptly, unencumbered by protocol. This action was relatively small in relation to the activities and events that followed as part of the Wards Corner Coalition, but they are significant in that they made the group aware of the potential force of self-organised action, and established a way of operating for the activities of the campaign in the following years. The coalition documentation reiterates that that the group were attempting to develop a different approach to the production of urban space:

We arose and work in direct opposition to the existing model that the Council/Developer operates by... [but] we have gone beyond just fighting an unwanted development, we are fighting for a new way of doing things. (WCC, 2009)

Thus the WCC's primary focus was twofold - to challenge the developer's proposals and to cultivate an alternate process through which to generate other ideas and imaginaries for the future of the site. By self-organising to search for new ways of working on, and demanding to be part of the discussion about, the development of Wards Corner, the coalition opened up the possibility of developing a new "configuration of possibilities" for processes of urban transformation. It did this in part by enacting a form of spatial self-organisation that is performative and demonstrative of the processes of dissensus.

One tactic was to produce their own 'Community Plan' for the site in the form of a design document that could counter the equivalent documents and images produced by the developer. It was first submitted to the planning department in 2012 and subsequently approved. The plan was produced slowly through the network and on the basis that it would attempt to make the planning process more transparent and accessible. The group also agreed to avoid using experts or professionals of planning or architecture in the traditional way. This was initially because the group wanted to take matters of design and imagination into their own hands (not to rely on others to do it for them) but also for financial reasons given their non-funded status. Instead the coalition wanted to encourage critical collaborations between invited and sympathetic experts to work closely with local inhabitants to explore the issues and their ideas.

[insert photo 02.jpg]

In 2008 the group set up the framework for the West Green Road and Seven Sisters Development Trust, which is intended to manage the new market and associated initiatives, should the plan be approved. This trust although in its very embryonic stage, was informed by collective and community management structures. Another organisational tactic within the group was a collaborative wiki ² which also acted as a dissemination and self-publishing tool. The website includes a detailed account of the process of political struggle and played a partial role in building up a network of interested and supportive parties.

Spaces of Urban Dissensus

Certain processes of urban dissensus can lead towards new socio-spatial relations, and a range of more spatial tactics at Wards Corner performatively re-figured various spaces into spaces of dissensus.. The key spaces that I identify here are the space of the site itself (the buildings of the market and businesses themselves), the street, and the spaces of the police-order.

One's own space as space of dissensus

The various spaces of the site itself have been transformed over the years of the campaign, not physically, but in terms of use and social understanding. The Pueblito Paisa Café is one of the most prominent spaces, a Latin American realm that sits between the High Road forecourt and the indoor market; an active, occupied threshold in itself. The café is used by market traders, shoppers at the market, and passers-by. The WCC hold weekly meetings in the café, and have done so for most of the time that the campaign has been active, since approximately 2007. The café is temporarily transformed through this action, over-layering it with alternate meaning. The planning of the group's tactics and actions was designed and developed in the very place under threat, and this served to cement and further the claim made on it.

To maintain openness of the process, The Glasshouse organisation was appointed to coordinate this aspect, who in turn invited East Architects to run analysis and design based workshop about the site and community driven development. This was one of the only times that professionals were appointed in this way, and specifically because of the way that East work. The coalition invited the NDC, the local authority, and the developer, but they did not attend any of the sessions. The emerging plan was communicated to the local residents and traders etc. as widely as possible between 2007 and 2012; the WCC employing a range of practices: events, large public meetings, on-site activities, conversations, leafleting, workshops, cultural events and engaging with London mayoral and local council hustings.

[insert photo 03.jpg]

Inviting the 'Police' and Others to the Site

The coalition also brought the police themselves to the physical space of the market, cafe and street; bodies in space again, but with a different inversion. In different instances, various formal actors were met to hold discussions about the proposed transformations and the alternative possibilities. These guests included local councillors, South American political and business people, and London mayoral candidates. While essentially a tactic with which to gather support and publicity for the campaign, these performative enactments of spatial self-organisation crucially demonstrate that others too can discuss these issues at hand with such people, not only the developer, local authority (the police) and so on. This tactic of dissensus reflects one aspect or approach to the recurring question of the relation of self-organised actions to authority or to the police. Because the process of political work that is going on here is concerned with instigating and maintaining a different kind of dialogue with the police, it defines this relation in a particular way. Actions such as those in the situations above reveal a necessity on the part of those engaged in urban dissensus to be able to work at the same time between positions of contestation and cooperation with the police-order and their mechanisations. Their cooperation is urgent and necessary; it is in

fact what processes of dissensus are working towards.

The Street as Space of Dissensus

Another tactic has been to design and initiate a number of theatrical events in the public spaces near the site, including barbecues, exhibitions, and a collective action which involved hundreds of bodies linking arms around the site, in a display of both protection and a sense of ownership. Beyond the internal spaces of the buildings, the enactments of spatial self-organisation here spilled out onto the streets, a familiar space of activism, campaigning and protest. Such gestures can be small - a poster on a tree, an info board or an occupied stall at an event. These are explicitly spatial actions - they occupy and transform their chosen space. They also bring the debate, the discussion about how the block could be developed, to the perspective of those that are typically removed from such a debate, to the realm of the sensible. This reflects only one side of the process of subjectivation - as by bringing the discussion into a more exposed place does not guarantee any shift in the attitude of the police, who may indeed simply reassert that there is 'nothing to see'. But it is an important part of the overall tactic - that a complex and overlapping spatiality is required; and that the realm of the sensible, the everyday and the lived, is a crucial component of such a conceptualisation.

One event included a 'hug' of the site which involved about 500 people standing with linked arms around the buildings. While the notion of the 'hug' may be clouded by a sense of sentiment, tradition or nostalgia, it can also be seen as a potent and significant part of the process of subjectivation, since it allowed many people who would not typically get involved with such a campaign to momentarily at least become something or someone else. Such actions are thus important reiterations of the point that Rancière makes about showing that it is possible to be someone else, to assume roles and subjectivities beyond those prescribed by the police.

The image of the 'hug' also shows the billboard which became a contested yet emblematic device. The advertising board is attached to the face of the department store, and was primarily either standard advertising space or empty and unused. The WCC decided to use the board to promote their campaign and make their efforts more visible; part of getting their voice, and an alternative approach, heard. The board was rented, and the text that can be seen above displayed legitimately. The space and existing surfaces of the site itself were thus utilised as devices with which to establish and push the political process, spatialising the debate further. As well as making more people aware of the campaign, the use of the billboard was also an attempt to stake a claim the space; to occupy through signs on, rather than bodies in, space.

After a few days, the actors at the WCC found that the billboard had been covered, professionally, in grey paper to obliterate the sign. This act, termed the greywash, was effectively criminal damage, since the WCC were paying for legitimate use of the advertising board. According to one of the members of the WCC, it had allegedly been carried out by Transport for London, the freeholder of the Wards Corner site. The

response of the campaigners is telling: "So finally they are speaking to us."

The billboard thus acted as a different kind of self-organised spatial device which, for a moment, offered an alternative dialogue, outside the limits imposed by the 'police'. It was also part of a system of broadcasting, of announcing presence as well as message, and although one-way, it was a vehicle through which to attract potential new actors into the network. With an activist attitude, it subverted the traditional space of commercial advertising, using it instead for the (Rancierian) political process. And, reinforcing the need for the broadcast itself, the police did duly silence it with their paper; the group noting that this was the only kind of dialogue taking place. Their reply was equally quick, and utilising the blank grey space that now stood there. First a variety of stickers were mounted, some asking the question "What Next?"; others noting specific issues about the qualities of the existing market and social relations. Finally, a spray-painted message appeared which related the violence of the removal of the sign with the proposed removal of the market, buildings and livelihoods of the actors.

Occupying the Spaces of the 'Police'

The final dimension of these spaces of dissensus works as a kind of mirroring of the last. The parallel move that the WCC made was to take themselves, literally, to the spaces of the police - to enter the spaces of local authority, of planning mechanisms, and of the judiciary. This is another statement of the conviction of the group that they have the ability, and the right, to be part of this conversation - a statement also conveyed through the act of developing the alternative plans themselves. But this is a particularly spatial act - to occupy the spaces of the police themselves with bodies and other subjectivities, to allow a different kind of dialogue between 'sans-part' and police, and to redraw the nature of the (political) spatiality of such spaces.

[insert photo 04.jpg]

Conclusions

The production of common spaces for the emergence of new subjects

There is a paradox that is fundamental to spatial self-organisation and the spatial practices within it that also lies at the core politics for Rancière: "What is specific to politics is the existence of a subject defined by its participation on contraries. Politics is a paradoxical form of action" (Rancière, 2009, p. 29). The paradox of politics for Rancière rests in the condition of the subject in the process of political subjectivation through dissensus partaking in the fact of ruling, while concurrently experiencing the fact of being ruled. The subject here is at the same time the "agent of an action", and "the matter upon which that action is exercised" (Rancière, 2009, p. 29). For Rancière, this must be acknowledged rather than an attempt made to escape from it, and this move requires breaking down the

essentialist view that there exists a particular disposition to act for some, and a particular disposition to be acted upon for others (which aligns with a "determinate superiority being exercised over an equally determinate inferiority" (Rancière, 2009, p. 30)). Practices of spatial self-organisation accept and understand this paradox and try to harness the potential radical possibilities therein for opening up the political potentialities of local actors (as we have seen) by providing a vehicle for the process of dissensus to occur. They can create space for negotiation and decision-making that enacts a redistribution of the sensible which challenges that imposed by the police-order.

By considering the way that dissensus can be seen to be operative within spatial self-organisation, I hope to have demonstrated how it can map out a new "configuration of possibilities" (Rancière, 2007, p. 1) for processes of urban transformation. The move implies positioning space (its conception, design, transformation, occupation, use and so on) as a core part of the (Rancierian) political process, since

Politics... consists in transforming this space of 'moving-along', of circulation, into a space for the appearance of a subject: the people, the workers, the citizens. It consists in re-figuring space, that is in what is to be done, to be seen and to be named in it. (Rancière, 2009, p. 37)

The developers repeated claim is that there is in fact no problem, that the campaigners are a small minority who are being difficult and that most local people are supportive of the scheme. This is very close to Rancière's evocation of the police call to 'move along', as there is nothing to see. The campaign as a process of dissensus is fundamentally about refuting this call, by changing the 'coordinates' of the sensible - of what there is to see, hear, feel and learn in regards to the past, present and future of this part of Tottenham.

Furthermore, by generating processes of political subjectivation, spatial self-organisation can create new spaces for the emergence of new subjectivities. By challenging the prescribed roles, possibilities and competences that are imposed by the urban police, a dissensual spatial practice "invents ways of being, seeing and saying, [and] engenders new subjects, new forms of collective enunciation." (Corcoran, 2009, p. 7) Actors become designers, builders and project managers, on their own account. They may take control of their own economic situation, and the pressures that this involves. But beyond this immediate sense of taking the matter into common hands, is the ability to be able to create an opening in the perception of what is possible for and in a space, to be able to create a space that actively and knowingly encourages subjects to question their assumed capacity and agency and to experiment with what it could become. This is a search for other ways to conceptualise and then experience spaces in the city, freed from the dominant conceptions that are pushed and placed upon the city by the police-order. Actors within processes of urban dissensus and spatial self-organisation therefore become able to move through multiple identities in a messy and complex and process of subjectivation; a process of what Chatterton and Pickerill call activist-becoming-activist, highlighting the multiple and

different forms that 'being' an activist can entail. It is only through experimentation and negotiation that the subject can move through this process, and by doing this, Gibson-Graham suggest that activists are engaging in 'new practices of the self' (Gibson-Graham, 1996, p. xvi)

Rancière's work helps us to identify the paradox of spatial self-organisation and its practices, and to see that it must be harnessed rather than suppressed. The notion of self-organised knowledges should consider the relations between different subject positions of different actors within a group, paying close attention to the asymmetric knowledges that distinguish them, in order to negotiate new social relations that not inscribe the familiar social divisions of the police-order:

The idea of emancipation implies that there are never places that impose their law, that there are always several spaces within a space, several ways of occupying it, and each time the trick is knowing what sorts of capacities one is setting in motion, what sort of world one is constructing. (Ranciere, 2007, p. 262)

As demonstrated by the WCC's alternative proposals, spatial self-organisation is premised on a multiplicity of spatialities, which permits different modes of occupation and being, at the same time.

So, in an antagonistic relation to the fixed prescription of roles by the formal proposals, a spatial self-organisation would look to create another world, with "other places, or other uses for places" (Ranciere, 2007, p. 4). The process of political subjectivation that dissensus and spatial self-organisation can put into motion, is built on two key, simultaneous spatial aspects; an ongoing confrontation about the closing down/opening up of the possibilities of space and the roles of the actors within it, and the creation of a new common space for the emergence of new subjects.

¹ The New Deal for Communities was a 10 year programme working in the UK's most deprived neighbourhoods, running between 1998 and 2008 and funded by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG).

² <https://wardscorner.wikispaces.com>

-
- Corcoran, S. (2009). Editor's Introduction. In *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics* (pp. 1–25). Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd.
- Dikeç, M. (2005). Space, politics, and the political. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 23(2), 171 – 188. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d364t>
- Gibson-Graham, J. K. (1996). *The End of Capitalism (as We Knew it): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy*. Cambridge, Mass. ; Oxford U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Guilbault, P., Lefebvre, H., & Renaudie, S. (2009). International Competition for the New Belgrade Urban Structure Improvement. In *Autogestion: Or Henri Lefebvre in New Belgrade* (pp. 1–32). Sternberg Press.
- Laclau, E. (1990). *New Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time* (First Edition edition). London ; New York: Verso.
- Lahiji, N. (2011). Is Building the Practice of Dissensus? Architecture between Aesthetics and Politics. Presented at the Architecture and the Political // Fourth International Symposium on Architectural Theory, The School of Architecture and Design at the Lebanese American University. Retrieved from <http://www.109architectes.com/blog/architecture-and-the-political-fourth-international-symposium-on-architectural-theory/>
- Lefebvre, H. (1995). The Right to the City. In *Writings on Cities* (pp. 147–159). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Massey, D. (2005). *For Space*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- Mouffe, C. (2005). *On the Political* (1 edition). London ; New York: Routledge.
- Rancière, J. (2004). *Disagreement: Politics And Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ranciere, J. (2007). Art of the Possible: Fulvia Carnevale and John Kelsey in conversation with Jaques Ranciere. *Art Forum*, 45(7), 256–368.
- Rancière, J. (2009). *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*. Continuum International Publishing Group Ltd.
- Ross, K. (2008). *The Emergence of Social Space: Rimbaud and the Paris Commune*. Verso.
- Ross, K. (2016). *Communal Luxury: The Political Imaginary of the Paris Commune*. Verso.
- Swyngedouw, E. (2007). The Post-Political City. In *Urban Politics Now, Re-Imagining Democracy in the Neoliberal City* (01 edition). Rotterdam : New York, NY: NAI Publishers.
- Swyngedouw, E. (2011). *Designing the Post-Political City and the Insurgent Polis*. London: Bedford Press.
- WCC. (2009). Wards Corner Community Coalition Presentation.