

Der folgende Text entstand in der Zeit gesperrter öffentlicher Räume während des Lockdowns Ende 2021.

# THE WAY OF SOLIDARITY

Or Towards a Solidarity-Based (Third) Space

M Hasan Hera

English: Solidarity

unity or agreement of feeling or action, especially among individuals with a common interest; mutual support within a group<sup>1</sup>

German: Solidarität

1. unbedingtes Zusammenhalten mit jemandem aufgrund gleicher Anschauungen und Ziele
2. (besonders in der Arbeiterbewegung) auf das Zusammengehörigkeitsgefühl und das Eintreten füreinander sich gründende Unterstützung<sup>2</sup>
3. Sanskrit: संहतिः *saṃhatih* f. 1 Firm or close contact, close union; -2 Union, combination; -3 Compactness, firmness, solidity. -4 Bulk, mass; -5 Agreement, harmony. -6 A collection, heap, assemblage, multitude; -7 Strength. -8 The body. -9 A seam.<sup>3</sup>

## The Narrator

I wish, I could write about the “*Solidarische Mittelvergabe*” or *Solidarity-based Fund Distribution* in a more specific manner. But I have very little personal experience in this regard (the German system and structure of funding). That is why this text is a mixture of reflection and imagination. What I have gathered from our long exchanges over video conferences and face to face meetings, my own research, and lonely pondering however, is that the prevalent practice of jury-based fund distribution and project selection have a lack of transparency and an inherent hierarchy of

1 Definitions from Oxford Languages (<https://languages.oup.com/google-dictionary-en>).

2 Definitions from Oxford Languages (<https://languages.oup.com/google-dictionary-de>).

3 Digital Dictionaries of South Asia (<https://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries>).

decision-making. Apart from that, it promotes the culture of competition and isolation, like in various other fields of an open market economic systems. For that reason, an alternative way of fund distribution comes into question. This alternative method should be more open, participatory, and here comes the idea of the solidarity. There are no set of rules or guidelines, until now, to demonstrate exactly, how it should function. But experiments have been done before this project and in this project too. We tried to work on the fund distribution among participants in an open way. Some participants had a clear vision on how it should work, while others did not. But altogether it was more an exchange on the conceptual level, rather than an intense fight over the fund. This was surely not an ideal situation, and it seemed to me, we had often our difficulties concerning the dual roles we were playing. On the one hand, we were a team with a common goal, on the other hand, we were supposed to act as individuals aiming for a fair share of the available funds. Nevertheless, the reflection of our critical discussions, now put together as a form of publication, is here. I hope this can be enlightening and inspiring not only for artists, interested in developing alternative methods of fund distribution, but also for anyone interested in the practice of solidarity in society.

The meaning of solidarity varies depending on the context, and although there is always an underlying unity of feeling or common interest, realizing it through concrete expression or action can be difficult. With regard to financial resources, it is rather easily identifiable and concrete to all. As far as this text is concerned, it is more about ideas and questions regarding these two (unity and resources) and their interaction, and transformation with a group of actors or participants. Here I would like to explore the possibility of moving from competition-based practices (exclusive spaces) to a more cooperative method that can create new spaces (shared spaces), where “the festival of solidarity” takes place. I am going to consider “*Solidarity-based Fund Distribution*”, along with the physical space (room, city etc.), the social context (society, politics, economy etc.) where it is taking place, the background of the participants (gender, age, ethnicity etc.) and the aspiration of the participants, all together as a “thirdspace” (as it is used by Edward Soja). I am interested in how we or a group of people can create and explore such a space. I am assuming, for the sake of this text, that there is no such absolute physical space (first space) or imagined space (second space) rather than the thirdspace (a combination, an alternative, and more than the previous

two). I hope that, with this critical perspective, which Soja called “thirding-as-Othering”<sup>4</sup>, we can reconstruct and transform existing spaces and create new ones that may have not existed before.

I would also like to mention here, that this text should not be seen as an academic work, although it is (questionably) full of quotations. There are two aspects of this. First, this is a personal frantic effort to find out answers and define ideas (while navigating mostly through the Internet) that some kind of a meaningful shape to my own initial thoughts. In this text, I have tried to address the following fundamental questions, using definitions mostly from others:

1. What is solidarity, and how does it work in society?
2. How to practice solidarity and why?
3. What is the alternative to competition?
4. What is space, and how do we shape it and own it?
5. Can solidarity change space?
6. How can we act out a *Solidarity-based Fund Distribution*?

Second, it represents diverse ideas, from classical Hinduism to postmodern analysis, which may seem contradictory or even conflicting. But this is because of the pure personal fact of being who I am, living between two worlds. This is the historical space that I find myself currently occupying, without knowing for sure, where I belong to.

## Background

The first time, when I heard about this concept of *Solidarischer Mittelvergabe* from Sebastian Brohn, it was a winter afternoon in corona lockdown. We were standing at the round open space of the *Ringlokschuppen Ruhr*, with empty surroundings, filled with cold wind and rain. People used to meet only outside at this time of the pandemic, and not much of social activity was possible. At this period, hanging out meant almost always a video conference, or as many of us would just call it Zoom. I had been thinking a lot lately about spaces, walking by the empty playgrounds and through empty parks and city center with closed shops. I was trying to figure out: how does a space become a space as we understand and see it? What does a space really mean if no one has access to it? Is it still a

4 Soja, Edward W.: *Thirdspace. Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*, Malden (Mass.) 1996, p. 5.

space? Is there an absolute space, as described by the classical physics? Surely there is. But isn't it more like a symbol without a meaning? And what is this very idea of space? Is it just a three-dimensional emptiness in time?

I know these questions are not new and are well discussed (Sociology of spaces). But going through this very special time, and while discussing solidarity, in a time of isolation, I just felt, there is no such space as such, as pure and absolute, and it can only exist relative to our presence and interaction. This helped me to see how unaware we influence and transform spaces all the time, not only through our physical presence, but also through our thought and imagination, that we bring with us, and of course the way we act. This may not seem obvious, but the outside spaces, that's how I felt, are in a way an extension of our inner space. As individuals and as social beings, we create and nourish spaces within us, not only for ourselves, but also for others. We are the meaning of the empty space outside; we are the space for us and for others. Through acceptance and attention, we can offer others belongingness, or through negligence, hatred, or exclusion, we can deny spaces to others. Even if it may seem intimidating, the power to occupy rests with us.

## Flashback

In the 1990s, I grew up in a small city (I prefer to call it a village) in southern Bangladesh, in a middle-income family, in a time when everyday life took place within a small radius, and globalization was limited to some foreign literature (mostly translations of English and Russian texts) and TV shows. We had at that time, like in many other places in Bangladesh, lots of small community cultural groups, practicing music, dance, and theater. This was mostly done by interested people in their free time and to celebrate traditional and national festivals together with the community. There were also practices of (irregular) publishing of printed literature magazines (mostly poetry) or handwritten wall-magazines. Almost all this work was done solely with the help of small donations, with a very few exceptions of funds from the city council or government. For the first literature magazine that I published with contributions from primary school children (I myself was in 7th grade), I asked an adult family friend of ours for a donation. He then helped me to collect small donations from market shops and in return we printed their business names as advertisements. When I moved to university later, we had our first student theater group on campus, and we were doing regular activities. But these activities were

done always with small donations from fellow students as well as friends and supporters outside. Once or twice we also got some financial support from the university, which we used to buy a few gadgets for the group. Now there were a few issues regarding government funds:

- There was no well-defined structure or system that one could go to and ask for funding.
- High corruption in politics and in the bureaucracy, which made fair funding almost impossible.
- Colonial continuity, which meant also that 'the authorities' were not friends but opponents, and collaboration with those in power should be avoided.
- It was also obvious: the state won't fund cultural activities that are critical about it.

As my time at university was coming to an end, it was getting clear for me that continuing this work would no longer be possible. Firstly, there would no longer be an active community to support me and secondly, I had to start earning a living to survive and support my parents. The community, I am talking about, was not just providing the money needed for the work, but it was also there to appreciate and enjoy the output. Both the supporters and the creators were inseparable parts of the whole process, and it was altogether a practice of solidarity.

At this point in life, I thought a lot about the benefits of being a student, and the freedom associated with it and, most importantly, why most of us lose these benefits afterwards. Surely there is a greater amount of responsibility associated with being an adult. But it's not only that. The society and the state provide students with a space and resources to live and work freely, and there is a strong community who is supporting each other. This creates a kind of island in the society, of which it is part but not functioning in the same way. When we leave the island and move into the 'real' society, we must perform efficiently and be part of the production system, to live, to have a family etc. I knew it then, and I still hoped that a few of us could stick together and keep a part of the 'island' among us, by developing a community.

All of this came to my mind, as we were discussing intensively over government funds and free creative projects. It seemed to me that the life of a free artist in Germany may not be that different from that in Bangladesh, or somewhere else. The financial and social challenges are almost the same. With the development of an open market economy and expanding

global capitalism, the cultural landscape in Bangladesh has changed a lot. There are less community spaces left, living has become expensive, and individuals have various ways to buy digital entertainment products, and often are too busy consuming that. Free cultural activities are becoming fewer, and many of the practices that kept them alive are disappearing.

For me, this group project was another opportunity to work in and with a community again, and even if we had not been able to come up with a concrete solution to the question of fund distribution practice, I am glad that we have practiced solidarity. Our critical reflection on the question of fund and solidarity will surely have some impact on our individual future works, whatever that may be.

## Solidarity

The first thing that came to my mind, the moment I heard about solidarity, was a room, a shared space for all, without hierarchy or competition, without winner and loser, without the prevailing power structures, and free from the binary opposites. I wondered if such a room could exist at all. If yes, where in this society? Is it at all possible to create such a space, or to turn society into such a space? Is it just an ideal? Is solidarity that magic word that can resolve all conflict and differences?

Looking at the fundamental working of the human society, cooperation seems to be the basis and taken for granted, which Durkheim called “organic solidarity” in terms of the division of labor in modern society, where individuals are free, but must play their part accordingly, so that the whole social system, or so to say the production system can work. Durkheim was concerned with the division of labor, as it is still the reality today.

Mechanical solidarity is the social integration of members of a society who have common values and beliefs. These common values and beliefs constitute a ‘collective conscience’ that works internally in individual members to cause them to cooperate. Because, in Durkheim’s view, the forces causing members of society to cooperate were much like the internal energies causing the molecules to cohere in a solid, he drew upon the terminology of physical science in coining the term *mechanical solidarity*. In contrast to mechanical solidarity, organic solidarity is social integration that arises out of the need of individuals for one

another's services. In a society characterized by organic solidarity, there is relatively greater division of labour, with individuals functioning much like the interdependent but differentiated organs of a living body. Society relies less on imposing uniform rules on everyone and more on regulating the relations between different groups and persons, often through the greater use of contracts and laws.<sup>5</sup>

Interestingly, in our discussion, while looking for a symbol of solidarity in respect to our project, we came up with the picture of an octopus (it was Anna Bründl's idea). The idea was to compare each tentacle with each participant, who is free to develop his/her idea, but there was this central part, the core, the solidarity, that binds us together. And in this form, it is not only about the individual ownership and responsibility, but also about the collective.

But in many aspects of modern societies, these seemingly organic interdependencies are overpowered by the exploitation of the powerless by the powerful, and accumulation of huge wealth by a handful of elites and corporations. There are the privileged and the non-privileged. In this regard, one can remember the public clapping from their balconies for the health workers in the pandemic period. This was supposed to express solidarity and gratitude. But at the same time, it started a debate, whether it was enough, to just clap for those who were working hard in a difficult condition with low salaries, like the health workers. Many of these people have very little space that they own, to live and to grow.

The hierarchy and inequality that exists in the society create a huge exclusive space, which is protected by law and remains inaccessible to the rest of the public. Let's think of the first-class compartments on trains, which often stay empty, while the second class is overly full with travelers who can't afford the luxury. Exclusive spaces exist in all sizes and shapes and are everywhere, in every society. They are not to be confused with private space, which is a human need. By private spaces, I mean spaces required by an individual for his/her physical (and mental) separation from others, for privacy, and can be anywhere, with or without the direct ownership to it. Exclusive spaces in turn, are characterized by the ownership to it, and have nothing to do with human physical or psychological necessity as such. Exclusive spaces exist not to fulfill some sort of 'special

<sup>5</sup> Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia. „Mechanical and organic solidarity“. Encyclopedia Britannica, Invalid Date, [britannica.com/topic/mechanical-and-organic-solidarity](https://www.britannica.com/topic/mechanical-and-organic-solidarity). Accessed 22 July 2022.

necessity' of a few, but to exclude the majority's access to it. I think the problem with organic solidarity is that a single part can become stronger than the others and can dominate the overall body functionality. Comparing this with the human body, we also automatically land in a hierarchy of body parts, where the 'head' stays above and has control over the 'foot'.

Are we then thinking of going back to the mechanical solidarity? I don't think this is our goal, given the social structures we are in. We certainly don't want to give up our individuality completely for a "greater cause". This brings us to the opposing idea of solidarity and individuality, and this dialectic can lead us to explore the alternatives, but more importantly to redefine and expand our understanding of these ideas, which, from the postmodern perspective, can be called 'deconstructing solidarity'.

## Funding

Another problem we are confronted with, while thinking of an ideal way of fund distribution, is the conflict between the reality of limited funds, and the imagination of an ideal situation where there is enough for everyone. I think this very attempt to think of an alternative way of prevailing fund distribution is a step towards understanding the funding system and the effect of it critically. Again, here we are confronted with dualism, and the way of either/or seems inadequate, whereas the solution lies in freeing ourselves from the binary opposites and finding a more open and combinational perspective.

Is it at all possible to create a space without replicating the existing social space structure? How prepared are we to create such an environment? What is lacking? What needs to be achieved? There seem to be more questions than answers. But the least I can do is think of an attempt or a practice to re-enact unity, that we try to get out of our given roles and given relationships and try to enact new roles and find new relationships, and new methods and possibilities by being aware of the spaces we create and that we belong to. Competition destroys diversity by owning more and more and creates excessive exclusive spaces. To begin with, we need to understand and see "space" as something more than a physical structure, as Edward Soja would put it:

I define Thirdspace as an-Other way of understanding and acting to change the spatiality of human life, a distinct mode of critical spatial awareness that is appropriate to

the new scope and significance being brought about in the rebalanced trialectics of spatiality – historicality – sociality.<sup>6</sup> Thirdspace itself, as you will soon discover, is rooted in just such a recombinatorial and radically open perspective. In which I will call it a critical strategy of ‘thirthing-as-Othering’, I try to open up our spatial imaginaries to ways of thinking and acting politically that respond to all binarisms, to any attempt to confine thought and political action to only two alternatives, by interjecting an-Other set of choices. In this critical thirthing, the original binary choice is not dismissed entirely, but is subjected to a creative process of restructuring that draws selectively and strategically from the two opposing categories to open new alternatives.<sup>7</sup>

When I am saying that the act of *Solidarity-based Fund Distribution* in a particular place and context is giving birth to a thirdspace, I am emphasizing the “critical spatial awareness” of it. Which means that if we are aware of such spatiality, and its historical, social, and cultural context, then we will see that negotiation outside of it is impossible, that we cannot stand out of it, and it is everywhere. This is setting the stage of our act, which we cannot escape.

## The Act

How are we going to perform, or how to act out solidarity? This seems to be the most difficult question we are confronted with, when thinking of fund distribution. And I don’t see that there is any straightforward answer to it. We are dealing here with characters, who have many different roles, and the roles seem contradictory or conflicting to each other:

1. Possible fund receiver
2. Fund distributor
3. Judge
4. Self marketeer, etc.

There is an air of uncertainty, and the stage seems quite inadequate, as it is focused on the fund and its distribution, and one must sell his or her idea

6 Soja, Edward W.: *Thirdspace. Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*, Malden (Mass.) 1996, p. 57.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 5

to others. It feels like an exam, where some will pass and some are sure to fail. The issue here is also about power and responsibility. If we are to get rid of hierarchy, then the power is in our hands, and we need to use it with care. But maybe there is a different approach to deal with this situation, an event where we can deal with the difficult questions more playfully.

Let's imagine a group of people coming together to celebrate togetherness, like we do with friends and families in our everyday lives or on social occasions. Let's assume these people to be free and that they can openly interact with each other. Let's cook, eat and drink together. Let's sing and dance together and talk nonsense. Let's get rid of our formalities and prejudices. Let our imagination speak. This can give the participants the chance to develop a relationship with each other, to get to know each other, as human beings, and not just as an artist who needs funds. This can provide an opportunity to see and feel how different the others really are, and how similar, too. Are we that unique as we are used to thinking? This festivity can create the ground for the negotiation and may help everyone see that it is about togetherness. That we are here to support each other.

We can perform better when we think of this whole thing as an art project. We put a lot of value on spoken words and negotiation based on values we put on certain attributes, whereas a lot remains unspoken and unexpressed through language. Furthermore, we express ourselves not only through words, but also through our acts, our gestures, and other signs, which are not readily translatable into language. This special festival, if we observe it, as an art, and all the participants as artists, then we are free to be creative. Then it is also about non-linguistic communication, the expression of the inexpressible, the image of the un-imageable. Maybe the festival of solidarity can be the stage for negotiation in a creative way, and an exploration of the unexplored.

To begin with the negotiation, here are a set of suggestions, that could serve as guidelines:

1. The participants articulate and share the reason for being there with the others, as well as their wishes and problems. A list of all that can be compiled.
2. The participants use the list to create a kind of manifesto in order to set goals, a manifesto acceptable to all.
3. The participants should also consider committing themselves to a cooperation with each other beyond the festival or that fund distribution.

4. The participants decide together on the criteria and priorities for the negotiation.
5. The conflicts, if there are any, are sorted out together.
6. The fund is distributed, based on the group's decision, based on the criteria and the manifesto.
7. I personally relate solidarity with sacrifice, which may seem old-fashioned and may be even frightening. But group work is not easy and can only be realized through patience and sacrifice in some way or another. It is also about giving up a bit of private ownership, in order to gain a part of the collective ownership.

## The Stage

Artists normally need stages to perform, whether big or small, and there comes again the question of access and availability. The stages are not without ownership and guidelines, and in a certain way exclusive. Therefore, solidarity among the artists will not be enough to bring about a change in the cultural landscape. Different cultural and social institutions, which are like the stages, as part of the society, need to open their spaces, in a less bureaucratic manner. There is a need for them to come together and create shared spaces through alliance and partnerships. Instead of competition, which may seem inevitable for survival, institutions can help each other grow and help spread solidarity beyond their own premises. Cooperation, which may seem natural, but may need a renewed understanding dealing with the pressure of competition. It may be necessary to renew our understanding of cooperation and the necessity of it. In response to the concept of the social Darwinism, Pëtr Kropotkin discussed the importance of cooperation as a survival mechanism in the history of human societies:

The number and importance of mutual-aid institutions which were developed by the creative genius of the savage and half-savage masses, during the earliest clan-period of mankind and still more during the next village-community period, and the immense influence which these early institutions have exercised upon the subsequent development of mankind, down to the present times, induced me to extend my researches to the later, historical periods as well; especially, to study that most interesting period – the free medieval city republics, whose universality and

influence upon our modern civilization have not yet been duly appreciated. And finally, I have tried to indicate in brief the immense importance which the mutual-support instincts, inherited by mankind from its extremely long evolution, play even now in our modern society, which is supposed to rest upon the principle 'everyone for himself, and the State for all', but which it never has succeeded, nor will succeed in realizing.<sup>8</sup>

I think the point Kropotkin tried to emphasize is that it is the mutual support and cooperation are the key elements to our development and not the competition (which we are so convinced of in contemporary economic systems). It is the practice of solidarity that has brought civilization this far, and not the wars. Therefore, to move forward, we need to support each other. People can be together not just to fight or to win, but to cooperate, and to help build something together, for each and for all. Instead of examination and result, it can consist of exploration and growing, by knowing each other, and by working together.

## Globalization

Are artists only individuals acting for their private creative projects? I personally can't avoid the global perspective, given my life inbetween two worlds, which seem very unreal and conflicting. The important factor is the global economy, which makes us participants of the unequal production mechanism, whether conscious or unconscious. When institutions and artists start to build up alliances and cooperate with each other, this can also mean efficiency. To find an alternative way of distribution, we will need to ask, what are we going to achieve by reproducing the competition everywhere? Is it at all sustainable? One of the biggest problems of the world is the unfair distribution of wealth and resources. Where there are a handful of people who can own anything, and there are millions with a lack of basic needs. Maybe the problem is not in the resources but rather in the distribution logic. Solidarity, as Durkheim saw it, doesn't seem to exist anymore. It's not that there is not enough, it's rather that the few have more wealth than enough, while many have almost nothing. This is a world, it feels like in the time

<sup>8</sup> Kropotkin, Pëtr: *Mutual Aid. A Factor of Evolution*. [theanarchistlibrary.org/library/petr-kropotkin-mutual-aid-a-factor-of-evolution](http://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/petr-kropotkin-mutual-aid-a-factor-of-evolution). Accessed 22 July 2022.

of frustration that we humans have managed to bring so far because of useless competition, because solidarity has lost its meaning and died in our heart. In our group discussion, this point also came up, and we had also the idea (I guess it was Anna Bründl) of including guest artists from other countries in our project, so that they can also get a share of the fund. But given the corona situation, and lack of time, we didn't pursue it.

But why is it so? Have we become more egoistic than our ancestors? As human beings we have come a long way to create societies, states and other institutions that are based on the principle of solidarity and not of sole individual interest. This is how individuals are guaranteed a safe space, security of living and growing. We are a social animal in that we need others to survive and to flourish. At least, we need someone to talk to and listen to. Even when all these seem so obvious and well understood, then why is our survival cherished more and more as a lonely adventure? Why are the success and the failure seen as pure personal matters? Why does our passion towards individuality seem not to know any bounds? Are we too obsessed with our individuality? At least in the highly industrially developed part of the world, an age of Singularity seems to have come, as Andreas Reckwitz has put it:

But singularization is not merely the result of economic competition. A cultural factor is also of importance: what late modern individuals 'want' for their lives is not the standard, but the singular. They are influenced by a life principle of successful self-realization, and individual development in a multitude of opportunities. This is the result of a far-reaching shift in values, which have been underway since the 1970s: away from duty and acceptance values toward self-realization values. Of course, there is a long tradition behind this shift, but it was not until the development of a broad new middle class, most of whom had high levels of education and participated in the knowledge economy, that a lifestyle of successful self-realization found a substantial social group to support it and thus became culturally dominant for the first time.<sup>9</sup>

9 Reckwitz, Andreas: Large Cities Are Where the Society of Singularities Concentrates. An interview with Sebastian Enskat 2018. [kas.de/en/web/auslandsinformationen/artikel/detail/-/content/-gro-stadte-sind-die-konzentrationspunkte-der-gesellschaft-der-singularitaeten-](https://www.kas.de/en/web/auslandsinformationen/artikel/detail/-/content/-gro-stadte-sind-die-konzentrationspunkte-der-gesellschaft-der-singularitaeten-). Accessed 22 July 2022.

The issue here, in our time, is not about individuality anymore, but of hyper-individuality to some extent. This obsession towards uniqueness is also about acquiring more exclusive spaces. Although Reckwitz is not pointing these phenomena as purely negative, in my opinion, if self-realization is only about celebration of exclusiveness, and if it is only limited to the accumulation and ownership of unique experiences and materials, then it can be a great obstacle to solidarity. In that case, the goal of self-realization seems to have lost its greater context and has just become a synonym for egotism.

## Aikyam

Thinking of self-realization, in the spiritual sense, I can't but mention the idea of enlightenment, which plays a central role in Hinduism or Buddhism, or in Classical Asian philosophical tradition in genera. There is this concept of "Aikyam", in my mother language (Bangla), which comes originally from Sanskrit:

Aikyam means – oneness, unity, harmony, unanimity, identity, or sameness or identical. All thoughts of the Upanishads move around two fundamental ideas – Brahman and the Atman; as a rule, these terms are used synonymously, there is no difference between these two. The main theme of Vedantic teaching is identity of the individual and the Total (jiva isvara aikyam), that the self (Atman) and awareness (Chaitanya) are identical (aikyam). Aikyam means oneness or identity.<sup>10</sup>

What is interesting about this idea, is to consider individuals as a part of the whole, where they are unique (Atman) and at the same time are inseparable, as they together create the "one", the "Brahman". With this understanding, our differences don't vanish, but get a new perspective, as the individual can identify the existence of the other individual as equal and no less. This may allow us to see that to join can also mean to grow, and that to empower others can also mean to make it safer for all. It is not that solidarity can work as a magic spell, but it can lead us to another way of negotiation, which is not based on the binary opposite. When we are ready to come out of our closed rooms, there is danger

<sup>10</sup> en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aikyam. Accessed 22 July 2022.

and uncertainty, but also opportunities, in knowing each other, and in discovering each other.

I can only hope we will be able to recognize the fact that space is sovereign, and it is there for everyone. It is when we act with solidarity and responsibility, the means become more than the money, and we create inclusive space, as we regain the ownership of it, that something can belong to us all, as far as we are ready to take care of it, together, for each other.

#### Sources

- Britannica, The Editors of Encyclopaedia: Mechanical and organic solidarity. Encyclopedia Britannica, Invalid Date, [britannica.com/topic/mechanical-and-organic-solidarity](https://www.britannica.com/topic/mechanical-and-organic-solidarity). Accessed 22 July 2022.
- Kropotkin, Pëtr: Mutual Aid. A Factor of Evolution. [theanarchistlibrary.org/library/petr-kropotkin-mutual-aid-a-factor-of-evolution](https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/petr-kropotkin-mutual-aid-a-factor-of-evolution). Accessed 22 July 2022.
- Reckwitz, Andreas: Large Cities Are Where the Society of Singularities Concentrates. An interview with Sebastian Enskat, 2018. [kas.de/en/web/auslandsinformationen/artikel/detail/-/content/-gro-stadte-sind-die-konzentrationspunkte-der-gesellschaft-der-singularitaten-](https://kas.de/en/web/auslandsinformationen/artikel/detail/-/content/-gro-stadte-sind-die-konzentrationspunkte-der-gesellschaft-der-singularitaten-). Accessed 22 July 2022.
- Soja, Edward W.: *Thirdspace. Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*, Malden (Mass.) 1996, p. 57.
- Wikipedia: Aikyam, [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aikyam](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aikyam). Accessed 22 July 2022.