NEGOTIATING THE RESISTANCE: CATCH 22S, BROKERING AND CONTENTION WITHIN OCCUPY SAFER SPACES POLICY

SAMANTHA FLETCHER

FACULTY OF ARTS AND CREATIVE TECHNOLOGIES, STAFFORDSHIRE UNIVERSITY

Abstract

In the post 2008 financial crisis climate we have seen a plethora of protest movements emerge globally with one of the most recognisable, particularly in the western context, being that of the Occupy movement, which sought to contest the global accumulation of wealth by the few, at the expense of the many. Such protest movements have paved the way for old and new, often contentious, dialogues pertinent for a variety of disciplines and subject matters. Drawing upon both emerging narratives from the movement within the published literature and the authors own empirical interview data with participants at a variety of Occupy sites, this article discusses to what extent the Occupy movement negotiates its existence with the hegemonic state-corporate nexus through its Safer Spaces Policy. The paper concludes that the counter-hegemonic endeavours of resistance movements can be compromised, through the coercion and consent strategies of the powerful working in tandem, resulting in a movement that both opposes and emulates what it seeks to contest. Such discussion can ultimately contribute to the longevous discourses pertaining to how hegemonic power operates not just on but through people.

Keywords

Occupy, Safer Spaces, management, negotiation, resistance, co-option

Corresponding author:

Samatnha Fletcher, Email: samantha.fletcher@staffs.ac.uk

One area that continues to remain relatively underdeveloped in the contemporary radical left is an examination of power working through people; in particular how hegemonic power might operate through resistance movements themselves. This is not to say that such internally reflexive analyses are completely absent from radical left discourses, there are indeed various sources of reflective dialogues where the critical lens has been turned inward to examine and reveal power structures within our everyday institutionalised practices, whether they be found at work, at home or within our social relationships (Mathiesen, 2004). However, specific critique of resistance operations from those involved themselves, or people pertaining to these movements, has long since been an issue of contention within counter-hegemonic movements and historically these movements have been keen not to criticise any informal transgressions or each other in a public forum (Ramamurthy, 2013: 67). It is easy to see why this is the case given the persistent condition of the establishment being that of one with plentiful reserves of unjust criticism that they are readily prepared to level against these movements, often with little provocation, in an attempt to protect their own vested interests. However, in shying away from an honest examination of contemporary protest movements the nuances of the present manifestations of hegemonic power continue to evade adequate scrutiny. Employing the work of critical state theorists it can be argued that resistance movements fall both within and outside the remit of the state. Poulantzas (1978: 154) argues that at the same time 'class struggles traverse and constitute the state; that they assume a specific form within the state; and that this form is bound up with the material framework of the state'.

Theoretical conceptions of state, power and hegemony are fraught with anxieties, as is evident by their various degrees of abstraction. What is largely agreed upon however, is that all of these concepts are fluid, perpetually evolving and inevitably complex (Coleman et al, 2009; Peck, 2010). Arguably one of the most composite areas of state power manifestations resides in the extent of its presence within the resistance itself, in its apparition within unexpected host actors beyond the better recognised traditional establishment. Further to this, a failure to rigorously investigate hegemonic power in all its guises can perpetuate the dangerous popular misconception of an 'us' versus 'them' rhetorical binary that can mask the delicate intricacies and blurred boundaries between state and resistance. The everyday contempt (Niven, 2012) expressed by the contemporary multitude of dispossessed and disenfranchised against the economic and political establishment arguably yields a misleading portraiture of a battlefield with distinct lines drawn between liberator and oppressor. Such attitudes have even been transposed from metaphorical portraiture to the language of the contemporary western resistance movement. Taylor (2013: 742) argues that within the hyperbole of Occupy Wall Street (OWS), the 'flagship' occupation in the US, 'the 'greed' of the economic '1%', counterpoised to the hard-working, rule-abiding 99%, has emerged as the dominant political frame of OWS. Rhetorically powerful, the slogan's elegant simplicity conceals as much as it reveals'. Alongside the 99% phraseology many of the other compositional messages emanating from Occupy also appear keen to proclaim its stance as a movement completely at odds to its hegemonic counter-part. This is done largely through the movement's commitment to non-violence in contrast to an aggressive, hostile and brutal attitude and actions towards the dissenting Occupiers (Solnit, 2011; Vitale, 2011). Nevertheless whilst Occupy may have successfully avoided replication of the coercive state arm through its dedication to peaceful protest, its ability to successfully evade the velvet glove, in the same way as it has avoided emulation of the iron fist, is questionable.

Kellner (2013: 265) argues that 'uprisings and insurrectionary movements throughout the world have ruptured the common-sense understanding that neoliberal capitalism provided the best hope for future prosperity'. Whilst the merits of these counter-hegemonic endeavours

should not be diminished or undermined, neither should they be accepted as holistically counter-hegemonic in their absolute entirety. These counter-hegemonic protest movements, alongside all our other various societal institutions and like the resistance movements that have preceded them, should be examined for residual coatings as they emerge from the neoliberal hegemonic mire. In this instance what will be examined and queried is the extent to which hegemonic power acts through the resistance via varying levels of ideological co-option in the day to day workings of the Occupy movement. The discussion will centre around a critical consideration of the Safer Space Policies constructed and implemented across many of the camps in the UK and the US and ultimately the implications of employing the 'Safer Spaces' notional rhetoric of the neoliberal city as a virtue of the resistance movement itself.

This research paper derives from the ongoing doctoral research of the author regarding a critical investigation into the varied responses to the Occupy movement captured in a civil and political society framework. It draws upon the data collected through a snow-ball sample of 13 semi-structured in-depth interviews with participants from 3 different Occupy sites in the UK since 2012: Occupy Liverpool, Communication Row; Occupy London, St Pauls Cathedral; Occupy Democracy, Parliament Square. The research methodology for this work also includes in excess of 80 hours of ethnographic fieldwork, intersecting with the authors own scholarly-activist endeavours, not only at the aforementioned sites but in other Occupy and activist arenas. Examples of this include shorter but still largely static occupations such as Occupy Media or fully mobile protests such as Occupy Faith. Alongside the formal interview data and ethnographic fieldwork the research incorporates analytical reflections from the emerging literature and published narratives emanating from a wider range of Occupy camps in the UK and the US.

Dismantling the dynamics of the Occupy Safer Spaces Policy

When we speak of hegemonic power or the establishment we are referring to a contested and complex web of state-corporate influence. In an argued state-corporate collaboration (Bratich, 2014; Dellacoppia 2013 et al, 2013; Pickerall & Krinsky, 2012; Wolf, 2012) Occupy has had a series of criminalisation and demonisation efforts levelled against it. In terms of efforts to criminalise Occupy there have been charges of illegal street vending when distributing food on camp (Barksdale, 2012), uses of anti-camping ordinances to prevent permanent residence (Khalek, 2012; Writers for the 99%); something which has persisted through to the most recent Occupy Democracy protests of 2014 and the introduction of bye-laws to halt the 'Tarpaulin Revolution' (Occupy Democracy, 2014). Alongside criminalising efforts there have been demonising efforts with swift switches from 'peaceful protest' to 'unlawful assembly' labels (Ty, 2011) with, for example, Occupy London being listed as a 'domestic terror threat' (Richmond, 2012) and tabloid descriptions of the group as 'gormless rent-a-mob' and 'swampy wannabes' (Daily Mail, 2011). This offers just a small glimpse of the regular assaults on the movement's credibility.

Early on in the first emerging formations of the Occupy Movement in 2011 a series of working documents were drawn up, the most well known being that of the Declaration of the Occupation of New York City (see: occupywallstreet.org, 2011) outlining the rationale, discontents and the demands of the occupation. Alongside this declaration a series of Safer Spaces Policies were drawn up and released across both US and UK sites. To elucidate the rationale for the Safer Spaces policies all statements included a form of preamble that described the aspiration for the creation of an anti-oppressive space that would be pleasant and conducive to the aims outlined in the declaration of the occupation. To those ends, using the main Occupy London Safer Spaces Policy as an exemplar policy (see: occupylondon.org), the majority of the 13 point list reflected

concerns regarding ensuring a respectful awareness for language used, the unacceptable nature of various forms of prejudice and encouraging mediation and reverent challenges to any such objectionable forms of behaviour. 12 of the 13 points listed were informal directives that many would agree would lay the foundations for a favourable environment in line with the coequality sentiment of the movement. However, as an appendage to these initial 12 points the Safer Spaces Policy also included point 13 regarding the prohibition of alcohol and drugs on camp. What began to emerge was some contention regarding point 13 of the policy as illustrated by the reflections of Participant C at Occupy London:

> I mean it was a big issue and a big thing this Safer Spaces Policy which had this last little tag at the end. So it was like, you know, we're not going to be abusive or racist and it was all about how we are going to maintain good behaviour and then the last tiny thing said 'Occupy London is a drug and alcohol free space' and I thought is it? [...] So this Safer Space policy got passed and then well I thought this is just as Addict-phobic as anywhere else on the planet.

The prohibition of alcohol and drugs from camp is not in and of itself surprising or contentious, given the already established restrictions of consumption of alcohol in public spaces under the Licensing Act 2013 - actualised in Designated Public Place Orders (DPPO's) - and the general outlawing of various drug consumption under the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971. However, what is disputable is the arguably uncritical alignment of drug and alcohol consumption with behaviours far more concomitant with harmful consequences for those in the camp. The rule asserting no alcohol or drugs became a key feature across many of the Occupy sites in the UK including amongst many others: Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds and Newcastle (Gee, 2011). Although there were some minute variations across the individually released policies the steadfast proclamation of no alcohol and drugs on camp remained consistent. However, as per the concerns of Participant C at Occupy London, some of the prefaces to the policy reveal subtle hints of dissonance. At Occupy Bristol (occupybristoluk.org, 2011) the following was posted on their webpage:

> **we are in statement, and intent a dry site with no alcohol or drug use.** This is difficult both **morally and practically** to enforce. To these ends people **visibly under the influence** of alcohol or any other drugs are **not welcome** (original emphasis)

Here there appears to be a formal acknowledgement of the moral contention regarding the enforcement of the no alcohol or drugs rule. What also emerges is the concept of visibility, which might allude to concerns regarding the portrayal of the Occupy protests through mainstream media outlets. As Participant C at Occupy London continues 'they never really said it in the meeting of course, but the issue was the PR [Public Relations]. You know because then they put up all these little signs that said "alcohol and drugs free space" so it was really for the press'.

The consequences of an explicit declaration of a no alcohol and drugs remit within the Safer Spaces PR bombast reverberated across the various Occupy sites within the UK and US. The assignation of alcohol or drug consumption within the Safer Spaces sphere, ergo aligning their use with the antithesis of safety (risk or danger), might also permit transference to public consciousness regarding the status of alcohol or drug users. Participant D at Occupy Democracy speaking about the police confiscation of the camps Safer Spaces notification stated: 'For a long time we didn't have a sign to let people know that they would be safe here and that we don't

condone alcohol or drug taking because that is not what we are about, we're about trying to get something done'.

The apparent amalgamation of drug and alcohol use as concomitant with an inability to 'get things done' is problematic and forms the basis for a reduction of political agency to be commensurate of with a certain set of 'normative' conditions of the 'professional' protester. As Walker (2012) writing for The Guardian said of the Finsbury Square Occupation, 'the longer it went on it attracted an increasing number of vulnerable homeless people, often with drink and drug problems, rather than protesters' (emphasis added). The continued variant manifestations of the binary distinctions made between drug user or protester, alcohol user or 'someone who gets things done' as mutually exclusive categories can give rise to a troublesome state sponsored ideological litmus test for political agency and ability. As Wagner & Cohen (1991: 543 - 544) argue, the structurally dispossessed are often portrayed as 'passive victims, people who are acted upon rather than conscious actors on the social scene'. There are various formal and informal documented cases of persons with alcohol or drug (mis)use/dependency issues as key actors within the Occupy movement. Participant B of Occupy Liverpool spoke of the key role one alcohol dependant member of the group played during their time on camp, cooking meals and performing night-watch duties. Although one must be careful of the emphasis on a labour based 'informal contribution calculus' as a form of determining legitimate protester status (Herring & Glück, 2011). In contrast to this Mendoza (2012) reports that often Occupy was refreshing because of its appreciation of the diverse ways to contribute beyond that of economic or labour based activities. It can also be argued that mere act of being at Occupy constitutes as protest through the value of 'amplified presence' (Spiotta, 2011). Developing the discourse further Schein (2012: 339) argued that 'Occupiers variously resisted and succumbed to a language dividing the 'real' political occupiers from those drawn to the park by the 'promise of a real meal and a safe space to sleep'.

Within the framework of this discussion a common reoccurring concern was that of the possibility of the disruption that might be caused by those with alcohol or drug (mis) use issues and, as per references made within the literature, those of homeless status. Within the category of the structurally dispossessed which encapsulates a number of possible social issues, sometimes disparate, sometimes inter-sectionally related, concerns were raised regarding the use of the term disruptive behaviour and when it was applied. Chadeyane Appel (2011: 119) argues that disruptive label was 'applied across categories of difference. Those people often considered to be disruptive in OWS processes have different educational backgrounds, homes statuses […] and certainly different psychological habitations of the world'. Singh (2012) was similarly critical of the ambiguous nature of terms such as disruptive or violent behaviour and as Gira Grant (2011) argued, blaming certain persons for disruptive or violent behaviour at Occupy could potentially be viewed as an expression of unchecked racism given that, for example in New York, over 50% of the homeless population are African-American. Roth (2011) also reflects on the ironic nature of the exclusion of some homeless people despite the parallels that can be drawn between the slogans and signposts made by those involved in the movement being similar to the very messages homeless veterans had long since been displaying on the streets of New York.

In summary, consideration of elements contained within the Safer Spaces Policy at Occupy raise important questions regarding their possible consequences. Reflexively, cogitation can be given to the neoliberal city semantic derivation of Safer Spaces, whose origin lies in the Business Improvement District (BIDs) profit focussed regeneration trends of the 1990s and beyond. In the context of urban regeneration agendas Safer Spaces have come under criticism for their exclusionary practices of the already marginalised and dispossessed who lack consumer

purchasing power to actualise their right to urban spaces (Coleman, 2009; Spalek et al, 2012). The potential for the replication of these marginalising practices was noted by Participant B at Occupy Liverpool:

> A couple of homeless guys turned up in the morning after the first night and they always come and sit on the monument and have a butty [sandwich] from the hostel and a can of beer. It was sort of like not so much explaining to them that you can't come and drink beer here because we are all going 'this is a no drinking camp' [...] it was more that the issue was explaining to other people on the camp that those guys do that every day; like who are we to tell them that they can't?'

Restrictions on Inclusivity

Yassin (2011: 126), with regards to what the media was calling 'unsavoury' [sic] people at an Occupy site in California, argued that 'these problems always existed in downtown Oakland. If anything, the Occupy space has provided a space where others can mediate the conflicts that arise, and where ideas of how to de-escalate conflict can be broached and improved upon'. Alongside this Dellacoppia et al (2013: 304) discuss how Occupy LA organised much of their activism centered around the 'fight against gentrification and the criminalization of poverty'. The Occupy El Paso site took similar action also but this was not without conflict (Smith et al, 2012), showing the heterogeneous nature of the Occupy movement that in some cases resisted the demonisation efforts of the powerful in more direct ways. However, for those that may have contributed, either intentionally or unwittingly, to the ostracisation of some from Occupy, there are further contemplations to make. Daily life within the Occupy camps is not without its hardships; evading the attention of state servants willing to use coercive force, withstanding the tempestuous weather conditions and reliance on copious amounts of altruistic contributions. To extend these expectations to providing welfare for those that might have mental health related conditions, drug or alcohol dependency or the various other possible welfare needs of the structurally dispossessed is a grandiose task. However, whilst the presence of populations with support needs does not mean that by default Occupy is obligated to provide assistance, the 'vacancies of capitalism' (King, 2011) - i.e. the mass closures and austerity - leave people palpably wanting and needing basic amenities, both within and beyond the movement and are often filled by the local populous ex gratia. Research participants at both the Liverpool and London sites remarked that often people chose Occupy as a preferable space to be than that of their state provided hostel accommodation that was extremely poor in quality. Where the state has failed to provide its duty of care, something Occupy has highlighted in its numerous anti-austerity sub-campaigns, this should not then mean that this becomes the responsibility of Occupy and it's campaigners by default. It is here that the equivocal nature of the inclusivity nebulous begins to unravel.

We can further disentangle the inclusivity amorphous to reveal more of it's clauses. Maclean (2012) argues the need for caveats to inclusivity in praxis, employing the hypothetical presupposition of former British National Party leader Nick Griffin wishing to attend Occupy to speak about ethnicity. There are people who by definition would be excluded for their peddling of hateful speech. As Power (2012: 179) states 'fascists are not protesters [...] anyone who campaigns for the unequal and the promotion of inequality is not protesting anything: inequality is the current state of things' and as such there are often a variety of markedly perceptible lines to be drawn regarding what is and isn't counter-hegemonic. Further examples of the limits

to participation include several known cases of sexual assault at Occupy Wall Street and the justifiable exclusion of these persons from camp (Occupy Wall Street Safer Spaces Working Group, 2012). There are indeed caveats to inclusion, stipulations on those who are welcome and able to participate without causing harm to others. However, those who (mis)use drugs, alcohol and/or are homeless, although great care should be taken not to conflate these three as inextricably linked, should not fall automatically under the same domain as more identifiably innately harmful acts. To do so without question, as has sometimes been the case at Occupy, is to suppose the conjecture of problematic state sponsored discourses of the 'dangerous' drug or alcohol user or the 'lazy' homeless person. Uncritical hard line 'zero tolerance' stances, themselves of distinctly neoliberal derivation, should not conflate alcohol or drug dependency within the same milieu as a host of intrinsically oppressive actions such as racism, ableism, homophobia or transphobia. The presence of Safer Spaces Policies that places these in juxtaposition disclose the anxieties of modern day protest; the desire to exclude those detrimental to the movement (those who exhibit racist and phobic discriminatory attitudes) and the need to deny those who may be used by state agents to demonise the movement (drug and alcohol users). The pursuit of an alternative to the status quo of capitalist accumulation of wealth by the few is not without a gauntlet of challenges that can lead to compromising its own raison d'être.

Managing the Resistance

Jones (2014) argues that management of democracy is a key function of the contemporary establishment to ensure their own interests remain unthreatened. Management, negotiation and brokerage remain key functions of the modern state. Evidenced based examples can be seen across various institutional locales including academia, such as the case where critical criminologists have long since unpicked the role of scholarship in reinforcing state defined crime pertaining to the legitimisation of oppressive criminal justice practices (Hillyard, 2013; Gilmore et al, 2013). Despite being commonly understood in some popular culture schematic overviews as the state antithesis; dissent, protest and resistance receive no exemption from the management and negotiation state convocation. Ramamurthy (2013) illustrates some key historical examples of protest movement including negotiations with state institutions, and the introduction of state funding that often resulted in divisive competitive drives for limited resources. Whilst the Occupy movement in its delightful organisational ambiguity does not fall into the state funding terrain, its informal state brokerage relationship is apparent in other ways. As an occupier of predominantly urban space, a space commandeered for the day to day operations of capitalism (Sassens, 1998), the state-corporate stronghold does not care for disruption of its operations. For Harvey (2012: xv) the city and urban space is an important site of struggle and a signifier, arguing that 'everything depends on who gets to fill it with meaning'. As Occupiers attempt to reclaim the often quasi-public spaces of the city, to fill it with their alternative meaning of real democracy, equality and liberation, they do not displace their neoliberal counterparts in their entirety. Furthermore, we might also ask to what extent the origins of Occupy Safer Spaces policies are emblematic of a neoliberal corruption of public consciousness that is difficult to unlearn or if they are reflective of the anticipated attack from the hegemonic foe. It is argued here that elements of the Safer Spaces Policy, alongside its routine function, in some respects forms the basis of a negotiation with its powerful adversary in order to subsist.

Conducting ethnographic fieldwork in this area one becomes distinctly aware that in the interview process there is uncertainty, suspicious inklings of the motives of the researcher, even if the researcher is known to the movement, which can be seen as a result of debased media spin-

doctoring and reports of undercover police infiltration (The Guardian, 2011). As a result there is a keenness to continue to project the safe, peaceful and almost docile image of Occupy at any given opportunity. The often tireless references to Occupy being a safe space is reflective of the incumbent day to day negotiation between state and protester in order to continue to exist. And as the state continues to manage its own adversary in Occupy, by negotiating the terms of its existence, the top down pressure exerted can tip the scales in favour of the establishment as some voices are sidelined, extradited and ultimately silenced from the protest through Safer Spaces fallout. By a sedulous championing of the virtues of Safer Space at Occupy ergo employing the vernacular of the exclusionary neoliberal city (see: Coleman & Sim, 2013; Davis, 1992; Lefebvre, 1996), conceivably elements of the resistance can begin to emulate to the very processes they seek to contest.

One cannot be completely dismissive or critical of the Safe Spaces Policy in its entirety because conceivably point 1 – 12 form the basis of a strong counter-hegemonic discourse for the movement. However, it is important to critically unpack the potential significance of the sheer presence of point 13 within the Safer Spaces Policy ambit. It is argued here that point 13, which makes clear the movement's absolute prohibition of alcohol and drugs on camp, can be viewed as a sort of misfit ideological appendage that sits uneasy with the wider counter-hegemonic sentiments of the Safer Spaces Policy. To take alcohol consumption as an example, Haydock (2015: 143) describes the role of the neoliberal project in the construction of what counts as admirable or problematic alcohol usage. He continues to argue that this is achieved through the shaping of a moral discourse on alcohol consumption that favours and preserves market capital. Coleman et al (2005: 2519) adduce that broadly speaking 'crime control networks within regenerating cities rarely obstruct regimes of consumption and production' and that 'anti-alcohol campaigns in cities have almost exclusively been confined to street drinking'. This is of great significance as it demonstrates that the ideological underpinnings of an anti-alcohol stance in public space, is one that is inextricably tied to a 'public order' pretension, designed to sustain and benefit market capital. Peck (2010: 108) argues that 'the neoliberal project was cobbled together to serve—corporate capital, financial elites, the shareholding classes' and as such it can be argued that the inclusion of an anti-alcohol position is one that is aligned with a moral discourse that preserves market capital as opposed to contesting it. Castree (2007:7) maintains that our empirical, theoretical and conceptual understanding of neoliberal environments is lacking, particularly in terms of understanding its diverse forms and manifestations. What is argued here is that within the overarching counter-hegemonic discourse of the Safer Spaces Policy there remains state-corporate ideological residue. This is significant not least because ideological struggle is a vital part of counter-hegemonic struggle, but also if we consider it to simultaneously act as a point of compromising brokerage facilitation between state ideology and dissenting counter-hegemonic discourse.

Seeking legitimacy by the standards created by the oppressor is not without cognitive rationale. The argued encroachment of state-corporate sanctioned ideology into the resistance is purposeful in the management strategies of the powerful. The conscious or unconscious bargaining process by the relatively power-poor is in part consequential of the coercive state-corporate stratagem. There is both individual and collective fear of state-corporate action, often very violent action, towards the Occupy movement (see: Howard & Pratt-Boyden, 2013; Taylor, 2011; Writers for the 99%, 2011). The outcome of the omnipresent state-corporate Damocles sword results in far reaching disciplinary denouement, as Participant C at Occupy London reflected:

Generally speaking what happened was the organic development of those who were

dependent chemically just keeping themselves out of the lime light a bit when necessary and you know, at the end of the day you have got to consider that they were in the public eye and if they were using hard drugs they needed to bloody well hide because the cops were there all the bloody time, so they were not just protecting Occupy but protecting themselves.

What emerges in this management process is a multifarious series of disciplinary processes working in tandem to reduce the movement's dexterity for change; direct state-corporate discipline in the guise of formal action such as the use of criminal justice arresting powers; negotiated discipline through certain elements of the Safer Spaces policy that can discourage and exclude; and finally internalised discipline where one limits their own participation in the resistance.

Conclusion

Taylor (2013: 742) states that 'capitalist power acts not only or even primarily on subjects from outside but through them'. By way of an examination certain elements contained within the various adopted Safer Spaces Policies across Occupy movements in the UK and the US, new and old questions have been raised pertaining to how hegemonic power operates through resistance movements themselves, arguably co-opting them in part into the ideological tool box of the establishment. The prior critical discussion should be understood as an analysis of state power in action, not a critique of the Occupy movement itself. Delving deeper we can see that in many ways the dual action of the coercive and consensual arms of the state plausibly lead Occupy into a precarious position whereby consent is granted, at the expense of unerringly radical departures, in order to avoid coercive reprisal. The material conditions of the divergent state weaves a composite web of consent and coercion working in synthesis; in many ways what we might describe as a hegemonic catch 22.

The chills of popular power and change (Sitrin, 2011; van Gelder, 2011) are ever present but their power capacity is often managed and negotiated by the tenacious state, to some degree rendering elements of the resistance to a diatonic tone that falls in line with the melody of the status quo. As Kelley (2002: 8 cited in: Choudry, 2012: 175) states, 'collective social movements are incubators of new knowledge' and in order to meaningfully harness some of the most valuable contributions it can make to the radical consciousness, recognition of the state's ideological presence within the resistance itself is key. The nuanced and more established theoretical conceptualisations are yet to be developed fully, but broadly speaking the intricacies and issues arising here are of fundamental diagnostic concern lest there be a systematic negligence 'to understand that the main features of contemporary popular struggles are both a reflection of an institutionally determined logic and a challenge to that logic' (Piven and Cloward, 1979: x).

References

Barksdale, A. (2012) 'Occupy LA: The Worst and Best', *Journal of Communist Theory and Practice,* Available from: http://insurgentnotes.com - Accessed 26/02/12.

Bratich, J. (2014) 'Occupy All the Dispositifs: Memes, Media Ecologies, and Emergent Bodies Politic', *Communications and Critical/Cultural Studies*, vol. 11 no. 1 pp 64 – 73.

Castree, N. (2007) 'Neoliberal environments: a framework for analysis', Working paper no. 04/07, Manchester Papers in Political Economy.

Coleman, R. Tombs, S. & Whyte, D. (2005) 'Capital, Crime Control and Statecraft in the Entrepreneurial City', *Urban Studies*, vol. 42 no. 13 pp 2511–2530.

Chadeyane Appel, H. (2011) 'The Bureaucracies of Anarchy' in: Schrager Lang, A. & Lang/Levitsky, D. (eds) (2012) *Dreaming in Public: Building the Occupy Movement*, Oxford: New Internationalist Publications, pp 112 - 120.

Choudry, A. (2012) 'Chapter 7: On Knowledge Production, Learning and Research in Struggle' in: Fanelli, C. & Lefebvre, P. (eds) (2012) *Uniting Struggles: Critical Social Research in Critical Times*, Ottawa: Red Quill Books.

Coleman, R. (2009) '"They just look wrong": visualising "crime" and grime in the post social city', *Criminal Justice Matters*, vol. 78 no. 1 pp 29 - 31.

Coleman, R. Sim, J. Tombs, S. & Whyte, D. (2009) *State, Power, Crime*, London: SAGE.

Coleman, R. & Sim, J. (2013) 'Managing the Mendicant: Regeneration and repression in Liverpool', *Criminal Justice Matters*, vol. 9 no. 1 pp 30 - 31.

Daily Mail (2011) 'Move Over Swampy, it's us who should be protesting', Available from: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-2050223/Occupy-London-Stock-Exchange-Its-Protesting.html - Accessed 08/01/15.

Davis, M. (1992) *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*, New York: Vintage Books.

Dellacioppa, K. Soto, S. & Meyer, A (2013) 'Rethinking Resistance and the Cultural Politics of Occupy', *New Political Science*, vol. 35 no. 3 pp 403 - 416.

Gee, T. (2011) 'Occupy the North' in: Schrager Lang, A. & Lang/Levitsky, D. (eds) (2012) *Dreaming in Public: Building the Occupy Movement*, Oxford: New Internationalist Publications, pp 280 - 282.

Gilmore, J. Moore JM. & Scott, D. (2013) 'The Politics of Dissent: An Introduction to Section C' in: Gilmore, J. Moore JM. & Scott, D. (eds) (2013) *Critique and Dissent: An Anthology to mark 40 years of the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control*, Ottawa: Red Quill Books, pp 219 - 236.

Gira Grant, M. (2011) 'Making Safer Spaces: Occupy Wall Street Addresses Questions of Security at Zuccotti Park', Available from: http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/4638:making-safer-spaces-occupy-wall-street-addresses-questions-of-security-at-zuccotti-park - Accessed: 05/08/14.

Harvey, D. (2012) *Rebel Cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*, London: Verso.

Haydock, W. (2015) 'Understanding English alcohol policy as a neoliberal condemnation of the carnivalesque', *Drugs, Education, Prevention and Policy*, vol. 22 no. 2 pp 143 - 149.

Herring, C. & Glück, Z. (2011) 'The Homeless Question' in: Taylor, A. Gessen, K. & editors from n+1, Dissent, Triple Canopy and The New Inquiry (2011) *Occupy! Scenes from Occupied America*, London: Verso, pp 163 - 169.

Hillyard, P. (2013) 'Chapter 18: Zemiology Revisited: Fifteen Years On' in: Gilmore, J. Moore JM. & Scott, D. (eds) (2013) *Critique and Dissent: An Anthology to mark 40 years of the European Group for the Study of Deviance and Social Control*, Ottawa: Red Quill Books, pp 219 - 236.

Howard, N. & Pratt-Boyden, K. (2013) 'Occupy London as a pre-figurative political action', *Development in Practice*, vol. 23 no. 5-6 pp 729 - 741.

Jones, O. (2014)*The Establishment: And how they get away with it*, London: Penguin Group.

Kellner, D. (2013) Media spectacle, insurrection and the crisis of neoliberalism from the Arab Uprisings to Occupy Everywhere!, *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, vol. 23 no. 3 pp 251 - 272.

King, M. (2011) 'Occupations and the Fulfilment of Human Need: The Vacancies of Capitalism', Available from: http://bjsonline.org -

Accessed 16/04/12.

Khalek, R. (2012) '12 Most Absurd Laws Used to Stifle the Occupy Wall St. Movement', available from: http://alternet.org - Accessed 10/12/12.

Lefebvre, H. (1996) *Writings on Cities*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Maclean, S. (2012) 'We Need Caveats on Inclusivity' in: Schrager Lang, A. & Lang/Levitsky, D. (eds) (2012) *Dreaming in Public: Building the Occupy Movement*, Oxford: New Internationalist Publications, pp 289 - 290.

Mathiesen, T. (2004) *Silently Silenced: Essays on the creation of acquiesence in modern society*, Winchester: Waterside Press.

Mendoza, KA. (2012) 'Voices from the Occupation: The homeless and the hungry - modern-day outlaws' in: Schrager Lang, A. & Lang/Levitsky, D. (eds) (2012) Dreaming in Public: Building the Occupy Movement, Oxford: New Internationalist Publications, pp 283 - 288.

Niven, A. (2012) *Folk Opposition*, Hants: Zero Books.

Occupy Bristol (2011) 'Safe Space Policy', Available from: http://www.occupybristoluk.org/about/safe-space-policy - Accessed: 08/01/15.

Occupy Democracy (2014) http://www.occupydemocracy.org.uk - Accessed 08/01/2015.

Occupy London (2011) 'Safer Spaces Policy', Available from: http://occupylondon.org/about/statements/safer-space-policy/ - Accessed: 06/01/15.

Occupy Safer Spaces Working Group (2011) 'Transforming Harm & Building Safety: Confronting sexual violence at Occupy Wall Street and beyond' in: Schrager Lang, A. & Lang/Levitsky, D. (eds) (2012) *Dreaming in Public: Building the Occupy Movement*, Oxford: New Internationalist Publications, pp 138 - 140.

Participant B Occupy Liverpool (2012) Interview conducted May 2012.

Participant C Occupy London (2013) Interview conducted October 2013.

Participant D Occupy Democracy (2014) Interview conducted October 2014.

Peck, J. (2010) 'Zombie Neoliberalism and the ambidextrous state', *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 14 no. 1 pp 104 - 110.

Pickerill, J. & Krinsky, J. (2012) 'Why Does Occupy Matter?', *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest*, vol. 11 no. 3-4 pp 279 - 287.

Piven, FF. & Cloward, RA. (1978) *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, Why They Fail*, New York: Random House.

Poulantzas, N. (1978) (2000 edition) *State, Power, Socialism*, London: Verso

Power, N. (2012) 'Winning the Media War: Why There is no Such Thing as a Bad Protester' in: Campagna, F. & Campiglio (eds) (2012) *What We Are Fighting For A Radical Collective Manifesto*, London: Pluto Press, pp 176 - 181.

Ramamurthy, A. (2013) *Black Star: Britain's Asian Youth Movements*, London: Pluto Press.

Richmond, M. (2012) 'Disguising, Mythologising and Protest' in: Schrager Lang, A. & Lang/Levitsky, D. (eds) (2012) *Dreaming in Public: Building the Occupy Movement*, Oxford: New Internationalist Publications, pp 291 - 294.

Roth, M. (2011) 'Letters of Resignation from the American Dream' in: Taylor, A. Gessen, K. & editors from n+1, Dissent, Triple Canopy and The New Inquiry (2011) *Occupy! Scenes from Occupied America*, London: Verso, pp 23 - 30.

Sassens, S. (1998) *Globalisation and Its Discontents*, New York: The New Press.

Schein, R. (2012) 'Whose Occupation? Homelessness and the Politics of Park Encampments', *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest*, vol. 11 no. 3-4 pp 335 -341.

Singh, S. (2012) 'Occupying Process, Processing Occupy' in: Schrager Lang, A. & Lang/Levitsky, D. (eds) (2012) *Dreaming in Public: Building the Occupy Movement*, Oxford: New Internationalist Publications, pp 121 - 124.

Sitrin, M. (2011) 'The Chills of Popular Power' in: van Gelder, S. and the staff of YES! magazine (eds) (2011) *This Changes Everything: Occupy Wall Street and the 99% Movement*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, pp 27 - 32.

Smith, C. Casteñada, E. & Heyman, J. (2012) 'The Homeless and Occupy El Paso: Creating Community among the 99%', *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest*, vol. 11 no. 3-4 pp 356 - 366.

Spalek, B. Isakjee, A. & Davies, T. (2012) 'Panic on the streets of Birmingham? Struggles over space and belonging in the Revanchist City', *Criminal Justice Matters*, vol. 87 no. 1 pp 14 - 15.

Spiotta, D. (2011) In the Name Itself, <u>in:</u> Schrager Lang, A. & Lang/Levitsky, D. (eds) (2012) Dreaming in Public: Building the Occupy Movement, Oxford: New Internationalist Publications, pp 201 - 202.

Solnit, R. (2011) 'Throwing Out the Master's Tools and Building a Better House' <u>in:</u> Taylor, A. Gessen, K. & editors from n+1, Dissent, Triple Canopy and The New Inquiry (2011) *Occupy! Scenes from Occupied America*, London: Verso, pp 146 -156.

Taylor, S. (2011) 'Scenes from Occupied Oakland' <u>in:</u> Taylor, A. Gessen, K. & editors from n+1, Dissent, Triple Canopy and The New Inquiry (2011) *Occupy! Scenes from Occupied America,* London: Verso, pp 134 - 145.

Taylor, B. (2013) 'From alterglobalisation to Occupy Wall Street: Neoanarchism and the new spirit of the left', *City: analysis of urban trends, culture, theory, policy, action*, vol. 17 no. 6 pp 729 - 747.

Ty, M. (2011) 'The Coming General Strike' <u>in:</u> Schrager Lang, A. & Lang/Levitsky, D. (eds) (2012) *Dreaming in Public: Building the Occupy Movement*, Oxford: New Internationalist Publications, pp 234 - 244.

The Guardian (2011) 'Undercover Police spied on protesters at Occupy LA', available from: http://theguardian.com/world/2011/dec/11undercover-police-spied-occupy-la - Accessed: 07/01/15.

van Gelder, S. (2011) 'Introduction: How Occupy Wall Street Changes Everything' <u>in:</u> van Gelder, S. and the staff of YES! magazine (eds) (2011) *This Changes Everything: Occupy Wall Street and the 99% Movement*, San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler, pp 27 - 32.

Vitale, A. (2011) 'NYPD and OWS: A Clash of Styles' <u>in:</u> Taylor, A. Gessen, K. & editors from n+1, Dissent, Triple Canopy and The New Inquiry (2011) *Occupy! Scenes from Occupied America*, London: Verso, pp 74 - 81.

Wagner, D. & Cohen, MB. (1991) 'The Power of the People: Homeless Protesters in the Aftermath of Social Movement Participation', *Social Problems*, vol. 38 no. 4 pp 543 - 561.

Walker, P. (2012) 'Occupy Finsbury Square camp removed: Last City of London encampment is cleared as new Occupy tents appear on Hamstead Heath', *The Guardian* (2012) Available from: http://theguardian.com/uk2012jun/14/occupy-finsbury-square-camp-removed - Accessed 10/08/14.

Wolf, N. (2012) 'Revealed: How the FBI coordinated the crackdown on Occupy', available from: http://theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/dec/29/fbi-coordinated-crackdown-occupy - Accessed 12/08/2013.

Writers for the 99% (2011) *Occupying Wall Street: The Inside Story of an Action that Changed America*, London: OR Books.

Yassin, JO (2011) 'Occupy Oakland: Hugs Are Also an Option' <u>in:</u> Schrager Lang, A. & Lang/Levitsky, D. (eds) (2012) *Dreaming in Public: Building the Occupy Movement*, Oxford: New Internationalist Publications, pp 126 - 127.