The Role of Spatial Organization in Resurrection City and Other Protest Camps

Fabian Frenzel

Abstract: Social and political organizing and organization has a spatial dimension, and there is increasing interest in academic studies of organization to understand better how space and organization relate, interact, and conflict. There is a range of studies that look at business and workplace organization, but little evidence from social movement organization or what is sometimes referred to as alternative organization studies. This article addresses this gap by observing and analyzing the effects of spatial organization in social movements. It focuses particularly on protest camps, a form of social movement organization in which spatial organization is particularly important. It looks at the Resurrection City protest camp of 1968 to identify the development of spatial organization practices. They are carried onwards across social movements, as they resolve organizational desires for the social movement organization, such as enabling mass organization without resorting to formal membership or hierarchical structures. In summary, the article provides insight into the relationship between spatial and social organization.

Keywords: alternative organizations, protest camps, Resurrection City, social movements, social space, spatial organization

The role of space for social and political organization is of increasing interest in organizational research, but a lot of the work has focused empirically on business and workplace organization,

or has addressed the questions arising in this context in rather abstract ways (Beyes and Steyaert 2012; Dale and Burrell 2008; Dale et al. 2018; Elsbach and Pratt 2007; Marrewijk and Yanow 2010). In this article, I aim to provide some contribution to this debate with a focus on social movement organizations, drawing broadly on my empirical research on various protest camps and focusing in particular on an early protest camp in the United States, the 1968 Resurrection City camp. Reflection on this camp in particular will provide an empirically grounded analysis and a set of theoretical considerations regarding the relationship between space and organization. The overall purpose is to expand existing knowledge on the role of space in organization by building on existing debates and widening the empirical scope of the knowledge base. Empirically, I also aim to highlight the fact that protest camps owe some of their contemporary popularity to their specific role in addressing sociospatial concerns of social movement activists. This in turn will open a number of research questions arising from thinking about space and protest organization that may be addressed in further research.

The article is based on a three-dimensional reading of the relation between space and organization. Accordingly, space is (1) a framework and (2) a product of social organization, while it also (3) exists as a more subjective category of the human experience in organizations. These three dimensions form the basis of the presented analysis of Resurrection City and other protest camps, in the sense that camps occur in space, that camps produce space, and that camps are experienced in space. In theory, organization may be imagined without space. By the same token, one can also imagine social space completely lacking social organization. But these theoretical extremes are not relevant to actually existing organizations such a protest camps. These are always spatial to some extent, as much as most spaces of humans will somewhat be organized. In this sense, space and social organization form a relationship that is dynamic and

dialectical. Decisions about organizational forms, such as the decision to organize a protest camp, will have spatial consequences and requirements, and, vice versa, certain spatialities will evoke different forms and requirements of organization. Such a relationship between space and organization becomes particularly poignant when applying the more subjective perspective of spatial experience within organizations. The relationship between space and organization has been described as a "trade-off" (Elsbach and Pratt 2007) with a focus here on physical environments and decisions about their arrangements. The notion of a "trade-off" implies a zero-sum game between spatiality and organization: more abstract organization replaces space, and spatiality, in return, replaces other forms of organization. As this article will show, there is the potential for organizations to create spatial fixes to organizational problems or to create organizational fixes to spatial problems. But such dynamics are beyond a zero-sum game: indeed, a key question is, for this article and the wider debate, whether we can identify instances where spatial organization can enhance social organization beyond a zero-sum game. Protest camps such as Resurrection City show that this is the case. This article will contribute to the wider debate some insights into the relationship between space and organization, highlighting instances of the dynamic relationship between space and organization in the sense that a specific focus on space, place, or territory has organizational implications and vice versa.

Such concerns matter to all organizations, but they are particularly pertinent in social movement organizations that are based on voluntary participation. Their organization in and for space, and the spatial experiences they create, must make sense to members or those considering joining. This implies, *inter alia*, that they must work toward the aims of the organization and provide positive experiences. In the second part of this article, I analyze the Resurrection City protest camp as a kind of spatial protest organization. Beyond highlighting the dynamics of this

specific camp, my task is to show the relevance of the analytical framework to explaining why protest camps have emerged as a dominant social movement repertoire and organizational form, and what commonalities they share, to a certain extent, with respect to the opportunities and challenges presented by the various political contexts in which they find themselves. The overall aim is, then, to investigate the spatiosocial organization of social movements and particular protest camps and to highlight their actual organizational forms and the ways in which space is negotiated in these camps.

This article has three sections. In the first section, I discuss my analytical framework, drawing from geographical and organizational studies of socio-spatial analysis; I then specifically apply this analysis to social movement literature. In the second section, I zoom in on the empirical world of protest camps, first reviewing the wider literature on this social movement form and then applying the theoretical analysis to the case of Resurrection City, a 1968 protest camp in the United States, while also discussing a wide range of examples to support my argument. The third section provides some insights and some conclusions on the relationship between space and organization while presenting questions that can be the topic of further research.

Space and Organization

When one looks at how social organization is discussed, both in casual debate and in more theoretical terms, one can see that there is frequent and broad use of spatial metaphors; in fact, one could argue that humans tend to think of organization in spatial terms (Dale and Burrell 2008). In adaptations of organizational thinking, we visualize human relations in spatial terms, considering for example the distances between people in an organigram as proxies for who

interacts with whom and at what level of immediacy. Spatial imaginaries in bureaucratic organization tend to put everything and everyone in their place, in neatly separated units, built onto each other. Center and periphery represent the distance to power, with different levels of connectivity serving as proxies for power and again spatially imagining organization. Equally, the "other" of bureaucratic organization, its absence, is often visualized in spatial terms by using circles and flows that suggests flat structures, networks, and a lack of hierarchies.

In the study of organization—perhaps because of the overuse of spatial metaphors—space has for some time remained an underresearched category (Marrewijk and Yanow 2010). In recent years, this has markedly changed with more researchers taking the concept of space more seriously (Beyes and Steyaert 2012; Dale and Burrell 2008; Dale et al. 2018; Marrewijk and Yanow 2010). A whole range of publications on this topic has emerged just in the last decade. Karen Dale and Gibson Burrell (2008), for example, attempt to integrate space into organizational research via an adaptation of Henri Lefebvre's (1991) important spatial theory. They argue for thinking about organization and space together in relation to scale. Social organization is spatially linked on different but overlapping scales. Supply chains may be traced to uncover the organization of production across increasingly global routes, but social movements addressing working conditions in these chains also organize globally (Reinecke et al. 2018). In more abstract terms, human beings organize in various forms, and on different scales, from friendship circles and voluntary organizations to state-level and interstate associations. They also function, broadly speaking, as workers and consumers in global supply chains. Scalar organizing can be seen, to some extent, as a fix for the universalizing and homogenizing tendencies of capital (Harvey 2001). But *contra* David Harvey (2001), Dale and Burrell propose in their work to analyze not just specific abstract notions of spatial organization but the "actual

organization forms" in which space becomes relevant to human organization: these actual forms are the mediators of social practices on various scales with Lefebvre's notion of a "political economy of space."

By this logic, space is not just the container in which (or beyond which) the social occurs. Space is also produced in organization. And in the terms used by Doreen Massey (2005), arguably organizations are "for space." Organizing socially means creating rules around membership, participation, and formal or informal relations, but this often also implies a notion of territorial reach and place relation (Ahrne and Brunsson 2011; Haug 2013). Organizing thus structures and makes space. Actual organizational forms (nation-states, businesses, social movements) will organize by drawing boundaries, via architecture and via planning, as they produce physical infrastructures (Agnew et al. 2017). They also create imaginary spaces relating to how far they claim to reach and what meanings they associate with said spaces (Anderson 1983). Place can be understood in this sense both as territory and as a relational category of flows and movements transcending territory (Nicholls 2009).

To the extent that space is a product of organization, one can ask what characterizes organization, or what its form is. Like scale, organizational form can be thought of as a continuum ranging from informal to formal, from closer to looser ties, or from network to institution (Ahrne and Brunsson 2011). The question here is: how do people relate to each other? And one would be hard-pressed not to take notions of space into consideration when trying to answer it. Actual organizational forms are rarely small enough to enable every member to personally know one another. In sociological terms, we may evoke community as a notion of personal connection, but empirically most of the time we relate to each other within some notion of imagined community (Anderson 1983), or we could also say "imagined organization." The

depth of this imaginary can be more or less formalized or binding, but it will always also produce a spatial dimension, from the very local to the universal, at least in imaginary terms. In this sense, it makes sense to speak of two dimensions in which space matters for social organization: (1) in the sense of how space is a container for social organization, describing a scalar axis from local to global; (2) and in the sense that it is also the product of specific forms of social organization that may reach, on an axis of organizational depth, from informal to formal.

There is a third way in which space matters to organization. Utilizing debates imported from geography and from phenomenological philosophy, organization scholars have considered what they would describe as nonrepresentational theory to capture the experience of space in a more immediate, nonmediated fashion (Beyes and Steyaert 2012; Hayes-Conroy and Martin 2010). The importance of these contributions lies in shifting one's analytical perspective. Instead of understanding space and organizational form by looking at them from an outside vantage point, a nonrepresentational approach to space demands that we take an inside view (Marrewijk and Yanow 2010). This approach thus concerns the experience of members in an organizational form, an experience that is deeply connected to space and that will be spatial in some form or another. This social experience can be understood as being on an axis of immediacy or of intimacy as opposed to being understood as a more abstract feeling of shared space.

To summarize the analytical framework outlined above, it considers the scalar organization of social movements and particular protest camps following Dale and Burrell. It also highlights the actual organizational forms therein and the ways in which space is negotiated therein with regard to three dimensions—namely, scale, formality, and immediacy (as it pertains to experience).

Social Movement Organization in Space

While organization studies have made a spatial turn (Marrewijk and Yanow 2010), this turn has remained empirically and conceptually limited. It has considered organizational forms such as business schools or firms, but it has not extended its empirical base into the realm of social movements. Their conceptual forays, in particular in adapting Lefebvre (1991) and also in importing nonrepresentational theory, have brought important advances, but they have left some central spatiosocial questions unaddressed, one of which is the question asked here that addressed the dynamic relationship between space and organization. Empirically, various dimensions of space play a crucial role in our understanding of social movement activities (Daphi 2014; Nicholls 2009; Patomäki and Teivainen 2004). But reflections on the spatiality of social movements tend to consider these dimensions severally and not in connection with one another. When the scale of organization is considered, it is considered in isolation from questions of formality or immediacy of experience. Likewise, when the experience of space becomes a topic in social movement studies, this is often done with limited attention to questions of organizational scale and/or organizational form. In adapting the insights from the abovementioned reflections, but also considering the specific organizational forms that social movements comprise, I now consider three questions from social movement studies, questions that draw on the work carried out by critical geographers and social movement theorists but that also highlight some of the extant gaps in the research as well.

The first concerns the scale in which social movements organize: in which space do social movements organize? To what space do they relate, for example, in terms of their contestation, and what is their target? Social movements can address local or global concerns, but they can also link these in a variety of ways (Featherstone 2012; Mathieu 2019; Nicholls

2009; Routledge 2017). Their spatial contexts can include or exclude certain groups. As Tim

Cresswell (1996) indicates with regard to the protests around Greenham Common in the United

Kingdom, social movements can move the locus of politics of a national state from its

conventional location. In his work, he argues that it moved from the House of Commons in

Westminster to a field next to a military installation in Berkshire. In a similar fashion, the

blocking of a chain store in Oxford Street may evoke a global discourse of social responsibility

and connectivity in the supply chain that the commodity sold in the store will normally obscure.

Relating to space, from the local to the global, is a central feature of many social movements,

and it is a topic that has been widely studied (Nicholls 2009). One of the benefits of social

movements is their potential to mark and make spaces of contestation. When a demonstration

gathers at a central space of a given city, one key purpose is evidently to show its existence to

nonmembers and to advertise for more support. When social movements mobilize to gather in

front of a government building, they may be doing so in order to deliver demands or to request a

hearing (Routledge 2017). Finally, if social movements mobilize to gather at a specific site of

contestation, they do so to mark this site, which might have been unmarked before, as a space of

political contention and a new center of political attention (Cresswell 1996). None of these

functions are exclusive. But they all pertain to the ways in which space provides a reference

point for social movement organization (hereinafter, SMO). This is closely related to the notion

of organization in space (Dale and Burrell 2008).

　　　Second, any social movement activity in relation to space also has to consider the way in

which space is a product of its own activities. This becomes pertinent when scaling up a local

campaign may be necessary or desirable to advance claims made locally. An SMO can network

with other, similar or comparable local campaigns to be able to affect policy changes more

successfully (Routledge 2017). But any upscaling of the organization is also productive of space in organizational terms: it will affect the form of the organization, which will have to find a balance the relationship between the different local campaigns. This can be more or less formal, more networked, or more centralized (Parker et al. 2014). The research question here would be: how does an organization produce space as a function of its own operation, which includes boundary-making and questions of inclusion and exclusion? With the notion of "organization for space" adapted from Massey (2005), we can ask here about the role of space with regard to the networked or otherwise connected form of SMO. How do movements manage their local, national, and global forms of reach internally? In the case of the labor movement, the formation of an "international" has challenged activists and social movement scholars for nearly two centuries (Featherstone 2012). Questions of the social movement "backstage," which itself is a deeply spatial metaphor, come into play too (Haug 2013). Göran Ahrne and Nils Brunsson (2011) claim that all organizing is about making decisions concerning the inner form: membership, rules, hierarchies, monitoring, and sanctions. Indeed, many social movements decide to organize horizontally in order to avoid the centralization of power and to empower ordinary members or give autonomy to local branches (Frenzel 2011). In recent decades, such decentralized, horizontal organization has had a lot of currency, at least in Western social movements, mostly on ideological grounds (Böhm et al. 2010; Day 2005; Maeckelbergh 2011). In prefigurative politics, the outcome of social movement actions should be aligned with the means of achieving their outcomes, and this centrally concerns the spatial and self-organization of dissent (Gordon 2007).

Finally, any decision about spatial purpose or output and the spatial shape of the organizational backstage will also deeply affect how the organization is experienced by its

members (Diani 2000). Thus, in the campaign that protests against a policy on the local level, the experience of the social movement will likely feel most intimate, with many personal bonds among members in the organization (Diani 2000; Jasper 1998). A stock of personal relations may enable the formation of such a campaign in the first place. But such bonds will also be deepened by the protest experience. Any upscaling of the organization toward a more global campaign, even a networking with other local campaigns on similar issues, may lead to some loss of intimacy experienced by members. This is predominantly because of the new bonds that some members will have to forge within the network (Routledge et al. 2007). It will create new layers of scalar hierarchy within the organization, where some members are now connected beyond the local level while others remain on the local level. None of this is necessarily a problem or has to be seen as a zero-sum game. In fact, scaling up a social movement creates new possibilities of bonds and may affect experiences of more widely shared solidarity, and we return to this below point in the analysis of protest camps (Diani 2000). A new scaled-up organization may thus focus on a type of activity that combines output with backstage and experiential purpose by organizing a large-scale demonstration. Social movements build on social bonds in space, but also create experiences of intimacy and solidarity and bonds within spatial contexts (Feigenbaum et al. 2013a). This is neither fully predicated by the scale of the organization, nor by its formal set. Thus, relatively large-scale demonstrations, for example the globally networked wave of protests against the Iraq War on 15 March 2003, or the global spread of protest camps and city-square occupations in 2011, can create a quasi-immediate and yet mediated experience of shared human organization on a very large scale. Some of this mediated intimacy is enabled by new information and communication technologies (ICTs) (Diani 2000; Frenzel et al. 2014). Global solidarities have for some time operated on mediated levels, but the spread and reach of

ICTs has increased this (Featherstone 2012). At the same time, face-to-face experiences remain a crucial part of successful mobilizations, as evidenced not just in the repeated desire to "go local" in many campaigns, but equally in such broad phenomena as solidarity travel and activist tourism (Ince 2016; Frenzel 2016; Leontidou 2006). At the same time, networks and campaigns based dominantly on ICTs can be perceived as less binding than direct experiences both of mass and small-level encounters (Juris 2012; Routledge 2000; Routledge et al. 2007). Activism by mouse click also carries a stigma of low effort engagement. There is an underlying assumption that activism needs to involve deeper corporeal and financial commitment and costs as a way showing concern from an activist but also from an outside perspective (Halvorsen 2015; Reinecke 2018).

Scale, Form, and Immediacy: Dynamics between Space and Organization

While it is impossible in the scope of this article to consider the breath of extant research, my aim really is to now point to what I think are some very evident dynamics between the described dimensions of social movement organization in space. Indeed, as I showed above, the dimensions tend to be tackled in isolation, obscuring these dynamics. In relation to the three dimensions identified above, there is a relationship between organizational form and spatial frame (often driven by the third dimension of spatial experience). This relationship can be characterized as dynamic. Accordingly, there is the potential for organizations to create spatial fixes for organizational problems and organizational fixes for spatial problems. In social movements, any such activity is predicated on voluntary membership, necessitating a careful balancing act and always making it necessary to take seriously the members' concerns. In this sense, social movements need to make decisions about the three dimensions and how these dimensions relate to their aims. Not all of this balancing is conscious—that is, SMOs do not

make conscious decisions about their spatial social dynamics. Also, certain formal conflicts cannot always be resolved with spatial fixes and vice versa. But organizing needs, paired with constraints, driven by desires and political will, effect a huge demand for creative solutions in the negotiation of space and organization. Innovation will often be the result. And a key case of such innovation in SMOs' spatial organization is the protest camp.

Space and Organization in Protest Camps

The "camp" protest form is a relatively new repertoire and organizational form of social movement (Feigenbaum et al. 2013a). The two elements, repertoire (Tarrow 1993) and organizational form (Den Hond et al. 2015; Parker et al. 2014), come together in camps in the sense that camps directly respond to different dimensions of space for organization. As a repertoire, the camp enables the marking of places often by means of blockade or occupation but also in relation to where they are located more generally. They pragmatically bring people to place and allow for their mobilization. As an organizational form, camps make space and create spatially extended movements in particular forms (Frenzel et al. 2014). They can be described as a movement backstage turned frontstage, in the sense that they present themselves as a spatially formed SMO. The protest camp has a number of historical precedents just like any protest form or kind of activism. Some say it goes as far back as antiquity: David Graeber (2011) is uncertain about whether the plebeians actually *camped* in their political agitation against the impositions of the ruling classes in ancient Rome. Here, however, I will focus on examples from more recent history. One early case of a protest camp, but by no means the first one, in the more recent past is Resurrection City (Feigenbaum et al. 2013a). Just over 50 years ago, in April 1968, the Southern Christian Leadership Alliance (SCLA) organized this camp on the Mall in Washington, DC, as

part of the Poor People's Campaign. The brainchild of Martin Luther King, Jr., the camp and the wider campaign it inaugurated marked a move from a politics of black emancipation toward a wider class-based social justice SCLA campaign (Chase 1998; Wiebenson 1969). Resurrection City was to bring together poor white, native, Latino, and black Americans from different parts of the United States. Below, I will discuss this camp with reference to the three dimensions outlined above. This section will not consist of a thorough historical analysis. I will refer here, however, to existing research on the camp and show the three dimensions of sociospatial organization at play at Resurrection City while at times presenting comparative information from other camps.

Movement Space and Time

Resurrection City was planned to be a camp at the center of US power on the Washington Mall. The explicit aim of the SCLA was to bring the issue of social justice and poverty into this powerful space. Such marking of space does not differ very much from a classical rally, which would have taken place in this space too. But by choosing the repertoire of the camp, additional emphasis was given to this marking of space. Camping means marking space over time, and this camp symbolized a higher level of urgency. It escalated the political act of this social movement practice beyond the usual rally or demonstration. Initially, organizers had not planned or announced an end date for the action. The protest instead set out to last as long as it would take to make a difference. Practices of disruption and civil disobedience that were the hallmark of much protest in the American civil liberties movement were escalated to a new level. With regard to this approach (i.e., the camp), we can note that there is something evidently powerful in the marking of space by longstanding temporary protest. It exceeds the normal level of

contestation by rallies. Space was marked and taken not just for an event, but more permanently. This emphasis on the seriousness of concern came with a higher-level challenge. The camp, as a manifest form of contestation, put itself on a somewhat equal footing with the permanent architectural expressions of US government, namely the White House and Congress, a powerful challenge to the status quo (Feigenbaum et al. 2013a).

For a social movement, such extended contestation signalizes a level of commitment to protest, but it also may render it beyond the scope of protest altogether. In 2011, British media questioned the seriousness of Occupy activists in front of St. Paul's Cathedral because tents were sometimes empty overnight (the press had used infrared technology to show this). The argument the press used was that the empty tents were merely symbolic and that the activists were not serious about their contestation (Halvorsen 2012; Reinecke 2018). In Germany, the opposite case was made against camps, when these were considered in the courts. Several court cases have considered the claim by authorities that a protest cannot be lawful (and can therefore legally be banned) when protesters sleep at the protest site (Sörensen 2018). Courts have confirmed that "sleeping cannot be considered protest" (Sörensen 2018). On this basis, protest camps in which people actually sleep fall out of the protection of the right to protest in the German constitution. Courts have also confirmed that using tents to make a symbolic point, for example to protest over homelessness, is perfectly legal. Thus, legal protest is essentially defined as a temporal exceptional practice. Such an interpretation of protest is presently being challenged in the German courts. What is remarkable overall is how the extension of protest over time and space creates a significant challenge for authorities. The establishment, with Resurrection City, of a protest repertoire that enabled long-term occupation has been met with various attempts at legal,

political, and rhetorical repression across a number of contexts. Resurrection City was evicted in May 1968 after five weeks of existence by a large police force (Chase 1998).

The marking of space for long-term protest also brings with it a number of challenges for the protestors. In a very fundamental sense, not having an end point to the protest has proven to be a significant challenge psychologically. Momentum is often eventually lost over time, and camps fizzle out, an experience that was particularly pertinent in the Occupy movement (Halvorsen 2015). But these are not the only outcomes of permanent space occupations. Famous peace camps of the 1980s, such as Greenham Common or Faslane in the United Kingdom, remained in place over decades. Faslane in Scotland, a protest camp turned into a permanent settlement, is probably the longest-standing protest camp in the world (Faslane 2010).

Movement-Building

If protest camps' spatial politics differ because of the relative permanence of the protest that they enable, then this has also direct implications for the second dimension of space for organization. The question is how to organize protest camps spatially in the backstage. Resurrection City also provides a very illustrative example in this respect. The mobilization for the camp was predicated on a strategic aim toward the formation of a coalition of very different constituents. The bringing together of various activists from different parts of the country and from very different backgrounds was designed to forge a new cross-racial, class-based challenge to the US status quo. Forging social movement coalitions can take place in the abstract, over negotiations, but Resurrection City aspired to a different approach. The joint organization of the permanent presence of activists together in one place, in some ways very much like a Congress, enabled the forging of a political coalition on the ground. There is little evidence to suggest that camping

together was deliberately chosen to enable the formation of a wider movement. It seems more likely that the choice of camping in this campaign was made in order to reduce costs. Organizers from the SCLA leadership stayed in a nearby hotel, and only the activists camped out. Such hierarchical organization was fairly standard for the time, and yet, due to the creation of the camp, a more horizontal basis of social movement backstage emerged (Feigenbaum et al. 2013a).

The use of camps to forge coalitions and larger SMOs has been a central function ever since. In Western Europe in the 1970s, in protests against nuclear power plant sites (and similar large-scale contested infrastructure projects), coalitions formed at campfires. The German Green Party and its lasting success can, in some ways, be traced to such joint occupation experiences, which allowed urban radicals to rub their backs with rural conservatives, to overcome reservations, and focus on their common goals (Frenzel 2011). Very early on in these processes, it became evident that more radical democratic forms of decision-making were necessary to enable such coalitions to act in concert. These new forms of decision-making were imported from experiences in the United States from groups such as the New Movement for a Democratic Society, which organized trainings and formalized procedures of horizontal decision-making (Cornell 2011). Camps, however, did more than just provide a context in which these new more democratic decision-making practices could be applied.

Camps also enabled the development of such practices in a spatial form. The backstage spatial setup of camps became, in historical processes from Greenham Common onward, a way of organizing camps democratically. Greenham Common plays a specific role here, due to the fact that the protestors attempted to block different entries to the military site. At each gate, distinct "neighborhoods" developed. Women joining the protest had a choice to align themselves spatially in those neighborhoods they found to be most appealing and politically appropriate.

Without planning to, Greenham Common's multigate structure had initiated what would become the "neighborhood" or "*barrio*" structure so familiar with contemporary camps. This spatial fix to organizational desires has helped to decentralize democratic self-organization and to manage diversity in protest camps ever since. Protest camps have increasingly become savvy in using decentralization and neighborhood structures to allow for differences between constituent parts of their coalitions (Feigenbaum et al. 2013a).

In this development of internal governance, protest camps also make evident the close relationship between formal and spatial organization. Up until the 1960s, most mass SMOs were formally hierarchical with leadership structures and clear lines of command. Since the 1960s, the desire for allowing more horizontal decision-making and for allowing more diverse coalitions of protest to form put a limit to the utility of such hierarchical organization. Ever smaller groups emerged, addressing ever more specific grievances, partly as a way to enable more direct democracy and give more power to their members. Large-scale SMOs, such as unions, lost their appeal, for their assumed homogeneity and the hierarchical leadership no longer reflected the democratic desires of their members (Boehm et al. 2005; Day 2005; Maeckelbergh 2011; Offe 1987). SMOs, however, will find it more difficult to make successful claims and to run successful campaigns. Politically speaking, the question emerged how organizational forms could accommodate diversity and democracy while still enabling mass participation and shared power. Camps became an answer to this problem by allowing for more flexible networked organizational patterns to still produce spatially visible mass movements. Herein lies arguably one of the key reasons for the occurrence and wide adaptation of camps from the 1970s onward. They have allowed for a replacement of formal organization in spatial organization: more anarchist, or horizontal in outlook, social movements since the 1970s have searched for ways in

which they can mass organize without having to form large-scale organizations, and they have found the solution in building protest camps.

Movement Experiences

The experiences of social movement participants are a rich source of data and are important for the analysis of movements. Social movement actions, such as demonstrations or events, form key moments of experience (Diani 2000; Feigenbaum et al. 2013a; Jasper 1998; Rosa 2016). In a protest camp, such experiences are prolonged and come with new challenges regarding all aspects of social life. The domain of protest becomes a domain also of social reproduction, a politico-economic domain, requiring the collective provision of shelter and food, childcare, education, entertainment, and other activities. Social movement experience in protest camps is comparable to that of a "home place" (Feigenbaum et al. 2013a). It could also be framed as a place in which the duality of private and public comes to the fore without being resolved but nonetheless open to being questioned. While other SMO forms and repertoires also witness tensions between the private and the public side of organization (its backstage and frontstage), it is the camp, with an explicit need to provide for all matters of life, that brings such tensions to the fore. As a result, social reproduction is rendered a political matter in camps, and this is in line with dominant feminist critiques of politics (hooks 1990).

In the history of protest camps, the utility of protest camps to achieve more horizontal, less formal SMO forms also overlapped with a political will to address issues of social reproduction in political practice. It is no coincidence that the first protest camps were often deeply influenced by feminist politics. The politicization of social reproduction becomes achievable in a protest camp by the collapsing of boundaries between the private and the public:

camps' self-organization becomes a central feature and the "private" or personal experience of participation in a movement becomes a conscious matter of public debate: who is responsible for maintaining the social reproduction of the camp? How are duties such as cooking, childcare, education, and security organized in a collective setup?

The example of Resurrection City shows how the experience of collective space directly prompted a questioning of the internal organization and provision of services. An internal conflict emerged in Resurrection City regarding security in the camp: men were patrolling the camp and ensuring order as initially organized by the leaders of the movement from the hotel. This security arrangement was increasingly questioned by participants, and it resulted in a number of conflicts. Halfway through the camp's existence, participants pressured the leadership to replace the arranged security with an internal camp security team comprising rotating groups of participants. The Resurrection campers took control of essential matters (being secure) of their own life by expressing and making political their rejection of the external arrangements, but did so also by feeling empowered enough to propose and install an alternative. The experience of joint living, spatial organization as a tangible form of experience, enabled a new formal setup with more power residing among participants and with an overall democratization of the backstage.

In many instances since Resurrection City, the provision of care in all its forms in protest camps has also been experienced as a massive challenge (English 2017). Addressing participants' needs and desires for life is a highly political but also a very practical challenge for any SMO. The challenge to provide for participants in the contexts of increasing inequality has often led to difficult decisions in camps, either of limiting access or of abandoning more outward-looking politics at the expense of the internal provision of care. Providing care in the

context of a protest camp is also, like everywhere else, a massive challenge. To be sure, there have been questions about the anarchist tendencies of camps when security could not be provided and vulnerable people felt exposed or excluded because of a lack of common rules and limits (Ehrenreich 2011; Schein 2012).

Conclusion

After considering the role of space for social movement organization, the presentation and interpretation of these examples from the history of protest camps has provided us with a better understanding of the dynamic relationship between formal and spatial elements of organization. Formal organizational challenges or desires—for example to become more democratic—can to some extent be addressed by spatial organization and vice-versa. The spatial experiences within camps inform its politics, while formal arrangements develop as a result of experiences and political desires and political will. The dynamic relations between spatial and formal organization are however not a zero-sum game in which more proximity necessarily leads to a loss of mass and size and more abstract organization necessarily leads to a loss of immediacy. Indeed, innovative forms of social movement organizing such a protest camps seem to emerge in direct response to the desires for more networked and democratic organization while allowing for powerful contestation and mass organization at the same time.

The other insight from the above analysis concerns the importance of time. With protest camps and related forms of social movement politics, holding space over time has become a powerful challenge to the status quo, contesting power but also innovating on the ways in which contestation is performed. It seems rather obvious that space and time matter equally to organization. But the level in which what is considered legitimate protest can be expanded by

holding space over time is still largely unaccounted for in social movement studies. Recent inner-city protest camps of movements such as Extinction Rebellion have shown the ability to challenge significantly the running of day-to-day operations of the status quo on a level previously only achieved by the collective withdrawal of labor power. The analysis also emphasized that time and spatial approaches to contestation are problematic—and not just because they will at times be regarded as illegitimate and face higher levels of repression.

Equally importantly, extending occupations is not a panacea and can actually overwhelm movements. This is because forms of spatial organization over time render it necessary to care for and provide for participants. The social reproduction of protest camps is a politico-economic domain covering many aspects of the daily life from the provision of shelter and food, to childcare, education, debate, training, entertainment, religious activities, and security. The example of Resurrection City shows the formation of a political common space of experience that led to a challenging of the hierarchical leadership structure still formally in place (Arendt 1998). Spatial organization in this sense is a directly tangible experience, but one that in many instances also becomes an explicit political matter of concern. This can be extremely powerful and empowering, but it can also be deeply disturbing and challenging.

In conclusion, protest camps like Resurrection City emerged from specific social movement decisions to employ, use, and relate to space in new ways. Combining the backstage of large-scale mass-based organization with the output of prolonged spatial contestation, Resurrection City also created an immediate bio-political space in which social reproduction could no longer be considered a private affair. Resurrection City prefigured a new politics to come. Questioning large-scale formal (and often hierarchical) social movement organization, emphasizing autonomy and difference, and rendering the private political, it was to be picked up

and infused by feminist, environmental, and many other campaigns to come. In the following decades, various movements also developed a variety of tools, techniques, and approaches to further shape this new organizational form, sometimes professionalizing the organizational form and often reinventing the wheel. Extending demonstrations and protests in temporal terms by remaining a site of contestation and perhaps even providing an alternative to the existing institutions, has been shown here to be a powerful tool of social movement organizing. It is no surprise that urban camps are often referred to as assemblies. They can go as far as challenging the status quo in its totality, laying the groundwork for revolutionary change.

Fabian Frenzel is Associate Professor of Political Economy and Organization Studies at the University of Leicester. His research addresses the political and social nature of human organization, with a particular focus on the effects of space and mobility on politics and society. His empirical interests include social movements, tourism, and cities. Email: ff48@le.ac.uk

References

Agnew, John A., Virginie Mamadouh, Anna Secor, and Joanne Sharp. 2017. *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Political Geography*. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ahrne, Göran, and Nils Brunsson. 2011. "Organization Outside Organizations: The Significance of Partial Organization." *Organization* 18 (1): 83–104. doi:10.1177/1350508410376256.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities : Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Random House.

Arendt, Hannah. 1998. *The Human Condition*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Beyes, Timon, and Chris Steyaert. 2012. "Spacing Organization: Non-Representational Theory and Performing Organizational Space." *Organization* 19 (1): 45–61. doi:10.1177/1350508411401946.

Boehm, Steffen, Sian Sullivan, and Oscar Reyes. 2005. "The Organisation and Politics of Social Forums." *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization* 5 (2). http://www.ephemerajournal.org/issue/organisation-and-politics-social-forums.

Böhm, Steffen, Ana C. Dinerstein, and André Spicer. 2010. "(Im)Possibilities of Autonomy: Social Movements in and beyond Capital, the State and Development." *Social Movement Studies* 9 (1): 17–34. doi:10.1080/14742830903442485.

Chase, Robert T. 1998. "Class Resurrection: The Poor People's Campaign of 1968 and Resurrection City." *Essays in History* 40 (1). http://www.essaysinhistory.com/articles/2012/116.

Cornell, Andrew. 2011. *Oppose and Propose: Lessons from Movement for a New Society*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Cresswell, Tim. 1996. *In Place Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dale, Karen, and Gibson Burrell. 2008. *The Spaces of Organization and the Organization of Space: Power, Identity and Materiality at Work*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dale, Karen, Sytze F. Kingma, and Varda Wasserman. 2018. *Organisational Space and Beyond: The Significance of Henri Lefebvre for Organisation Studies*. London: Routledge.

Daphi, Priska. 2014. "Movement Space: A Cultural Approach." In *Conceptualizing Culture in Social Movement Research*, ed. Britta Baumgarten, Priska Daphi, and Peter Ullrich, 165–185. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Day, Richard J. F. 2005. *Gramsci Is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements*. London: Pluto Press.

Den Hond, Frank, Frank G. A. de Bakker, and Nikolai Smith. 2015. "Social Movements and Organizational Analysis." In *The Oxford Handbook of Social Movements*, ed. Donatella Della Porta and Mario Diani, 291–307. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Diani, Mario. 2000. "Social Movement Networks Virtual and Real." *Information, Communication & Society* 3 (3): 386–401. doi:10.1080/13691180051033333.

Ehrenreich, Barbara. 2011. "Throw Them Out With the Trash: Why Homelessness Is Becoming an Occupy Wall Street Issue." *TomDispatch*, 23 October. http://www.tomdispatch.com/archive/175457/barbara_ehrenreich_homeless_in_america.

Elsbach, Kimberly D., and Michael G. Pratt. 2007. "The Physical Environment in Organizations." *The Academy of Management Annals* 1 (1): 181–224. doi:10.1080/078559809.

English, Claire. 2017. "Security Is No Accident: Considering Safe(r) Spaces in the Transnational Migrant Solidarity Camps of Calais." In *Protest Camps in International Context: Spaces, Infrastructures and Media of Resistance*, ed. Gavin Brown, Anna Feigenbaum, Fabian Frenzel, and Patrick McCurdy, 353–370. Bristol: Policy Press. https://policypress.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.1332/policypress/9781447329411.001.0001/upso-9781447329411-chapter-020.

Faslane. 2010. "Faslane Peace Camp (Faslane Peace Camp)." http://www.myspace.com/faslanepeacecamp.

Featherstone, David. 2012. *Solidarity: Hidden Histories and Geographies of Internationalism*. London: Zed Books.

Feigenbaum, Anna, Fabian Frenzel, and Patrick McCurdy. 2013a. *Protest Camps*. London: Zed

    Books.

Feigenbaum, Anna, Fabian Frenzel, Patrick McCurdy. 2013b. "Towards a Method for Studying

    Affect in (Micro)Politics: The Campfire Chats Project and the Occupy Movement."

    Parallax 19 (2): 21–37. doi:10.1080/13534645.2013.778493.

Frenzel, Fabian. 2011. "Entlegende Ort in Der Mitte Der Gesellschaft Die Geschichte Der

    Britischen Klimacamps" [XXX]. In *Zivilisierung Des Klimaregimes : NGOs und Soziale*

    Bewegungen in der Nationalen, Europäischen und Internationalen Klimapolitik [XXX],

    ed. Achim Brunnengräber, 163–186. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Frenzel, Fabian. 2016. *Slumming It: The Tourist Valorization of Urban Poverty*. London: Zed

    Books.

Frenzel, Fabian, Anna Feigenbaum, and Patrick McCurdy. 2014. "Protest Camps: An Emerging

    Field of Social Movement Research." *The Sociological Review* 62 (3): 457–474.

    doi:10.1111/1467-954X.12111.

Gordon, Uri. 2007. *Anarchy Alive! Anti-Authoritarian Politics from Practice to Theory*. London:

    Pluto Press.

Graeber, David. 2011. *Debt: The First 5,000 Years*. New York: Melville House.

Halvorsen, Sam. 2015. "Taking Space: Moments of Rupture and Everyday Life in Occupy

    London." *Antipode* 47 (2): 401–417. doi:10.1111/anti.12116.

Halvorsen, Sam. 2012. "Beyond the Network? Occupy London and the Global Movement."

    Social Movement Studies 11 (3–4): 427–433. doi:10.1080/14742837.2012.708835.

Harvey, David. 2001. *Spaces of Capital : Towards a Critical Geography*. New York: Routledge.

Haug, Christoph. 2013. "Organizing Spaces: Meeting Arenas as a Social Movement

      Infrastructure between Organization, Network, and Institution." *Organization Studies* 34

      (5–6): 705–732. doi:10.1177/0170840613479232.

Hayes-Conroy, Allison, and Deborah G. Martin. 2010. "Mobilising Bodies: Visceral

      Identification in the Slow Food Movement." *Transactions of the Institute of British*

      Geographers 35 (2): 269–281. doi:10.1111/j.1475-5661.2009.00374.x.

hooks, Bell. 1990. *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End Press.

Ince, Anthony. 2016. "Autonomy, Territory, Mobility: Everyday (Geo)Politics in Voluntary

      Exchange Networks." *L'Espace Politique: Revue En Ligne de Géographie Politique et de*

      Géopolitique 28. doi:10.4000/espacepolitique.3779.

Jasper, James. 1998. "The Emotions of Protest: Affective and Reactive Emotions in and around

      Social Movements." *Sociological Forum* 13 (3): 397–424.

      doi:10.1023/A:1022175308081.

Juris, Jeffrey S. 2012. "Reflections on #Occupy Everywhere: Social Media, Public Space, and

      Emerging Logics of Aggregation." *American Ethnologist* 39 (2): 259–279.

      doi:10.1111/j.1548-1425.2012.01362.x.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Leontidou, Lila. 2006. "Urban Social Movements: From the 'Right to the City' to Transnational

      Spatialities and Flaneur Activists—Introduction." *City—London—City* 10 (3): 259–268.

      doi:10.1080/13604810600980507.

Maeckelbergh, Marianne. 2011. "Doing Is Believing: Prefiguration as Strategic Practice in the

      Alterglobalization Movement." *Social Movement Studies* 10 (1): 1–20.

      doi:10.1080/14742837.2011.545223.

Marrewijk, Alfons van, and Dvora Yanow. 2010. *Introduction: The Spatial Turn in Organizational Studies*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing. https://www.elgaronline.com/view/9781848446502.00005.xml..

Massey, Doreen. 2005. *For Space*. London: Sage.

Mathieu, Lilian. 2019. "The Space of Social Movements." *Social Movement Studies* 0 (0): 1–15. doi:10.1080/14742837.2019.1630267.

Nicholls, Walter. 2009. "Place, Networks, Space: Theorising the Geographies of Social Movements." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 34 (1): 78–93. doi:10.1111/j.1475-5661.2009.00331.x.

Offe, Claus. 1987. "Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics: Social Movements since the 1960s." In *Changing Boundaries of the Political : Essays on the Evolving Balance between the State and Society, Public and Private in Europe*, ed. Charles Maier, 63–105. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parker, Martin, George Cheney, Valérie Fournier, and Chris Land. 2014. *The Routledge Companion to Alternative Organization*. London: Routledge.

Patomäki, Heikki, and Teivo Teivainen. 2004. "The World Social Forum: An Open Space or a Movement of Movements?" *Theory, Culture and Society* 21 (6): 145–154. doi:10.1177/0263276404047421.

Reinecke, Juliane. 2018. "Social Movements and Prefigurative Organizing: Confronting Entrenched Inequalities in Occupy London." *Organization Studies* 39 (9): 1299–1321. doi:10.1177/0170840618759815.

Reinecke, Juliane, Jimmy Donaghey, Adrian Wilkinson, and Geoffrey Wood. 2018. "Global Supply Chains and Social Relations at Work: Brokering across Boundaries." *Human Relations* 71 (4): 459–80. doi:10.1177/0018726718756497.

Rosa, Alessandra. 2016. "Student Activists' Affective Strategies during the 2010–2011 Siege of the University of Puerto Rico." *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 36 (11–12): 824–842. doi:10.1108/IJSSP-12-2015-0149.

Routledge, Paul. 2000. "'Our Resistance Will Be as Transnational as Capital': Convergence Space and Strategy in Globalising Resistance." *GeoJournal* 52 (1): 25–33. doi:10.1023/A:1013188131666.

Routledge, Paul. 2017. *Space Invaders: Radical Geographies of Protest*. 1st ed. London: Pluto Press.

Routledge, Paul, Andrew Cumbers, and Corinne Nativel. 2007. "Grassrooting Network Imaginaries: Relationality, Power, and Mutual Solidarity in Global Justice Networks." *Environment & Planning A.* 39 (11): 2575–2592. doi:10.1068/a38338.

Schein, Rebecca. 2012. "Whose Occupation? Homelessness and the Politics of Park Encampments." *Social Movement Studies* 11 (3–4): 335–341. doi:10.1080/14742837.2012.708834.

Sörensen, Paul. 2018. "'Zeugung' oder 'Geburt'—Zeitlichkeiten politischer Transformation oder: Ist Schlafen politisch?" *Leviathan* 46 (2): 232–254. doi:10.5771/0340-0425-2018-2-232.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1993. "Cycles of Collective Action: Between Moments of Madness and the Repertoire of Contention." *Social Science History* 17 (2): 281–307. doi:10.1017/S0145553200016850.

Wiebenson, John. 1969. "Planning and Using Resurrection City." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 35 (6): 405–411. doi:10.1080/01944366908977260.