

Everyday micro-resistances and horizons of radical solidarity, care and mutualism

Abstract

Although resistance is traditionally conceived as oppositional and reactive, we propose to follow those everyday resistant practices that create alternative organisations and horizons of change. Drawing on data collected through a range of qualitative methodologies (semi-structured interviews, participant observation and informal group conversations) from KIA, a social and solidarity clinic in Greece, and Ri.Maflo, a recuperated factory in Italy, we explore the microphysics of resistance at work and its transformative potential. We reflect on how a social clinic evolves from a healthcare initiative to a health community and a space of wider social experimentation that is questioning the traditional hierarchical structure of the medical apparatus. Or how a recuperated factory is more than a reaction to unemployment, as it reinvents work, autonomy and self-management within the walls of the warehouse and in its relation with the wider ecology of its community. We want to emphasise how these resistances are not simply a reaction against the loss of social and economic infrastructures due to austerity, but active practices of solidarity that experimentally engage with creation with often unintentional and unanticipated outcomes.

Introduction

Despair is often the hallmark of our contemporary resignation to the sheer injustice and inequalities of neoliberal governmentalities. From ecological degradation to the erosion of our social infrastructures, we are ordinarily confronted with a sense of powerlessness and irreparability that produces desperation and obfuscates our potential to repair and transform our lives and our ecologies. This chapter is an escape from despair, a resistant leap towards a horizon of reparation. We present the stories of a social and solidarity clinic in Greece (KIA) and a recuperated factory in Italy (Ri-Maflo), both of which have evolved into spaces of experimentation within a wider network of struggles. The choice of these two spaces for the purpose of discussing and problematising the idea of mundane micro-practices of resistance is deliberate. We believe that these cases bring forth the fragility of resistance formation; fragility 'not in the sense that it is already formed and might be easily broken but in the sense that it is taking shape and needs care and caution as it comes into being' (Gibson-Graham, Cameron, & Healy, 2013, p. 1062). We look at mundane and experimental practices in these two cases with the intention to reaffirm its complexity as being not only an (un)intentional and (un)anticipated act of refusal but also a transformational process of becoming within and across spaces/places. Resistance evolves as a constant reconfiguration of socio-spatial formations, a productive process that 'shapes ideas of politics and the potential for social transformation' (Bloom, 2016, p.6).

The concept of resistance has traditionally reproduced a binary model that poses at its opposite pole the monolithic pervasiveness of power and domination (Ortner, 1995): power comes first and resistance can exert an action of disturbance and dissent, aimed at replacing its opponent. This view has often been attached to a fascination for rare and spectacular events of struggle. Resistance involves masses, barricades, occupations, clashes, a certain degree of violence and febrile enthusiasm. These coordinates define a circumscribed moment in history that momentarily disrupts the ordinary stability of power. The idea of resistance as an event (Badiou, 2007; Douzinas, 2013; Rancière, 2010) has been widely criticised in recent years as it does not account for the complexity of the emergence of resistance as an incremental and grounded process (Uitermark and Nicholls, 2014), its vast repertoire of practices and its creative and transformative potential (Checchi, 2021). We follow Lilja (2022) to argue that today "resistance is to be treated as an umbrella concept that contains forms of everyday, serial and organized resistance as well as the connection between these". In particular, the idea of everyday resistance helps to provide a microphysical gaze that focuses not only on the oppositional and adversarial component of resistance, but on its mundane, minute, and experimental practices that display its creative character. While the concept of everyday resistance was originally conceived to make sense of those hidden micro-practices that avoid repression through disguise (Scott, 1985), we look at everyday forms of resistance that operate openly and, on the contrary, reclaim their visibility despite the risks that this might entail. To some extent, the analysis of these everyday practices of resistance contributes to the wider debate on prefiguration (Yates, 2015). Yet, it is important to emphasise how our case studies display practices that not only

prefigure an alternative future, but, more urgently, address present needs and the impellent necessity to create alternative forms of living in the here and now, despite adverse conditions and vulnerable infrastructures. In this chapter, we show how everyday micro-resistances, through multiple reiterations and experimentations with alternative forms of organising, create a horizon of radical solidarity, mutualism and care. Our work draws on data collected between July 2016 to December 2021 through a range of qualitative methodologies (semi-structured interviews, participant observation, photo-elicitation, event organisations and informal group conversations) from KIA, a solidarity social clinic in Greece, and Ri.Maflow, a recuperated factory in Italy. Our data analysis process had several stages starting with an initial free coding of the transcripts from the recorded interviews and our reflective diary to identifying key themes. We then use photography to revisit our experience and reflections in the diaries, to initiate discussions among ourselves about our interpretation of our data and to question how these images affected us. The outcome of this process was to identify the agency of more mundane materialities (for example in the case of KIA we looked at the clothes, posters, medical equipment, etc.) in a variety of uncertain and experimental practices. We found this process useful for exploring the microphysics of resistance at work in the continuous experimentation of exerting power differently within those organisations and their transformative potential that expands beyond their boundaries.

This chapter is divided in two main sections and tells the story of Ri.Maflow and KIA looking at how the blurring of boundaries contributes to the emergence of new possibilities and new imaginative relationships at the setting of a recuperated factory and a health care facility. First, we look at the case of Ri.Maflow, and reflect on how a recuperated factory is more than a reaction to unemployment, (re-)inventing work, autonomy and self-management within the walls of the warehouse and in its relation with the wider ecology of its community. We then turn our attention to the case of KIA, aiming to reflect on how a social clinic evolves from a health care initiative to a health community and a space of wider social experimentation that is questioning the traditional hierarchical structure of the medical apparatus. We believe that these stories are important for making better sense of the microphysics of resistance, encouraging us to reflect on everyday micro-resistances not simply as a reaction against the loss of social and economic infrastructures due to austerity, but active practices of solidarity that experimentally engage with creation with often unintentional and unanticipated outcomes.

Resistance as creation: The story of KIA

The Social Clinic of Solidarity (KIA) is located near the city centre of Thessaloniki and it was established by a group of medical professionals and activists in 2012 as a reaction to the austerity policies implemented in the Greek national health care system that left over 3 million people without access to health care (Evlampidou and Kogevinas, 2019). During that period, Greece witnessed a wave of experimentation with alternative forms of organisation, based on the principles of user-ownership, user-control and user-benefit (Kokkinidis, 2015; Daskalaki and Kokkinidis, 2017; Howarth and Roussos, 2022). Social and solidarity clinics were established across Greece most of which were self-organised and although most had slowly died out, KIA is not only remaining operational but thriving. The clinic has several divisions, some of which operate daily (pharmacy, dentistry and pathology) while other periodically (e.g. psychology and physiotherapy). At its busiest period, the clinic counted more than 350 members (medical and non-medical personnel) and provided free medical care to over 10,000 people every year. While several members have left the clinic in the past 2 years, partly as a result of disagreements about the character, purpose and future potentialities of the clinic, the basic structure has remained intact and so does the members' inspiration for creating a 'health community'. In fact, it is perhaps fair to suggest that the member's aspiration to create a health community has been strengthened, with new collaborations and possibilities emerging both at local and at European level, with KIA at the forefront of these initiatives.

The clinic has a flat structure across its divisions and is guided by the principles of self-management, cooperation and egalitarianism with the aim to cultivate relationships that promote collective working and members' autonomy. Autonomy here is to be understood in its collective dimension, as a collective project and as a social relation that shapes our ways of both living and connecting with others that requires a distinct form of being, both at an individual level and at a collective level (Weeks, 2011; Ghelfi and Papadopoulos, 2022). Operationally, the clinic is supported (both financially and with medical supplies) by solidarity groups in Greece and across Europe, and none of the members is financially remunerated for their work. As for the clinic's governance, it is solely the responsibility of its members through weekly divisional meetings and a monthly general assembly meeting. There is an inclusive model of participation in place where all members of the clinic are invited to actively participate and decisions are made consensually, whenever possible. Disagreements are common as in any open initiative, and although we

have witnessed extreme situations where members have chosen to leave the clinic, it will be fair to argue that such instances are rather rare and that disagreement is not suppressed or discouraged but creatively embraced, encouraging thus members to discuss what produces the objection and negotiate potential solutions until they are able to find a way to meet that need in a revised agreement, rather than to suppress the objection. Yet, at times of unresolved conflicts and disagreements, the group is using majority rule. The general assembly is responsible for laying down the basic principles and loose boundaries for the operations of the clinic, yet there is much flexibility and members are encouraged to be proactive on daily matters as well as organise action groups for local or national-level initiatives and social struggles. In short, looking at the organizing practices at KIA, emphasis is placed on the collective dimension of autonomy and the realization of their self-creating, self-altering and self-instituting capacities, which in turn is fashioning 'rule-creating' rather than 'rule-following' subjectivities.

KIA is far from a typical clinic. Once through the entrance, you immediately notice something is missing: from the doctors' white coats and the blue outfits of nurses to the distinctive smell of a clinic, a blending of medical odours and sickness, that situates the body within the particular setting of a medical space and shapes doctors' and patients' behaviour accordingly. Their absence causes a sense of disorientation that calls for a new cartography of the clinic and the active reconfiguration of the embodied experiences of doctors and patients alike, blurring organizational boundaries and opening possibilities for different material entanglements and alternative ways of exerting power.

Reflecting on how these resistances are not simply a reaction against the loss of social and economic infrastructures due to austerity (in this case access to health care), but active practices of solidarity; stories such as that of KIA invite us to look beyond grand events or heroic individuals, and more into an ever-expanding community of struggle and creation that extends across time and space. It is a story of everyday forms of resistance that are often messy, experimental and creative processes with unintentional and unanticipated outcomes. What started out as a response to austerity policies which left over 3 million people without access to health care, is gradually evolving into a 'health community', contrasting the hierarchical and disciplinary nature of mainstream medicine to the egalitarian character of the health community. Where and how did this transformation start? Does it have an ending? Let us take a closer look at some of their everyday and experimental practices and initiatives.

As we have already argued, KIA is far from a typical clinic. The layout of the clinic, the unconventional dress code and the distinctive odour, all create a sense of disorientation; while the traditional hierarchical relations of medical profession are challenged through a range of discursive ('proserhomenos') and experimental (cooperative dentistry, integrative medicine and common diabetes sessions) practices that we will turn our attention to, in the rest of this section.

Starting with the idea of the Proserhomenos, this is a Greek word meaning that someone is 'coming into', 'engages in/with' and 'presents oneself'. At the setting of the clinic there is no doctors, no patients, not even researchers. Entering KIA turned us into 'proserhomenos', a term used to describe anyone intra-acting within the clinic (irrespective of their role), an attempt to create a shared identity that instigates relationships of mutuality towards the collective co-creation of a health community, bringing forth the plasticity of a co-created space, where boundaries between the expertise of the medical professional and the passivity of the patient are altered. Such distinctive discursive practices created the conditions to rearticulate the boundaries of a clinic by excluding exclusionary practices entailed by traditional discursive practices/(con)figurations; from the commonly used notion of patient that connotes someone socially 'weak' and marginalized, to the idea of 'clients' often used in private clinics, or even that of the 'beneficiaries' commonly used in other social clinics as it bears a charity connotation. This is how KIA manifests its distinctive political stance, sketching the apparatus of a more-than-social clinic, from a space of health care provision to a health community. Yet, the actual entanglements that materially emerge through the performative reiterations of KIA's everyday practices arguably swerve from the intentions of those who attempted to craft them. This signals the emergence of new and unintended boundaries. There was a persistent antagonism between KIA's alternative mode of organizing and the spectre of the mainstream clinic. Despite its absence, the traditional clinic deploys its ongoing antagonism through dispersed practices: the recalcitrant proserhomenos who asks for the doctor or the proserhomenos-dentist who defies cooperation. The presence of the 'reluctant' vs 'engaged' proserhomenos nicely illustrates the messiness of mundane practices of resistance, particularly cogent for alternative organizations that experimentally engage with novel reconfigurations of power. It is through such uncertain and contested everyday practices that KIA traces its own strategy. Boundaries were disrupted when people disengaged from 'being patients' and become 'proserhomenos', when new initiatives such as that of integrative medicine challenged the traditionally held roles of caretakers and caregivers or when the sharing of dental

tools created the conditions to reinvent the relations between proserhomenos, while reconfiguring dentistry as a cooperative and collective enterprise.

Looking more closely at some of their initiatives (diabetes group session and integrative medicine) designed to provide a more holistic approach to medical care, we witness how new ways of 'knowing' about health care were gradually produced, boundaries altered, assumed identities questioned and relationships problematised. At the diabetes group sessions, for instance, medical personnel (GP, dentist, psychologists, pharmacist, dietitian and physiotherapist), non-medical personnel, diabetes patients and their relatives or friends, were all coming together to share their knowledge and experiences irrespective of participants' roles or specializations. In similar fashion, the integrative medicine initiative was designed to offer a holistic approach to medical treatment. These sessions typically lasted around 1.5 hours and were supported using a Health card, designed by KIA's members. The use of the card, a 6-pages long document featuring four categories: (a) basic personal information, (b) social life, (c) lifestyle and (d) full medical record, had unanticipated effects for all proserhomenos, prompting them to invent new ways of connecting with each other, encouraging doctors to reflect more critically on the conventional practices of their specialization and patients to reflect more on their own experiences living with a health condition and become more active in dealing with it. Such material practices produce new ways of exerting power, disrupting the dominant apparatus of the clinic.

Although some of these practices had a degree of intentionality in terms of creating the possibilities for more collaborative relations, other initiatives, such as the cooperative dentistry, were far from intentional and had gradually emerged once dentists had to work alongside other dentists and non-medical professionals. How equipment should be sterilized or what material should be used were matters that required ongoing negotiation and collective agreement. Setting specific protocols and knowledge sharing processes on such mundane practices was crucial for the functioning of the dentistry, yet, the collective use of dental tools was also a source of tensions and disruption of the dentist's authority; while the absence of private 'ownership' forced all proserhomenos involved to negotiate and re-configure their professional identity. The dentist as an 'artist' vs the 'cooperative dentist' is an illustrative example of the persistent antagonism within KIA and the role of the tools in resolving this conflict. Tools are collectively owned, and they have specific necessities (need to be sterilised for instance) and this constitutes their agency that acts upon the actions of the conflicting strategies of dentistry. The mundane, nonhuman entanglement of the dental tools, bacteria and sterilising chemicals modifies the actions of all dentists, subsuming them into a unique strategy that define a horizon for a radically different way of exerting power.

In this section, we have tried to illustrate how resistance is far from binary, instrumental and reactive to power. We have reflected on a range of experimental initiatives that have contributed to the development of new ways of interaction and knowledge that challenge mainstream medical practices and the dominant order of the medical profession. What started out as a space to provide medical care to those excluded from the health care system due to politics of austerity, has gradually evolved into something more-than-social clinic, an ecology of care where a range of mundane practices 'create the conditions for the articulation of alternative imaginaries and alternative practices that bypass instituted power and generate alternative modes of existence' (Papadopoulos, 2018:198).

Resistance as reparations and recuperations: The case of Ri-Maflow

Ri-Maflow is a recuperated factory that during ten years of resistance has evolved into a unique project of experimentation based on solidarity, mutualism and autogestion. It is located in Trezzano Sul Naviglio, an industrial area near Milan. Even when it was a thriving economic centre, Trezzano appeared gritty and lifeless as any industrial town. Years of delocalisation and global competition have condemned it to an even more desolate torpor. In this context, Ri-Maflow is not only a space for experimenting with alternative practices of work and production, but a vital and expansive site of resistance that repairs this broken urban ecology of despair through its everyday practices of mundane creation and experimentation.

Today Ri-Maflow has finally managed to find its own space, a more modern warehouse obtained legally through a hard-fought agreement with local authorities. This is the result of over a decade of stubborn and obstinate resistance and solidarity. This story starts with Maflow, a company producing components for the automotive trade. At the peak of production, the factory in Trezzano counted 330 workers. In 2009, the financial crisis hits hard and Maflow files for bankruptcy. One year later, another corporate group, Boryszew, acquires Maflow and relaunches production in Trezzano, but most of the workers lose their jobs in the process. In 2012 the factory shuts down, abandoning all its workers to a state of despair.

All the machinery is removed from the factory, which remains empty, but not abandoned. It is capital that has abandoned the factory, depriving it of its productive potential, but the workers, or those who have

just lost their jobs, are still there, outside its gates. The pickets outside the factory are already the expression of an ongoing, everyday resistance made of micro-gestures of solidarity, mundane practices of collective action and imaginative horizons of emancipation that pervade each step of the story of Ri-Maflow. Because the pickets connect the struggle and the protest against the closure to the affirmation of the vital right of these workers to a dignified work. It is in this continuity that resistance finds its oscillation between confrontation and creation, between the deployment of a fight against an enemy and the transformative exploration of what is possible even in a situation of despair. It is probably in those long hours outside the factory that the idea of occupying and reclaiming the factory turns from a bold provocation to a concrete project, from utopian thinking to the actual planning of its material execution: how to break the lock of the gates, who is going to bring a pair of bolt cutters, whether to sleep in at night, who to call in support.

The occupation is definitely a significant moment of resistance for Ri-Maflow. It is an event that introduces a temporal caesura between a state of despair and a new beginning. Before the occupation, we have the jobless workers on one side and the empty factory on the other, separated physically by the gates of the factory and symbolically, but no less materially, by the ownership rights of the creditors on the warehouse. This is when separation also represents despair. After the occupation, the workers and their warehouse are once again paired together, despair is replaced by re-pair and a whole series of new experimentations and new ways of living become finally possible. The occupation, as an event, is a macro-practice of resistance that turns despair into repair. But for as much as it is tempting to coagulate all our fascination for resistance to this singular glorious moment, we need to carefully appreciate resistance in the thickness of its complexity and the wealth of its micro-practices.

When we think of macro moments of resistance, we come close to Alain Badiou's concept of the event: 'a pure break with the becoming of an object of the world, ... an intemporal instant which renders disjunct the previous state of an object (the site) and the state that follows' (Badiou 2007: 39). The event of resistance marks a rupture, an absolute separation with the rest of history given in its isolation and circumscription. Against Badiou's concept of event, Daniel Bensaid highlights the theoretical and strategical problems that this account of resistance implies: '[d]etached from its historical conditions, pure diamond of truth, the event ... is akin to a miracle. ... Its rarity prevents us from thinking its expansion' (Bensaid 2004: 101). On the one hand, there is power in its ordinariness; on the other hand, there is resistance in its miraculous exception, always already on the verge of vanishing. Not only resistance as event undermines the contemporaneity and coextensiveness of power and resistance, but it also reduces the crucial contributions of a multiplicity of resistant practices precede the miracle of resistance and these mundane and everyday practices that sustain and reproduce the creative potential of resistance. The notion of rarity has the effect of closing off the possibility of thinking the expansion of resistance (as continuous multiplicity of practices), but also the possibility of thinking resistance as expansion: proliferation, creation, openings, becomings.

Ri-Maflow's story of resistance acknowledges its expansiveness, its continuity that equally pervades its practices before and after the occupation: "We didn't surrender, and continuing to resist and fight, we recuperated the factory and started our project, our re-birth" (<http://rimaflow.it>, my translation). The mundane and everyday practices that constitute this story of resistance range from the choice of the name and their keywords to the productive activities and the organisational dynamics. Despite each of these aspects taken in its singularity may seem minor, it is the complex connections of these supposedly minor practices that weaves a robust resistance in the face of a constitutive fragility. Because Ri-Maflow, as any resistant story, moves its steps through multiple experimentations embodying a fragility that is embedded in the constant threats from a hostile environment dominated by the market, its competitive logic and its hierarchical practices.

Experimenting with new practices and creating new ways of living means engaging in everyday resistance that constantly marks and reproduces the end of the old and the beginning of a new, alternative present. The choice of the name is significant in this sense. Maflow was the name of the company before the factory shut down and left its workers unemployed. The Ri- (the Italian equivalent of re-) in Ri-Maflow stands for an ideal continuity, but also a new beginning, the start of a new adventure: a new enterprise, not only understood as a productive activity, a business or a company, but also in the other, often neglected, meaning of the word that designs an unexpectedly successful achievement against all the odds. More in general, the Ri- (re-) affirms the connection of this enterprise with a whole series of keywords that map the ideological and political horizon of Ri-Maflow: resistance, revolution, reversal, reappropriation, but also repair and recycle. All these words are painted on graffiti and banners outside the old warehouse and they often appear on posters, leaflets and on their website: a constant reminder that reinforces and reinvigorates their everyday practices. These words constitute the culture of the

organisation, together with their unequivocal definition of Ri-Maflow that often pops up on their merchandise: “Fabbrica autogestita e senza padroni”, self-managed factory with no bosses. More than a mere definition, it is a programmatic affirmation of an alternative way of organising, horizontal, participatory, egalitarian and mutualistic.

Beyond these symbolic aspects that express the creative and resistant character of Ri-Maflow, we can appreciate how the strategic and political choice of engaging with operations of recycling goes well beyond its business value. Not only is recycling a source of income for this recuperated and reappropriated enterprise. Recycling is the hallmark of a regenerative process of resistance that permeates the everyday operations at the level of space, materials and people. As Massimo, one of the founders of Ri-Maflow, puts it in his book: “We thought that those materials that others considered waste, for us could have been resources. We were determined to reconvert the factory ecologically by recuperating waste materials, recreating 300 jobs, as many as there were before the crisis. We started walking on a path of possible utopia” (Lettieri 2019: 35, *our translation*). Re-cycling express a wide ecological stance, an ethico-political gesture. All activities at Ri-Maflow are oriented towards recuperation, repair and recycling.

The first act of recuperation regards the warehouse. Its closure had accelerated those processes of environmental degradation that typically affect industrial areas. The soil was polluted by the presence of toxic agents in the aquifer, while the warehouses had roofs in asbestos. An abandoned factory is a potential environmental catastrophe. As it happened to many other abandoned warehouses, it would have not been long before the site was to be converted into a waste storage and then burnt down provoking an environmental disaster, one of the most lucrative businesses for eco-mafia in the last years, with 690 warehouses burnt down in Italy between 2016-2019 (Castaldo and Gabanelli 2019). After the occupation, it becomes necessary to intervene on the warehouse and transform it into a space that can safely be opened to the workers and to the community, neutralizing the potential risks for the environment. “We ventured on the roof and cleaned up the obstructed gutters that had caused the flooding of the warehouse. We then cleaned the floor and convert the warehouse into a covered marketplace open to the public” (Lettieri 2019: 59). Through these steps, Ri-Maflow opens up to its territory, developing a symbiotic relation with the wider community through an expansive process that is also regenerative as it reawakens a desolate industrial area from its torpor: “Ri-Maflow is the active core of the town, despite Trezzano sul Naviglio is the typical dormitory town of the Milanese hinterland” (Lettieri 2019: 60).

More in general, recuperation and recycling become the core activities that generate income for Ri-Maflow. These can be considered as everyday practices of resistance as they represent an ethico-political choice to fight the tremendous capitalist link between indefinite accumulation of wealth and indefinite accumulation of waste through an active engagement with ecological practices that transform waste into something valuable. The main business is originally the ecological dismantling of washing machines and the reparation and sale of old IT equipment and devices. Perhaps the most interesting set of practices in this sense is the idea of “modernariat”. While generating income through house removals, some of the materials and the objects collected are reconverted into artworks by the artisan laboratories that Ri-Maflow hosts. It is a creative enterprise that recycles waste into art, a mundane process of valorization that includes a series of transformative practices.

But it is not just the space (the warehouse) or materials that are recycled. Probably the most important recuperation regards the people in and around Ri-Maflow. When the factory shuts down, the moment is so dramatic to the point that the workers do not lose only their job, but also their identity, their dignity and their sense of belonging: “We were kicked out and disposed as human waste” as Stefano puts it in Azzellini and Ressler’s film *Occupy, Resist, Produce: Ri-Maflow* (2014). This aspect of recycling, the recuperation of life for otherwise despaired people is a continuous process of resistance that starts from the occupation of the factory and gets reinforced through the everyday practices of working together, managing the factory together, reinventing production, reinventing their lives and establishing new relationships among themselves and with the wider community. In this sense, we see resistance at work in each assembly, where workers need to resist the old habits to take orders from managers and take responsibility for imagining new ways of generating income, new ways of distributing that income and new ways of using their labour also for other purposes, as for all their ecological and political initiatives. It is in the collective management of the organization that resistance affirms itself as a mundane creative process, consisting of what are perhaps minor decisions on the operations of the factory, but loaded with an underlying horizon of meaning that proposes a collective experimentation with alternative practices of organizing. Resistance is expressed also by an alternative use of time. It is interesting for instance how the moment of lunch is perceived. As Abraham, one of the workers at Ri-Maflow, tells us during an informal conversation, lunch is unusually long, a collective moment of joy that resembles more a theatrical piece

rather than a mere break between working hours. The wealth of these collective moments is such, that he says that it is a massive regret to miss a lunch when calling sick.

While these processes we have illustrated so far express mundane practices of resistance that are connected to various forms of recycling, repair and recuperation, there are other aspects of Ri-Maflow that even more explicitly connect the reproducibility of their organisation through production with a clear political horizon of resistance. It is for instance the case of their production of alcoholic drinks. After Ri-Moncello, their first liqueur, they produce the Vodka Kollontai: a feminist, anti-sexist spirit. Amaro Partigiano is possibly the drink that mostly shows how that production can be an act of everyday resistance connecting to a wider horizon of political defiance. It is a digestive liqueur made of herbs carefully selected in the "resistant woods of Lunigiana", a mountainous region between Tuscany and Liguria, where clashes between partisans of Italian Resistance and the Nazi-fascists took place. The label on the bottle beautifully remarks its political spirit: "Naturalmente di parte", naturally partisan, naturally taking sides.

Ri-Maflow is a resistant enterprise, a recuperated factory, a cooperative with a rebel hearth. This is evident from its ostensive politics. But its resistant stance can only be fully appreciated if we take the time to observe these tiny everyday practices, each of them containing the potential for a transformative and revolutionary future.

Conclusion

The two stories we present in this chapter might disappoint the reader who feels the fascination for the grand events of resistance, who expects from resistance that radical change and transformation that ends once and for all injustice and despair. But perhaps KIA and Ri-Maflow can give us the chance not only to propose an alternative understanding of resistance, but to reimagine altogether what resistance is and what we can expect from engaging with resistant practices. KIA and Ri-Maflow are two extraordinary stories of resistance that break with the ordinary day by day, everyday micro-revolutions, continuous refusal of an unjust existent and creative reinvention of the world we want to live in. What are everyday resistances? It is first and foremost the disillusionment with grand events, with the purity of these isolated moments where resistance descends upon us out of the blue to then disappear the following instant. Resistance always emerges from a continuity of practices that change, find diversions, encounter obstructions and then create new trajectories. Resistance is extraordinary in the sense that it defies power, dominant ways of living and common ways of organising. But at the same time, resistance is extremely ordinary, it belongs to our everyday lives, it shows up with different intensities, at different times, individually or collective. But the relation of resistance and the everyday is also a matter of ethical stance, an ethico-political conduct. Even after the supposedly grand events, resistance requires everyday engagement, continuous application, active participation to micro-practices that sustain and nurture alternative project and new forms of living.

This is what we find at KIA and Ri-Maflow: resistance is continuous and manifests itself even in the apparently most trivial aspects of the life of an organisation that consciously adopts a political perspective of solidarity and mutualism. In their everyday practices, KIA and Ri-Maflow find resistance beyond its oppositional stance (Checchi, 2014). It is not so much about fighting against the privatisation of healthcare or the property rights of a bank that wants its warehouse back. Resistance is about inventing new practices, creating the conditions for an alternative way of working, an alternative way of caring and providing healthcare. Resistance is about everyday experimentation with new forms of life (Papadopoulos, 2018). It is an art of connecting, of repairing after the multiple ruptures and separations. As KIA deals with fragmented bodies, divided into healthy and ill organs, separated from their communities and from their social and economic conditions, Ri-Maflow engages with the multiple processes of degradation and destruction at environmental, social and political level that are typical of contemporary capitalism. It is easy to succumb to despair, not just as a subjective psychological state, but as a collective resignation, as if we were unable or unwilling to come together and intervene to stop those processes. As Guattari warns us: "It is not only species that are becoming extinct but also the words, phrases and gestures of human solidarity" (Guattari 2014: 29). Ri-Maflow and KIA instead recuperates those words, phrases and gestures, they apply them to their everyday practices in a radical mutualism that resists ecological, social and economic degradation. Resistance marks the passage from despair to repair: it is an act of care that accounts for the fragility of our existences and our ecologies, but also for the fragility of these resistant experimentations that need to be reproduced through mundane, everyday practices. Resistance is a matter of staying everyday with this fragility, an ethico-political stance that continuously reaffirms a revolutionary horizon of solidarity, care and mutualism.

Reference List

- Azzellini, D. (2018) 'Labour as a commons: the example of worker-recuperated companies'. *Critical Sociology*, 44: 763-776.
- Badiou, A. (2007) 'The event in Deleuze'. *Parrhesia*, 2: 37-44.
- Bensaid, D. (2004) Alain Badiou and the miracle of the event. In Hallward, P. (ed.) *Think again: Alain and the future of philosophy*. London: Continuum, pp. 94-105.
- Bloom, P. (2016) *Beyond power and resistance: Politics at the radical limits*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Checchi, M. (2014) 'Spotting the primacy of resistance in the virtual encounter of Foucault and Deleuze'. *Foucault Studies*, 18: 197-212.
- Checchi, M. (2021) *The primacy of resistance: Power, opposition, and becoming*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Daskalaki, M. and Kokkinidis, G. (2017) 'Organizing Solidarity Initiatives: A Socio-spatial Conceptualization of Resistance'. *Organization Studies*, 38: 1303-1325.
- Douzinis, C. (2013). *Philosophy and Resistance in the Crisis: Greece and the Future of Europe*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Evlampidou, I. and Kogevinas, M. (2019) 'Solidarity Outpatient Clinics in Greece: A Survey of a Massive Social Movement', *Gaceta Sanitaria* 33(3): 263-7.
- Ghelfi, A., & Papadopoulos, D. (2022). "Chapter 36: More-than-social movements: politics of matter, autonomy, alterontologies". In *Handbook of Critical Environmental Politics*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Guattari, F. (2014) *The Three Ecologies*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K., Cameron, J., & Healy, S. (2013) *Take back the economy: An ethical guide for transforming our communities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kokkinidis, G. (2015) 'Spaces of possibilities: Workers' self-management in Greece'. *Organization*, 22: 847-871.
- Kokkinidis, G. and Checchi, M. (2021) 'Power Matters: Posthuman entanglements in a social solidarity clinic', *Organization*.
- Lettieri, M. (2019) *RiMaflow. Storia di una fabbrica recuperata*. Palermo: Aut Aut.
- Lilja, M. (2022). The definition of resistance. *Journal of Political Power*, 1-19.
- Ortner, S. B. (1995). Resistance and the problem of ethnographic refusal. *Comparative studies in society and history*, 37(1), 173-193.
- Papadaki, M. and Kalogeraki, S. (2018) 'Exploring social and solidarity economy (SSE) during the Greek economic crisis'. *Partecipazione e Conflitto*, 11: 38-69
- Papadopoulos, D. (2018) *Experimental practice: Technoscience, alterontologies and more-than-social movements*. London: Duke University Press.
- Rancière, J. (2010) *Dissensus: On politics and aesthetics*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Scott, J. C. (1985) *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. Yale University Press.
- Uitermark, J., & Nicholls, W. (2014). From politicization to policing: The rise and decline of new social movements in Amsterdam and Paris. *Antipode*, 46(4), 970-991.
- Weeks, K. (2011) *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics and Postwork Imaginaries*. London: Duke University Press.
- Yates, L. (2015) Rethinking prefiguration: Alternatives, micropolitics and goals in social movements. *Social Movement Studies*, 14(1), 1-21.