

[DE]TERRITORIALIZING MOVEMENTS AND ANOTHER DEMOCRACY: EXTRUSIVE INTRUSIONS
MOVIMENTOS [DES]TERRITORIALIZANTES E OUTRA DEMOCRACIA: INTRUSÕES EXTRUSIVAS
IGOR GUATELLI

Igor Guatelli is an Architect, holds a Master's degree in Architecture and Urbanism and a Doctor's degree in Philosophy. He is an Adjunct Professor at Mackenzie University, Brazil, and the Graduate Program in Architecture and Urbanism at the same institution. He is a researcher at the GERPHAU laboratory of the Ecole Nationale Supérieure D'Architecture of Paris-La Villette and Université Paris 8, France. He coordinates the research group City, Architecture, and Philosophy, where he conducts research on deconstruction, post-structuralist philosophy, urban condensers, and new processes of territorialization. igorguat@uol.com.br

<http://lattes.cnpq.br/0684027099625255>

ARTICLE SUBMITTED ON AUGUST 15, 2022

How to quote this text: Guatelli, I., 2022. [De]territorializing Movements and Another Democracy: Extrusive Intrusions. Translated from Portuguese by Adriana Kauffmann and Maya Johnson. *VIRUS*, 24, December. [online]. Available at: <<http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/papers/v24/595/595en.php>>. [Accessed: dd Month yyyy].

Abstract

Through a winding route, this paper develops the concept of territory (almost) as another term in relation to common sense. It weaves a reflection about the processes of territorializing de-identification of the subject as an opening to an urban revolutionary becoming. The notion of land derives from the French term *terroir*, which, in turn, derives from *terroir* [*territoire*], from Latin *territorium*, an alteration of *territorium*, *territoire*, in accordance with *terre*, from whence come *terra* (land) and territory. They are close to the term *territō*, *territatum*, which means terrible. Territory, *terra*, and terror are woven together through an etymology that operates by shadings. Based on this unusual approach, we intend to think about the power of disturbing minority, marginal deterritorializing flows that affect a territory, transgressing its codes, rules and property regimes, of what is supposedly their own by “natural right”. Finally, this paper explores how these counter-hegemonic, rebellious flows can become the means by which the struggle for land signifies openness and resistance to dominant social and cultural constructions and, at the same time, the founding condition of another urban democracy grounded in the action of taking collective possession of a territory, as Occupations do.

Keywords: Territory, Deterritorialization, *Voyous*, Democracy to Come, Occupations

1 Introduction

History shows us that counter-hegemonic barriers, whether in the form of barricades (Paris Commune, May 68) or collective enclaves of struggle for existence (*Quilombos*, cultural Occupations that are also linked to struggle for housing movements) can become devices for the cutting of majority flows and the beginning of deterritorialization and the decoding flows of dominant productive arrangements. Unpredictable territorializations arise from deterritorializations processed within a political arena called Territory.

Territory is a concept that belongs, unavoidably, to the lexicon of architecture and urbanism, especially the latter. Often treated generically, and sometimes confused with the idea of space or place, the concept of territory, despite its historic semantic layers, has an ontological residue that remains and that cannot be surpassed. Or, at the very least, this should be the case when the term is evoked or emulated.

In an etymological digression, territory refers to the French term *terroir*, which, in turn, comes from the popular Latin *territorium*, later amended in Gallo-Roman to *territorium*, *territoire*, in accordance with *terre*, from where emerge *terra* (land, in Portuguese) and territory. Territory refers to a natural region with homogeneous characteristics, and its meaning is associated with an extension of land suitable for agricultural production; but which can also be read as a kind of cultivation field, outside the city, characterized by a population of peasants who live at the fringes of city laws. However, close to this term is the Latin term *territō* (*terrify* in English), present infinitive of the verb *territāre*, to the infinitive verbal name *territatum*; from these, derives *terreō*, from which arises terrific, terror, and terrorism; but from which one can also deduce or extract, without great maneuvers, the term *térreo*, *terra*, or ground as a vital place, a place of insemination, dissemination, and germination, or cultivation. *Territorium*, *territō*, *territatum* are intertwined; from the enclosure of the full and established meaning of the concepts, we will follow the trail left by their tracks. These connections are made possible by the regime of the sign and the multivalence of its meanings which drive meanings that exceed their reification and worn-out encodings. To see the concept in palimpsest is to think about our future.

Also close to territory are the French terms *terroir* and *terreur*. From this dialogical etymological digression, we can present the concept of terrorism closer to the idea of a struggle for land; Jacques Derrida points out this possibility to us in his article “*Qu'est-ce que le terrorisme*” (“What is Terrorism?”, our translation), published in *Le Monde Diplomatique*, in February 2004.

Here, we enter a conflictive conceptual field, a field where cultivation, dispute, struggle, and sovereignty meet. Subsequent to the French Revolution, an event marked by the struggle for land [*terroir*], the period known as the “Reign of Terror” [*terreur*] was marked by an unstable movement of intense legal disputes for the consolidation of a germinating democracy. Derrida

points out that terrorism is born from and in this struggle. Territory, *terra*, terror, and terrorism are distinct terms with shaded, convergent radicals.

Although derived from *terreur*, etymologically, terrorism is close to *terroir*. The concept of Territory (*territor*, but also *territō*), in an etymological derivation, is linked to a movement of dispute or struggle for land, for the ground, through which we build or cultivate our existence and from where emerge modes of existence more or less rooted in this land. From this struggle for existence and survival, with different gradients of intensity and possibly due to these degrees of resistance, re-existences arises from processes of identification with the place. Hence, the notions of belonging, identity, by cultivating territory based on its assumptions, characteristics, attributes, or *disaffection* in relation to it when initiating other germination processes from this conquest and right of usufruct.

Remainders of what was, or what it is, when becoming another territory during the struggle, the levels of resistance faced will constitute modes of existence as “remnants” (traces of self and other; that which erases and evades itself to avoid being pure presence, remaining detached, neither absence, nor presence) in relation to what they are or have ceased to be. Full identities – with no remainders, fused to the land for which they fought and continue to fight for, or identities lacking in relation to their own selves when aspiring to become another beyond what they have always been, i.e., alterities of themselves.

In any case, it is difficult to imagine a territory, a place of dispute, unscathed in its being, in its onto-teleological dimension,¹ precisely because this is the place of an often permanent, irresolute conflict. The territory, place of dispute, of conflict, is an *archi*-trace in a Derridean sense, a trace of itself in relation to its origin, seeing that it is a place of instability, of an unstable stabilization, an interval between what has been and what will become as ontologically unstable ground, a passage between one being and another, a becoming, a place of dispute and difficult agreements. Unstable, a place under dispute, the territory emerges as a vector of unpredictable deterritorializations and movements, according to Deleuze and Guattari, of minorities capable of disrupting artificial and incessant reterritorializations promoted by the hegemonic power (state, market). Deterritorializations are abrupt, unpredictable actions that, motivated by feverish movements of counter-hegemonic occupations, wish to denature hegemonic processes of domination, hierarchization, and social stratification. For this reason, it is not possible to think of them through the legality of legal law, which historically legitimizes illegalities, or through the reordering and prescription of new regulations.

Its path can perhaps be thought of negatively, based on a counter-path, a path that does not trace a path, but opens gaps in the logics traced by the hegemonic power; a counter-path that can be thought of as a deviation from paths naturalized by the majority reterritorializing movements. Articulating and disseminating themselves throughout the territory in the form of bundles and interweavings, these agents (active subjects, no longer constituted in the given, the predictable, and in the habit, operators of urban micro-transmutations) make the appropriations that promote, for the most part illegal, a proscribed movement of subversion of the hegemonic territorial order. They are bundles that produce informal, unstructured flows, disseminating a new political, social, and urban energy, through which flows a variety of intensive self-organizations, of territorial morphogenesis of paradoxical power from the deterritorialization of the routes prescribed by the Capital-State. Let us now consider this close bond formed between territory-[i]legality-[de]structuring.

2 [Des]territorializations *Voyous*

Voyous, French for criminals, but also bandits and vagabonds, is a work by Derrida in which the goal of the philosopher was to reveal that the term *voyou*, which serves to frame, stigmatize, and characterize states that do not abide by the rules of international law, the UN or other international legislating bodies, can also serve to characterize the same states that employ the term in the name of democracy. According to Derrida (2003, p.97, our translation), “The *voyou* is someone who, by social pedigree or by manners, belongs to what is most common or popular in the people. The *demos* is thus never far away when

¹ In Aristotelian metaphysics, the *télos*, the immanent end of an action, can be divided into two types of activities: the *enérgēai* (complete, immanent purpose) and the *kinéseis* (incomplete, imperfect, but aimed at achieving something, however not its purpose or a purpose). The territory and practice of *terroirisme* are perhaps closer to the place and action of *kinéseis*.

one speaks of a *voyou*, and thus, neither is democracy from *voyoucracy*."² (Derrida uses *voyoucratie*, in a play on words, which can also be translated as "criminocracy.")]

Based on a discussion about democracy, sovereignty and criminality, a disturbing reflection is built around the notion of democratic states and terrorist states i.e., states that operate within the law and states that operate outside the law. However, of which law and democracy are we talking about and considering when an alleged democratic state, in the name of the law and democracy, gives itself the right to invade a state declared *Voyou*, criminal, bum, or thug? What crime is the outlaw state being accused of? Laws often exist to legitimize crimes considered "within the law". Derrida provokes us by questioning the notions of sovereignty and democracy based on the prerogative of International Law itself, which recognizes that a sovereign state, in the name of democracy and order, understood here as global order, is exempt from complying with the laws and rules of International Law itself, and is self-regulating its legitimacy to invade another state, previously stigmatized or considered *voyou*, delinquent, marginal, criminal, terrorist – here used as synonym of one that disseminates terror. Would this state, considered democratic, also not be a "legitimate" *voyou* state?

The cards are shuffled by Derrida so that we can ask ourselves about certain notions and ontologically stable values. A necessary mediation between Territory, Democracy, Terrorism and Sovereignty is a prerequisite for an uneasy reflection on the "destinerrances."³ We have reached a point where territorialization processes, perpetrated by sovereign states, are justified in the name of preserving an established world order. This order is responsible for the emergence of criminal "states", territories considered or declared *voyous* for harboring terrorists, and that are therefore liable to be invaded in the name of restoring democracy and general order.

In some situations, even before the possible terror practiced by these states can be proven, the territorialization by a sovereign state considered democratic will be considered justified. This sovereignty promotes territorial agencies of adequacy and maneuvers that aim to control and order its "chaotic" flows – of humans and material – but that also tries to avoid deterritorializations in its solidly territorialized interior, also in the name of managing the flows and backed by the so-called democratic sovereignty. However, another horizon for the practice of a democracy perhaps not yet inscribed in the logic of prefigured, pre-codified sovereignties arises from these chaotic de-territorializing movements. Let's think about *voyous*, "marginals," "outlaws" democratic deterritorializations.

3 [De]codifying [De]territorializations

As argued by Deleuze and Guattari in *A Thousand Plateaus* (Deleuze; Guattari, 1997, p. 170-172), the axiom of capitalism⁴ always requires a center – necessary to generate a periphery and, with it, unequal exchanges. However, there are always unstable flows capable of destabilizing and throwing off balance the balanced-imbalance proposed and sustained by the center, the sovereign power. Case in point, axioms (and here the duo cited Keynesianism, Marshall Plan, the New Deal as examples of axioms created in the interwar period and after the Second World War) regulate both material and immaterial flows, from working classes to unions, from job positions to the role of the state and markets. Such axioms are responsible for territorializing a territory, bridging unpredictable lines of flight that they themselves produce and become possible sources of threatening deterritorializations.

The decoded, deterritorialized flows are the inescapable and inevitable result of the constant [over]codifications and territorializations of the territory, promoted by the sovereign state and capital. These flows become a vital action for their stability because unstable flows, loose gears external to the global axioms of capitalism, represent a risk to the desirable

² From the original in French: "*Le voyou est ce qu'il y a de plus populaire dans le peuple. Le demos n'est donc jamais loin quand on parle du voyou. Ni la démocratie est très loin de la voyoucratie*".

³ In Derridean language, errant destinations, other destinations already distant from their original or foundational meaning, of the concepts of terrorism, territory and, now, territorialization.

⁴ "The axioms of capitalism are obviously not theoretical propositions or ideological formulas, but operative statements that constitute the semiological form of capital and that enter as component parts into assemblages of production, circulation, and consumption"(Deleuze; Guattari, 1997, vol. 5, pp.163, our translation).

homogenization of the global and local territory, conducted by the state. If there is always an intention from sovereign power and capital to stratify and encode the territory for better control of its material and immaterial flows, then

[...] assemblages are different from strata although they are produced there. There are zones where milieux are decoded, and assemblages are able to extract a territory from them. Any assemblage is territorial first. The first concrete rule of assemblages is to discover the territoriality they envelop, because always is one in their trash can or on their bench, Beckett's characters stake out a territory [...] The territory is made up of decoded fragments of all kinds, which are borrowed from the milieu, but are turned into 'properties' in assemblages, and even rhythms can take on the meaning of the refrain (ritornello). The territory creates the assemblage." (Deleuze; Guattari, 1997, vol.5, pp. 218, our translation).

From the idea of assemblage, once again the territory approaches another possible interpretation of its meaning, the place of conflict, of struggle for the right of that which gives existence, of the enunciation of that which exceeds the codification and the stratification imposed by the sovereign power. Territories territorialized by contents and regulations linked to the sovereign power, the state, and capital can be crossed by deterritorializing lines and forces; "The territoriality is no less inseparable from deterritorialization than the code was from decoding." (Deleuze; Guattari, 1997, pp. 220, our translation). The constant reterritorializations of the territory, promoted by capital and state in favor of expansions or redirections of their axiomatics, imply, at the same time, deterritorializations and decodings, flows that escape this needed adjustment and/or alteration of axioms. It is these new deterritorialized flows, always generated in conjunction with existing deterritorialized flows, that are capable

[...] to enter into "connections" that delineate a new Land; without their constituting a war machine whose aim is neither the war of extermination nor the peace of generalized terror, but revolutionary movement (the connection of flows, the composition of non-denumerable aggregates, the becoming-minoritarian of everybody/everything). (Deleuze; Guattari, 1997, p. 177, our translation).

We are in the field of undecidability, of an uncontrollable future. The deterritorializations of a territory codified by the axiomatic of the state and capital, attributing "properties" to it from a bureaucratic programming, global or local, would be the unforeseen connections of its lines of flight, links that begin to operate transversally to the stratifications of the territory. In sum, of everything that escapes and is discarded by the axiomatic itself; "Every struggle is a function of all these undecidable propositions and constructs revolutionary connections in opposition to the conjugations of the axiomatic." (Deleuze; Guattari, 1997, p. 177, our translation)

The condition of the possibility of a revolutionary urban becoming, beyond the axiomatic of capital and the state, lies in the ability to want-say something almost impossible made possible by the struggle, by the conflicting desire to overcome a determined democracy – or a democracy determined – by a broader democracy, a democracy that is based on the near unconditional embracement of the other. As conflicting territorialities and territories of struggle, the so-called Occupations have positioned themselves as problematizing and propositioning actions of the territory and its future from potent deterritorializations (decodings) of the territory itself.

4 The Territories of Urban Occupations: Territorializing Deterritorializations

In a sort of glossary at the end of the fifth volume of *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari created a conceptual dictionary, where they condensed the thoughts presented over the course of the 5 (five) volumes. Under the letter D, Deterritorialization is defined as

The function of deterritorialization: D is the movement by which "one" leaves the territory. It is the operation of the line of flight. There are very different cases. D may be overlaid by a compensatory reterritorialization obstructing the line of flight: D is then said to be negative. (Deleuze; Guattari, 1997, p. 224, our translation)

In a thought constructed by and through paradox, we perceive the duo's predilection for processes of deterritorialization of the territory where, to them, there is always encoding. Perceiving and enhancing lines of flight of a territory means making it the other-of-itself. By means of deterritorialization, the territory, framed and guaranteed by the legal-judicial framework related to property, to the right of land (of which right?) to the sovereign power, releases from prerogatives, specificities, heritages and surpasses its own meaning and borders. Occupations, which are the subject of any study in current times related to housing and sharing, located in central territories, mainly in metropolises, can represent such lines of flight, much needed to the urban future.

Occupations exceed limits and borders, confirming them by transgressing their senses and meanings, territorializing them as key devices for the opening and embracing through deterritorialization. They do not take borders to be static limits between the inside and outside, between what belongs and what is strange and foreign to it. Borders are no longer the place of difference between the *in* and the *out*. And the “the out-sider,” the foreigner is never a *voyou*, a potential criminal or bandit, but one who arrives and, already from “in-side”, helps build the logic of “out-side,” which goes beyond borders. Considering that in most cases Occupations begin with a *voyou* act, a crime in the eyes of “democratic” legal law of the sovereign power, it will be by means of this *terroiriste* action of struggle for a place that a territory of near unconditional embrace from the struggle for the right to land will be constituted, without, however, reterritorializing it as a property with clear limits between the in-side and the out-side.

Occupations become territories that resemble the concept of *Khôra*,⁵ discussed by Derrida (1995, p. 26). Originally defined by Plato, *Khôra* is a surface of inscriptions constantly [re]marked by the out-side and not only by those who already belong to it or become its proprietors - proper to the place. Its borders seem to exist only to de[s]limit tangible forms and contents related to what is proper or external to it. Like *Khôra*, Occupations are places of a different hospitality. They become a spacing before becoming a delimited territory, an interval that opens an opening (redundancy intentional) to the future, unpredictable, place where the out-side becomes essential to the consolidation of the in-side.

Occupations are places of *kineseis*, of the *imperfectum*,⁶ matter of dissemination of social becomings from the construction of singular contents that are often times foreign to them; the parties, courses, workshops, debates, lectures, are supplementary content to housing act, but essential to survival as heterogeneous territory, space of blends, of the hospitality of the territory. Figures 1 and 2 show the 59th Rivoli, public occupation of artists from many countries in the central region of Paris, a collectivity originated from the occupation of former headquarters of *Crédit Lyonnais Bank*, literally arising from the breaking down of its front door. Figures 3,4 and 5 show the 9th of July Occupation in downtown São Paulo, a current and still illegal occupation of an old abandoned public building that housed the Brazilian Social Security Institute (INSS). Both, places of unforeseen ritualizations and behavioral rhizomes.

These are examples of territorializing deterritorializations, both 9th of July Occupation and 59 Rivoli become founding places of a common territory, the shared cultivation of a hospitable space. A territory constantly deterritorialized by the unnamable other that arrives and enters, not necessarily as guest, but who is embraced as an “out-sider” becoming an “in-sider,” inasmuch as these territories are strengthened by their abaleity, precisely (and not by aseity, i.e., existence in itself). Here, we are speaking of profane interworlds, generated, quite often, by unforeseen, unexpected coexistences, not guaranteed by social affinities or proximities. Parties, assemblies, food get-togethers or cultural events become in these places instituting praxis of the hospitality of presence or passage. Occupations not guaranteed by law – i.e., that emerged as *voyous* territories from the legal judicial standpoint – are territories deterritorialized in their routines by such moments that territorialize them as permanently decoded territories by the occasional presence of such any another.

⁵ “*Khôra* receives, so as to give place to them, all the determinations, but she/it does not possess any of them as her/its own. She possesses them, she. She possesses them, she has them, since she receives them, but she does not possess them as properties, she does not possess anything as her own. She ‘is’ nothing other than the sum or the process of what has just been inscribed ‘on’ her, on the subject of her, on her subject, right up against her subject, but she is not the *subject* or the *present support* of all these interpretations, even though, nevertheless, she is not reducible to them.”

⁶ From Latin, *imperfectum*: purposes not consummated, yet to come, or always in process.



Fig. 1: 59 Rivoli: Artist occupation. The former headquarters of Crédit Lyonnais Bank has become a place where anonymous artists of many countries and continents spend some time for cultural exchanges, an authentic Tower of Babel. Source: Igor Guatelli, 2017.



Fig. 2: 59 Rivoli: praxis that institutes a common territory. The magic of the process and of a being committed together proves to be more important than the product. A place of social micro-assemblages, without pre-established geographic, social, and economic borders. Source: Igor Guatelli, 2017



Fig. 3: 9th of July Occupation: main access and public party in the courtyard. Source: Igor Guatelli, 2018



Fig. 4: 9th of July Occupation: Assembly with the participation of students from the Mackenzie Presbyterian University. Next door, art workshop for neighborhood children. Source: Igor Guatelli, 2018



Fig. 5: 9th of July Occupation: Performative reading of the “Cosmic Manifesto,” from Mario Novello’s cordel, Pandemic series, n-1 Publishing house, lunch time, May 8th, 2022. To the right we can see a stand with books from n-1 Publishing house. To the left, a mannequin with clothes from the thrift shop operating in the Occupation. Source: Igor Guatelli, 2018

The programmatic supplements, assembled in their interiors, deterritorialize them as housing entity transforming it into another entity, an in-between, unnamable, undecidable. Being an undecidable other in relation to the axiomatic of capital, being able to decode it without imposing itself as a new sovereign logic allows Occupations to take on an ontological dimension obscured by the deterritorializing movement they emulate. In other words, they deterritorialize the metaphysical oppositions they promote by representing the in-between, an interval between one thing and the other, private and public, exterior and interior, without the need to name it. The territory constituted by the Occupations have no regard for the axioms and territorialities linked to the housing act imposed by state and market framework, not allowing this dwelling to reterritorialize in the *eidós*, primordial idea, original and supposedly founding limits of its contours.

Occupations are unstable, *voyou* to the legal judicial framework of the pseudo-democratic state. Ordinary places, belonging to everyone and no one, democratic and embracing of minorities, sovereign without the exercise of sovereignty (exercise of force that imposes itself as force, as demonstration of force), simultaneously public and private, interior, while at the service of constructing an out-side. Thus, Occupations tear apart prerogatives that they themselves institute. In other words, as a heteroclite dwelling, it rids itself of the idea of belonging and the logic of identity. As places of invention of the other, of unforeseen interactions, without a pre-determined destination, Occupations thus are a territory of equivocality (complex, entangled), of the interplay of proximities, distances, entanglements, differences.

Occupations are deterritorializations of a place that territorializes as in *terroir*, as a cultivated field of future, an enunciation that does not configure a new code. Any attempt at codifying or recodifying would mean a coercive conduction of the social-becoming emulated by solidary struggle, by the construction of an impossible hospitality which cannot be reduced to the

order of those who build it or whom it is intended for. Without associating themselves to a sender or a recipient, Occupations are enunciations with no statement or aim. They are collective assemblages that enunciate another territory, a territory of embracement and introversion, while also representing territories of passage, of opening to other forms of living based on aesthetic practices which escape the enunciation (axioms) of state and capital. The lines of flight provoked by Occupations are aesthetic practices linked to the formulation of different social bonds and ways of living together.

5 *Imperfectum Territory*

These are the territorializing deterritorializations of territories, here considered intra-urban territories, specifically the Occupations, a path for a destitution of the territory. Place of a territorialization that must always be completed, deterritorialized by the spacing it itself generates, it is a place between ontologies and specific destinations, not fully one thing nor the other. A place of destinations without the destination of place, errant in its interval condition, a possible impossible, a difficult condition of possibility, always to come, always struggling. Again, according to Deleuze and Guattari (1997, p. 82-83), territorial assemblages can be differentiating traits against the homogenization of the state machine. Occupations become this spectral trace of what is a dwelling entity and what a dwelling can come to be, without prior enunciation, but through assemblages of enunciation of a possible other, possible only because of its impossibility, of its apparent, but disturbing, inadequacy, if evaluated from what is formulated and proposed by the state and capital.

The machines of state and capital encode social flows of the territory (human, goods, desire, consumption, behavior, language, communication flows), disciplining and territorializing them into productive chains – social production – as desiring chains alienated from desire. According to Deleuze and Guattari,

[...] every machine functions as a break in the flow in relation to the machine to which it is connected, but at the same time is also a flow itself, or the production of a flow, in relation to the machine connected to it. This is the law of the production of production. That is why, at the limit point of all the transverse or transfinite connections, the partial object and the continuous flux, the interruption and the connection, fuse into one: everywhere there are breaks-flows out of which desire wells up, thereby constituting its productivity and continually grafting the process of production onto the product. (Deleuze; Guattari, 2011, p. 55, our translation)

The housing-machine and its gears – social housing is one of them – has its flows that are generated and encoded by the mega-machines of the state and capital. However, there is always the chance of breaking “naturalized” flows, deterritorializing them. It is in this process of break-disconnection, break-residue (Deleuze; Guattari, 2011, p. 57-62), that new flows emerge, fugitive, random, unforeseen flows, heterogeneous “ungoverned” machines. From these flows, discordant, misaligned, partial objects (remnants) are produced. Occupations – partial objects resulting from the break and the chaotic flows caused by the mega-machines themselves – become the future of the social-housing machine, deterritorialized and unpredictable, producers of different social flows, which are flows of decoded desire that have not been previously marked by the social codes they are part of.

A field for cultivating the political being, occupations are the territory of the middle, neither the origin nor the end of something. They are territorial assemblages of coexistences, matter of territorial content and expression, of turbulent movements as counterpoints to a democracy determined, democracy at same time in debt and that has come, has been de-reterritorialized, and still is to come. It is not a becoming of democracy, but a democracy-becoming, a democracy still to come, but already in enunciation, in gestation, not in terms of reproduction, but of producing social lines of deterritorialization, social lines of flight. Once again, according to Deleuze and Guattari, “What we term machinic is precisely this synthesis of heterogeneities as such” (Deleuze; Guattari, 1997, p. 151, our translation). Occupations are machines of expression of a *terroiriste* action, rhizomatic machines of social de-stratification by leveraging swarms of people without addressments.

6 *Displacements - Placements*

For some time already, Saskia Sassen (Sassen, 2016) has highlighted the globally widespread material practices of acquisition of foreign lands, generating brutal expulsions and evictions. Sovereign and multinational states, global economies, resort to deliberate practices (soil contamination, stimulation of internal wars) of forced cleansing, displacements,

and eradications (where burials of human beings are acceptable collaterals) of natives from their territories, debilitating them. They build the ideal scenario for large-scale acquisition of foreign lands for their own use, especially through plantations and installation of extractive mines. Displacements degrade social bonds. People and place are irretrievably territorialized by a global code based on the subservient and lenient sovereignty of minority states to dominant states and corporations with their covert, sweetened practices of terrorism; *terreurisme* (destruction of the alien land) not as *terroirisme* (struggle for land), but as promotion of deleterious forms of conflict for the social death of the land.

If, according to Sassen, “territory becomes merely land in the case of plantations and dead land in the case of mines” (Sassen, 2016, p.102, our translation), occupations inseminate life in sterile urban territories, deterritorializing them as territorialized lands, as per the inviolable principle of property and market axiomatics, while territorializing them from the “repatriation” of the unlanded standpoint, exiled from within and from outside, fellow citizens without the right to citizenship. From deterritorializing Occupations – *voyous* territorialities – another territory of a different discreet, sober [*sōbər*] sovereignty [*sōbər*] arise. No longer is it the sovereignty of the strongest, but of the modest, a place of modesty, a territorial extension [*in*]sovereign; (not) of one's own (nor) of others. A democratic sovereignty that is built with the other, by interdependence, by living together. The territories of the Occupations are the becoming *terroirist* of a territory, perhaps (not) from salvation [*salut*] but above all, from the salutation [*salut*] of the other.

Product of hegemonic, dominant actions, which have or hold control over which way the territorialization of a city – and its endless reterritorializations – are engendered, explains the distribution of functions and zones in urban, local, and global space. Functions and zones are always [re]created, organized, and maintained by dominant, axiomatic reterritorializations (parental, patrimonial, state, market). In this sense, deterritorialized self-organizing minorities, constitutive and constituted by territorial [ex]appropriative occupations, are the chance of counter-hegemonic disorganizations. Apparently incipient, they have shown themselves capable of leveraging processes in which certain components and zones of the urban environment, expropriated from their majority properties, become a means of trans-spatial [dis]arrangements.

7 Final Considerations

If, in modernity, the processes of urbanization promoted by the state are dominated by the zoning of society in populations from within and outside, occupations are constituted as counter-hegemonic actions promoting territorial and legal disarrangements within this process. They are, therefore, the fundamental inadequacy to the emergence of another logic of territorial organization. When talking about occupations, we are talking about an *ethos* of the graft, of the residue that is generated, gestated, and strengthened by the intruder, of an intrusion that, beyond that specific place, is the chance to make something foreign and surplus to itself. According to Nancy (2017, p. 60, our translation), grafting is a “metatechnique, an art of combinations, supplements, substitutions, permutations, prostheses, regenerations, inscriptions, transfers, transpositions, transactions.”⁷ Via the hospitality of the intruder, directed at the intruder – and made possible by him – to anyone who introduces themselves without being invited, a radical exercise of aesthetic and political *epochè* takes place, the suspension of any exclusionary identity logic as a condition of the openness to any other, to a common becoming without preconditions.

Intrusions and foreign grafts to a place's past generate the necessary divorce between memory and history so that both become traces not of a past, but of a future, of an unnamed other, of a still impossible democracy. They are territories that function as a living archive, a memory without memory, an inaugural deterritorialization. Here, memory is no longer as an internal continuity of the place linked to a past, but as a discontinuity emulated by its exterior, caused by the unexpected arrival (events without memory, according to Derrida) of this any other, inaugurating other contents; place-archive as a barn of possibilities, and not a memory or an inheritance of what was or has ceased to be.

Occupations are strange communal grafts in a world logic that aims at stratifications, territories of becoming-*Quilombo*, factories of the “power of living” through friendship, hospitality, resistance of a lived experience that experiences the other, from the anti-servility, are transformed into urban erogenous zones. Zones that amplify the desire for the otherness, that serve as catalysts and disseminators of another socio-spatial libido, nameless, devoid of parental and patrimonial *nomos*.

⁷ From the original in French: “*métatechnique, l'art des combinaisons, suppléments, substitutions, permutations, prothèses, régénérations, inscriptions, transferts, transpositions, transactions...*”

Encrusted in the heart of cities, intrusive *res-publica*,⁸ they cease to be only parentheses of norms when they begin to subvert them from within to become a beyond, and inner overflow. The graft is always a territorializing deterritorialization.

Acknowledgement

This article derives from the research project "Habiter en devenir: autres demeures", coordinated by the author with financial support from MSH Paris Nord - Maison des Sciences de l'Homme Paris Nord.

References

Bogue, R., 1999. Art and Territory. In: Ian Buchanan (ed.), *A Deleuzian Century?*. Duke University Press. pp. 85-102

Deleuze, G., Guattari, F., 1994. *Mil platôs, Capitalismo e Esquizofrenia*. vol. 4. São Paulo: editora 34.

Deleuze, G., Guattari, F., 2011. *O Anti-Édipo*. São Paulo: Editora 34.

Derrida, J., 1995. *Khôra*. Campinas, Papirus.

Derrida, J., 2003. *Voyous*. Paris: Galilée.

Derrida, J., 2004. *Qu'est-ce que le terrorisme*. Paris, Le Monde Diplomatique, pp. 16.

Nancy, J. L., 2017. *L'Intrus*. Paris: Galilée.

Sassen, S., 2016. *Expulsões, Brutalidade e Complexidade na economia Global*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.

⁸ From the Latin, *res-publica* does not mean only the public thing or the state but the place where people gather and debate publicly. Res, from the Greek *rethos*, *rhema*, *reden* in German, i.e., network [encounter].