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ABSTRACT

In Greece a mass movement known as the Aganaktismeni (the Indignant) became the main agent of social resistance to the memorandum signed by the Greek government, the European Union and the International Monetary Fund. The Greek movement did not take the form of a social movement sharing a minimum collective identity. Left-wing protestors played a prominent role. Protestors embracing right-wing populist frames also participated actively in collective mobilizations, while segments of the extreme right attempted to manipulate rage to their advantage. This unique feature of the Greek movement posed a completely different challenge to the principles of diversity and inclusiveness than the one debated within the Spanish Indignados and the Occupy protests. Furthermore, it illustrates that rage and indignation may spark dissimilar, even conflicting forms of political contention.
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Rage and Protest: The case of the Greek Indignant movement

1. Introduction

In Greece, a mass movement known as the Aganaktismeni (the Indignant) became the main agent of social resistance to the memorandum signed by the Greek government, the European Union and the International Monetary Fund.¹ It succeeded in transforming public squares into the primary locus of political mobilization across the country. The Greek movement shared many attributes with the Spanish Indignados and the Occupy movements across the U.S.A. In all three cases protestors mobilized against official political institutions, challenged financial capitalism, espoused the principle of solidarity and, finally, established encampments in public spaces, demanding change and experimenting with direct democracy. However, these various mobilizations cannot be subsumed into one single category, since there were significant variations in regard to political priorities, expressions of protest, the presence of collective identities, the prevailing frames and finally the trajectory of collective mobilizations.² Accordingly, the Greek movement, unlike the other cases, did not take the form of a social movement sharing a minimum collective identity. Left-wing protestors played a prominent role. Protestors embracing right-wing populist frames also participated actively in collective mobilizations, while

¹ The name ‘Aganaktismeni’ was coined by the Greek media. Since the term implies that the Greek mobilizations were merely copies of the Spanish Indignados’ mobilizations, alternative names have also been used, such as ‘the piazza movement’, ‘the outraged’, ‘the infuriated’, ‘the Square Movement’. See Leontidou (2012), Theodossopoulos (2013), Marangudakis, Rontos, Xenitidou (2013).
² Occupy protests across the United States sparked a debate, whether they were long-term social movements or short-lived protests. According to Craig Calhoun these protests were rather moments than movements. See Calhoun (2013).
segments of the extreme right attempted to manipulate rage to their advantage. This unique feature of the Greek movement posed a completely different challenge to the principles of diversity and inclusiveness than the one debated within the Spanish Indignados and the Occupy movements. Furthermore, it illustrates that rage and indignation may spark dissimilar, even conflicting, forms of political contention.

The Greek movement took place amid a global economic crisis and the proliferation of Occupy protests around the world. This article focuses on the national context, highlighting the domestic factors that have influenced the current wave of political contention in Greece. An account of the time sequence of major protest events before and during the Greek movement follows. Next the distinctive features of the movement are further elaborated.

2. The Greek Indignant movement

The 2008 financial crisis following the collapse of Lehman Brothers found the Greek economy struggling with a huge and mounting public debt and deficit. In the parliamentary elections of 4 October 2009, the socialist party (PASOK) won power. By April 2010 the country had lost market access. On 23 April the prime minister announced the government’s request of a financial bailout from the EU and the IMF in order to avoid an official declaration of default. A memorandum was agreed between the so-called “troika” of foreign lenders (the European Central Bank, the European Commission, the International Monetary Fund) and the Greek government, on a series of economic and financial
policies, including short-term objectives as well as long-term structural reforms. The Greek government’s implementation of the memorandum has been monitored on a regular basis by troika representatives. Whenever the set objectives have not been met, the Greek government has announced new austerity packages, since meeting the terms of the foreign lenders has been a precondition for securing the next installment by the troika. Thus, following the initial memorandum, the Greek government has repeatedly announced new austerity measures.

The first mobilizations against austerity policies took place in February 2010. Throughout 2010 multiple strikes in the public and private sectors and mass rallies took place across Greece. The high level of participation and the broad geographical spread of collective mobilizations were remarkable. Protest events in 2010 revealed some new elements in comparison to previous episodes of mobilization (Psimitis, 2011). The heterogeneity of the protestors’ social, economic and political identities was unprecedented. Protestors expressed their anger not only at government’s austerity policies, but also at official political institutions. Slogans appeared portraying the Parliament as the personification of a corrupt and bankrupt political system (e.g. ‘Burn, burn this brothel, the Parliament’ became a popular slogan). Furthermore, in the mobilizations of 2010, isolated incidents of aggressive actions were recorded (e.g. during the demonstrations a former Speaker of the Greek Parliament as well as the president of the General Confederation of Greek Workers (GSEE) were physically attacked). Verbal and physical attacks on politicians subsequently became a recurrent pattern. Finally, new collectivities (such as citizens’ initiatives, new grassroots associations in conflict with the two established confederations GSEE and ADEDY, the
movement ‘I Won’t Pay’) became actively involved, staging multiple protest events. Even though rallies in 2010 manifested a shift in the political culture of contention, they still reproduced traditional political divisions. Thus the rallies were spatially fragmented into three diverse blocks: the two main trade-union confederations, the leftwing party Syriza and the extra-parliamentary Left, and the Greek Communist Party. This fragmentation, which was highly criticized by many protestors, would later be overcome, when public squares became the primary sites of political mobilization, leading to the fusion of diverse political forces.\(^3\)

In November 2010 the government unveiled the final draft of the following year’s budget. According to the finance minister, the government’s goal was to narrow the budget gap by 5 billion euros to 17 billion euros in 2011, or 7.4% of GDP (SETimes.com, 2010). The continuous announcement by the government of new draconian austerity measures, despite its promises that the country would quickly recover from the crisis, the further contraction of the economy, the sharp rise in unemployment and the rise in public debt increased fears within Greek society that the country was caught in a vicious cycle of debt and recession. Thus, the initial perception of the economic crisis as a limited transitional phase that would finally lead to the normalization of economic and social life was completely negated. The ongoing austerity policies affected not only the working class, but also the middle-income strata. Wages and pensions across the public and private sector were slashed, while at the same time taxes were raised and new taxes were introduced. The government’s spending cuts led also to the

\(^3\) The major trade unions joined the mobilizations. The Greek Communist Party, on the other hand, continued to stage protest events separately from the collective mobilizations in the squares.
abrupt dismantling of the welfare state. Thus in 2011 the rapid disintegration of the social fabric became visible. A new generation of homeless poor appeared on the urban landscape (Kaika, 2012). The provision of free meals grew to meet rising social needs. This collective experience of society’s rapid disintegration intensified existing emotions of anger and rage. Hence in 2010 a significant cognitive and emotional shift took place in Greek society, affecting the goals and tactics of subsequent collective protest. Accordingly, mobilizations in 2011 escalated, becoming more confrontational than those of 2010.

Within this context, the first endeavor to occupy Syntagma Square (the capital’s central square) took place on 23 February 2011. Forceful police action and the limited number of participants rendered the attempt unsuccessful. On 15 May 2011, the Spanish Indignados occupied the squares Puerta del Sol in Madrid and Plaça de Catalunya in Barcelona. In late May 2011 multiple calls-outs appeared in social media (especially on Facebook) calling on people to protest peacefully, without holding any party flags or banners, on 25 May 2011. The calls-out appeared following Greek media stories that Spanish protestors in Plaza del Sol held banners with the sarcastic slogan “Silence or we will awaken the Greeks!” (Korizi, Vradis, 2012, p. 237). The calls were highly successful. On 25 May people protested in central squares in over 38 cities across Greece (“Συνοπτικό Χρονικό”, 2012). In Athens, following a massive rally, a group of protestors decided to remain in Syntagma Square overnight, occupying the square. Participants in the occupation of Syntagma Square

---

4 In Athens and Thessaloniki (the second biggest city in Greece) 20,000 people received free meals in 2011. See Ritzaleou (2011).
5 These stories proved to be false (Συνοπτικό Χρονικό, 2012).
6 The earlier multiple episodes of protest contributed to the effective mobilization.
took inspiration from the Arab Spring (especially the sustained occupation of Tahrir Square in Cairo) and the Spanish Indignados Movement. This initial occupation of Syntagma Square turned into a long-term encampment that played a leading role in collective mobilizations all over Greece.

Occupation is not a new tactic in the Greek repertoire of contentious politics. Occupation of private and public buildings (e.g. ministries, universities, factories, schools, town-halls and highways) has been a common practice in multiple episodes of protest. Squatting also proliferated following the riots of December 2008. Still, the encampment of Syntagma Square was an innovative political strategy, since protestors took full advantage of the symbolism and location of the specific space. In contemporary Greek political history, Syntagma Square (Constitution Square) symbolizes the struggle for democracy, since in 1843 Syntagma Square was the locus of mass mobilizations against King Otto, leading to the establishment of a Greek constitution (Madden, Vradis, 2012). Moreover, the long-term encampment in the capital’s central square provided an open space where citizens from all over the city could assemble. The strategic location of Syntagma Square directly opposite the Greek Parliament intensified the symbolic challenge that collective protest posed to political decisions taken within the Parliament building, while at the same time the image of the Parliament provided a specific and tangible target for protestors in the square. Furthermore, the occupation provided “a center” and a “more

---

7 Prior to the occupation of Syntagma Square, a long-term encampment in central Athens was carried out by Afghan migrants, demanding their right to political asylum. They went on a prolonged hunger strike, while some of the strikers sewed their lips together to emphasize their determination.
cohesive identity” for the diverse political forces that mobilized (Calhoun, 2013, pp. 29-30).

On Friday 27 May the first popular assembly took place in Syntagma Square. It passed a resolution calling on citizens to fight for direct democracy and the principles of ‘Equality-Justice-Dignity’. The resolution defined the goals of the movement as follows: “...We will not leave the squares until those who brought us here, go away: Governments, Troika, Banks, Memoranda and all those who exploit us. We send them the message that the debt is not ours. DIRECT DEMOCRACY NOW! EQUALITY – JUSTICE- DIGNITY” (Συνοπτικό Χρονικό, 2011, p. 280). As the resolution illustrates, protestors distanced themselves from the Spanish Indignados’ call for ‘Real Democracy Now’. Instead, protestors called for ‘Direct Democracy Now’, emphasizing thereby that their claims were incompatible with the official institutions of representative democracy (Gourgouris, 2011). On 29 May, the day of the first pan-European appeal by Indignados, people gathered and protested in 55 cities across Greece. The number of people participating in the encampment in Syntagma Square multiplied. Working groups were formed and assemblies on specific subjects (e.g. unemployment, education, economic crisis) were established. On 31 May, the popular assembly included in its proposals the establishment of organizational links between protestors in the ‘upper’ and ‘lower’ levels of Syntagma Square (Συνοπτικό Χρονικό, 2011). This proposal addressed one of the distinctive elements of the Greek movement, which was the coexistence of conflicting political forces, united by their common opposition to the memorandum and official political institutions.
The Greek Square Movement was not a representative case of a social movement sharing a minimum collective identity. According to Taylor and Whittier, collective identity refers to a shared definition of a group, founded on members’ common interests, experiences, and solidarity (Taylor and Whittier, 1992). Thus, a “sense of we-ness...is an essential component of collective identity” (Owens, Robinson, Smith-Lovin, 2010, p.490). This “we-ness” may derive from identities, preceding collective protest or identities constructed “in and through” collective protest (Polletta, Jasper, 2001, p.285). In the Greek Square Movement, even though protestors shared a common opposition to the memorandum, they did not always identify positively with each other because of their conflicting norms and values. Hence incompatible narratives often prevailed among the diverse group of demonstrators. This became more apparent in Syntagma Square, where ideological divisions also took the form of a spatial divide. Syntagma Square is not a single physical space, since it consists of two separate squares on two different levels (the ‘upper’ and the ‘lower’ level). These two levels are connected by a flight of stairs. Thus, the stairs became an invisible dividing line between the activists at the top of the square and the ones at the bottom. During the day demonstrators usually passed through both squares, thereby merging the two squares. Following, however, the first month of mobilizations demonstrators in each square assumed more uniform attributes, leading to two quite distinct blocs. In the upper square, protestors expressed mainly feelings of rage “with rough tactics of anger” (Leontidou, 2012, p. 306). Thus in the upper square the dominant method of protest took the form of collective verbal abuse of the

8 The term Square movement in regard to collective mobilizations at Syntagma Square refers to protestors in both squares.
Parliament and the political parties (Sotirakopoulos, 2011). For this bloc it was not simply an issue of social injustice. It was primarily an issue of national treason and the necessity of imposing punishment (e.g. slogans like *Traitors/Sell-outs, the country will never die, Traitors, Traitors! Justice, Justice!, Take the traitors to Goudi* (meaning execute the traitors) were written on banners and chanted (*Συνθήματα*, 2011, Tsaliki, 2012, Fragoudaki, 2013). Demonstrators protested holding Greek flags, while portraying foreign lenders, Parliament, parties and politicians as dangerous forces that had led to the humiliation of the Greek nation. Since all politicians were portrayed as corrupt or traitors, anti-political populism prevailed in this bloc. This anti-political populism merged with strong nationalism and “culturally defensive themes” (Tsatsanis, 2011, p. 15). References were made to the glorious past of the Greek nation (e.g. flyers and posters recalled the heroes of the Greek war of independence against the Ottoman Empire in 1821, Sotirakopoulos, Sotiropoulos, 2013). Furthermore, protestors’ demands for direct, unmediated forms of popular sovereignty (such as referenda) often expressed their belief in the unified will of the Greek ‘people’. For protestors this homogeneous body would render any genuinely representative government strong enough to defend the national interests and restore the country’s lost pride. Thus claims for genuine democracy entailed often demands for a stronger and more effective state. The presence of strong nationalistic and populist frames in the upper square transformed the square into a public space occupied exclusively by Greek protestors. Even though the majority of demonstrators identified themselves as democrats protesting about the current crisis of representation and searching for alternative models of democracy (Georgiadou, Kafe, Nezi, Pieridis, 2013),
the prevailing narratives constructed a political space that enabled the intrusion of extreme-right political forces.

The encampment dominated the lower square. Protestors experimented with direct democracy, adopting horizontal decision-making and holding open popular assemblies. Protestors used cosmopolitan terminology, underlining the significance of international solidarity. Social media were extensively used to coordinate mobilizations with protestors in Tunisia, Egypt, and Spain. Activists in the lower square had generally had experience in the global justice movement, the anti-war movement and the World Social Forum. There was general agreement among activists on the non-violent identity of the movement and the need to safeguard this identity. Protestors wished to demonstrate that collective self-rule is feasible. Two political parties of the Left played a prominent role in the lower square. These were the leftwing party *Syriza* and the extra-parliamentary leftwing party *Antarsya*. Both parties functioned at that time as umbrella organizations, consisting of multiple and diverse political organizations. Other political groups on the extra-parliamentary left and the anti-authoritarian/anarchist spectrum also engaged actively in mobilizations in the ‘lower square’ (Rokamadour, 2011/2013). In the lower square divisions stemming from long-standing ideological conflicts within the

---

9 In the Greek Square Movement, as in other Occupy protests, there was an ‘inner’ (e.g. core activists) and an ‘outer’ movement (e.g. occasional demonstrators participating in collective mobilizations). The identities of the ‘inner’ and the ‘outer’ movements often diverged, but the encampment provided the space where the two movements actually merged (Gitlin, 2013).

10 Social media were also extensively used to co-ordinate mobilizations and slogans across Greece. For the role of political communication in the Greek Square movement see Panagiotopoulou (forthcoming).

left-spectrum (e.g. ‘reformers’ vs. ‘radicals’) came to the foreground. Some activists prioritized bringing down the government and prompting national elections while others aimed to consolidate a strong anti-capitalist, anti-systemic movement (Makridis, Pagiatsos, 2011). Similarly, divisions were recorded in regard to Greece’s participation in the Eurozone or the EU. The international/national dimension of collective mobilizations was another element, generating friction. Some political forces in the lower square embraced the notion of ‘nationalism’ as the only means of resisting the implementation of policies decided at the European level. Accordingly, many demonstrators were fighting to regain democratic control over decisions taken at the national level. In the Greek Square movement as a whole, the aspiration of creating ‘a European political space’ in which to contest austerity policies remained secondary. National frames and narratives predominated in the mobilizations, marginalizing the prospect of a Europe-wide challenge of neoliberal policies (Pianta, 2013, p. 155). Contention retreated to the national level, even though there was extensive networking between activists in occupy protests.

By contrast with those in Syntagma Square, similarly incompatible blocs in other piazzas across Greece shared the same physical space. Even though divisions were clear, there was no direct confrontation (Stavrou, 2011, Leontidou, 2012).

Mobilizations multiplied during June. Participation was impressive, revealing the government’s increasing loss of political legitimacy.

---

12 For similar divisions within the Portuguese mobilizations since 2011 see Baumgarten (2013).
13 One of the main findings in the research conducted by Mary Kaldor, Sabine Selchow, Sean Deel, Tamsin Murray Leach was that Europe was “… ‘invisible’ in current public displays of subterranean politics.” (Kaldor, Selchow, Deel, Murray-Leach, 2012, p. 18).
Expectations in regard to the political potential of the movement rose. The largest protest took place in Syntagma Square on 5 June. Approximately half a million demonstrators took part. More than 10,000 demonstrators participated in the popular assembly (Συνοπτικό Χρονικό, 2011). The internet was used to communicate directly with the popular assembly in Puerta del Sol in Madrid. Massive protests took place also in cities all over Greece. On 15 June, the day of a general strike, protestors tried to encircle the Parliament. Police responded with excessive violence and indiscriminate use of tear gas and flash grenades. The mobilizations that had the strongest influence on the future trajectory of the movement were those on the 28 and 29 June. On those two days a new package of austerity measures (the Mid-Term Memorandum) was to be presented to Parliament for ratification. The labor unions called for a national strike on both days. Activists in the movement decided to surround the Parliament, prevent deputies from entering and put strong pressure on deputies within the Parliament to vote against the new measures. Participation in these mobilizations exceeded initial expectations. Most demonstrators were convinced that deputies would be reluctant to vote in favor of the austerity measures due to the sustained episodes of popular protest and large-scale mobilizations. However, the measures were ratified and the police responded to the collective mobilizations with extreme violence. They brutally beat demonstrators, journalists, passers-by and patients at the first-aid station in Syntagma Square. Amnesty International condemned the police violence (Amnesty International, 2011). Demonstrators chanted “it is a junta, it will end”. Protest continued throughout the following weeks, but participation gradually declined. The ratification of the new
austerity measures shattered many protestors’ belief in the political potential of the movement. As Claus Offe underlines: “In order to become active in the public sphere you need ... a reasonable certainty that there is some agency ‘out there’ that will actually ‘listen’ to, be attentive to, and be able to make a difference in response to what you have to say, even in the presence of powerful opponents to the point of view you wish to communicate. In other words, you need a measure of basic confidence in the responsiveness of democratic institutions, such as parties, parliaments, and governments.” (Offe, 2009, pp. 12-13). Sissi Korizi reflecting on her participation in the movement argues: “I went to the square with the conviction that after a few days of protest our government, or at least the other parliamentary parties, would listen to popular indignation. That they would respect our demands, our right to equality, dignity, work.” (Korizi, Vradis, 2012, p. 241). The majority of demonstrators took an extremely negative view of representative democracy as a practical political project. However, they continued to take a positive view of representative democracy as a model of constitutional government. Hence protestors questioned the legitimacy of existing political institutions, but did not withdraw their consent from representative democracy.¹⁴ As one militant activist vividly expressed it: “Our big illusion was that we believed that we had suddenly persuaded hundreds of thousands of people to reject democracy that they were ready to go to the “next step” [...]. They [the protesters] cursed the politicians, all politicians indiscriminately, yet they remained in front of the parliament all day, as if they were expecting something from their representatives. Their claim was addressed exactly to the people they

¹⁴ For the distinction between legitimacy and consent see Burawoy (1989).
were shouting against. This we did not see at that point.” (Sergi, Vogiatzoglou, 2013, p. 232).

On 3 July a resolution by the popular assembly posed two central questions: “What do we do now?” and “How do we do it?” (Συνοπτικό Χρονικό, 2011, p. 297). Disappointment and self-reflection was also evident in subsequent resolutions passed by the popular assemblies. On 30 July the police dismantled the encampment. Mobilizations continued throughout September and October, taking the traditional form of strikes and demonstrations as well as the occupation of public buildings. However the 2012 protests were smaller, less vociferous and more sector-fragmented, even though the scale of unemployment and economic deprivation increased sharply. After the Square movement, the protestors’ belief in the political efficacy of collective protest had weakened, undermining any further endeavor to unite diverse political forces. On the other hand, grassroots activism was strengthened. Protestors ceased to expect that change would come from above and became actively involved in multiple regional and local social solidarity networks. Furthermore, the Greek Square movement had a strong impact on the existing party system. It set in motion political changes that altered the established political landscape.

In late October 2011 Prime Minister George Papandreou announced that Greece would hold a referendum on the EU bailout agreement for the country. This unexpected declaration triggered a fierce reaction from the

---

15 Ishkanian, Glasius, and Ali state in their research that “In Athens, after Syntagma Square, there has been emphasis on solidarity economy including food parcels, social pharmacies, electricity reconnection, direct selling by farmers to consumers, community self-help centers, etc. One of the slogans of the solidarity movement in Greece is “No One Alone in the Crisis””. See Ishkanian, Glasius and Ali (2013), p. 10.
European Union and Greek oppositional parties as well as from members of the socialist party. Moreover, it led to widespread public outrage in Greek society. Since all previous decisions had been taken behind closed doors, consistently ignoring lasting, large-scale protests, the sudden referendum plan was perceived as a strategic move by George Papandreou to regain political legitimacy and avoid calling early elections. In November 2011, Prime Minister George Papandreou resigned following the formation of an interim three-party coalition government, which consisted of PASOK (socialist party), New Democracy (conservative party) and the LAOS (far right party). The two national elections that followed in May and June 2012 brought radical changes, leading to the collapse of the traditional two-party system. In its place a polarized multi-party system emerged. In both elections New Democracy won a majority with a small lead over Syriza (18.85% of the vote in May 2012 and 29.66% in June 2012). Syriza, which had gained 4.59% in the national elections of 2009, consolidated its position as the main opposition party (winning 16.79% of the vote in May 2012 and 26.89% in June 2012). The former governing party (PASOK) was the main loser of the elections (winning 13.18% of the vote in May 2012 and 12.28% in June 2012). The new parties Democratic Left (centre-left), the Independent Greeks (right-wing populist) as well as the neo-Nazi party Golden Dawn all entered Parliament. The far right LAOS which had

---

16 LAOS (People’s Orthodox Rally) was founded in 2000 by a former legislator of the conservative party (George Karatzaferis). The party “…has championed the radical right-wing principle of “national priority”” (Georgiadou, 2013, p. 83) and has called for “…the protection of the Nation, the Genus, the Faith” and the expulsion of illegal immigrants (Ellinas, 2013, p. 4). The party gradually softened its extreme positions. The participation of LAOS in the interim coalition government and the sudden rise of the Golden Dawn led to the former party’s demise. In the elections of 2012 LAOS failed to get any seats in Parliament.

17 The neo-Nazi party Golden Dawn was founded in 1983, but remained inactive for many years. It became active in the early 90s during Greece’s dispute with the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia over the latter’s name. Golden Dawn supports National Socialism and speaks in the name
participated in the interim coalition government failed to elect any representatives.

3. Socio-political Profile of Protestors

The grievances that mobilized diverse groups and individuals included anger with the government’s austerity policies, foreign lenders, banks, political parties, economic elites, corruption and increasing inequalities. Hence, in the case of the Greek movement, as in the other Occupy protests around the world, neo-liberalism and the power of global financial capital, the prescription of national policies by international organisations (e.g. the EU, the IMF), the crisis in political representation and finally corruption were major causes of protest. Participants in collective mobilizations were a combination of experienced political activists and people participating in street politics for the first time. Protestors belonged to a broad range of social strata, age groups and political affiliations. It is almost impossible to categorize the socio-political composition of the Greek movement, since it continued to evolve throughout its course. Thus social surveys provide a crucial insight but do not capture the complete picture of collective mobilizations. According to a poll conducted during collective protest in Syntagma Square in June 2011, 23.8% of protestors were private employees, 14.6% were pensioners, 13.7% were public servants, 13.7% were unemployed, 13.2% were self-employed and 12.9% were university

of the biological superiority of the Greek race. The party also openly endorses the country’s 1967-1974 military dictatorship (Ellinas, 2013, Georgiadou, 2013). Golden Dawn has been involved in hundreds of violent attacks against immigrants, left-wing activists, Roma and homosexuals. The party has taken a stand against the bailout agreement. In September 2013 a young anti-fascist musician, Pavlos Fyssas, was stabbed to death by a Golden Dawn supporter. In late September the leader of Golden Dawn and party officials were arrested on charges of forming a criminal organization. In late December 2013 opinion polls still put the party in third place behind the conservative party New Democracy and left-wing opposition party Syriza.
students (Chiotis, 2011). An academic project co-coordinated by Vasiliki Georgiadou found that most participants held bachelor's degrees (60%), while a small minority had a post-graduate degree (8%). The majority of protestors were aged 25-44 (25.3%) and 35-49 (27.4%) (Kollia, 2012). At the national level, the social profile of protestors differed in some respects from the profile of protestors in Syntagma Square (e.g. older age cohorts and protestors with secondary education were more numerous at the national level).¹⁸ As for the political profile of protestors, 43% of left-aligned and 36% of right-aligned citizens participated in the Square Movement across Greece. In addition, 38% of those who described themselves as having ‘no ideology’ engaged in collective mobilizations (Public Issue, 2011).

In conclusion, collective mobilizations in Syntagma Square represented a broad social and inter-generational alliance. This alliance was firmly grounded in material conditions, since austerity measures affected the greater part of Greek society. The heterogeneous social and political composition of the Square movement influenced the movement’s narrative to a certain extent (e.g. class-discourse remained marginal within the Greek movement, despite the sharp rise of class polarization in Greek society).¹⁹ In the Greek case, as in other Occupy protests, a collective subject (e.g. the Indignant) was constituted. This collective subject was primarily the outcome of collective mobilization and prevailing narratives.

¹⁸ In contrast with the December 2008 events, young people were not the political protagonists of the Square Movement. The participation of immigrants was also more limited in comparison to December 2008.
¹⁹ The national elections of June 2012 were marked by an exceptionally high level of class polarization. See Η Εποχή online (2012) Συνέντευξη με τον Ηλία Νικολακόπουλο: Όλοι περιμένουν να έρθει κυβέρνηση της Αριστεράς, 5 November, (available at http://www.epohi.gr/portal/politiki/11256-2012-11-05-03-14-55 - accessed on 20/20/2013).
4. **Square Encampment - Direct Democracy**

During the Greek movement the largest mass experiment in direct democracy took place in Syntagma’s lower square. In the lower square, multiple working groups were established to support and sustain collective mobilizations (e.g. a nursery, a food and beverage rationing group, a media group, a cleaning team, an artistic team). The working groups operated horizontally according to the principles of grassroots democracy. Open discussions about the state of the economy and the possibility of alternative economic policies were held, enabling citizens to voice their opinion and concerns. Thus the traditional divide between technocrats and citizens was challenged. This participatory ethos also guided the proceedings of the popular assemblies, the main decision-making body of the movement. Every evening at 21:00 a popular assembly was held (Tsaliki, 2012). The selection of speakers was random. Numbers were allocated randomly to participants and lots were drawn to determine the order of speakers on the podium (Leontidou, 2012). Every day, approximately a hundred people expressed their opinions. The encampment, however, was not simply a free enclave, where the existing order could be contested and participatory democracy enacted. Activists in the encampment looked beyond the occupied square towards achieving a broader transformation of social relations. Therefore links were established with other actors (e.g. neighborhood assemblies) to further mobilizations and contestation.

The encampment constructed an alternative public realm in which people interacted, debated, got informed and expressed feelings. As well as articulating opinions, the participants shared their feelings of anger,
confusion and anxiety. Social interaction among strangers was a common pattern. Since in the Greek context problems like poverty, unemployment and private debt were experienced by numerous and diverse social groups, they were openly discussed and debated. Thus individual experiences were stripped of any moralistic discourse, individual deficiency or failure and were transformed into shared social experience. Moreover, impoverished individuals living on the margin of society or belonging to the underclass (e.g. drug addicts) found an open space to engage with broader collectivities or to voice their concerns. Syntagma Square provided a space of solidarity within a society overwhelmed at times by feelings of anxiety, rage and aggressive reactions.²⁰

Nevertheless, the Greek Square movement differed from the Indignados and Occupy movements in regard to inclusiveness. In the latter two movements, political activism was coupled with an aspiration to create spaces open to diversity. Both movements acknowledged the existence of multiple counterpublics within the broader movement.²¹ They encouraged, therefore, the articulation of counter-discourses by participants with different identities and interests (Asen, 2000). For instance, the 15M Movement in Spain persistently focused attention on developing structures and tactics that would give voice to the excluded (Hughes, 2011). Likewise, Occupy Boston addressed the issue of under-representation of people from poor, working class communities and of

²⁰ Athanasia Chalari in her research on social change and agency in current Greek society recorded that the “… main themes emerging from the interviews in relation to how Greeks perceive Greek society involve uncertainty, disappointment, pessimism, insecurity, fear, anger, negativism, pressure, anxiety and depression.” (Chalari, 2012, p. 18).
²¹ The acknowledgement of diversity is linked to the political experience of new social movements, the alter-globalization movement and the social forums.
In the Greek context the open character of the piazza movement should not be overestimated. Syntagma Square was a site of confrontation within a highly polarized society. Demonstrators did not simply voice their opposition to austerity policies. They struggled to bring down the government and repeal the memorandum. For protestors, the movement’s outcome would determine their personal lives and the country’s future. Hence, priority was given to immediate political confrontation with the government. Moreover, the 15-M movement’s strict codes to ensure civility were incompatible with the polarization of Greek society and public rage against elected politicians (Baiocchi, Gauza, 2012). In the Greek context, heterogeneity of opinions existed in popular assemblies, but only in regard to issues debated within the anti-memorandum bloc (e.g. to stay in or leave the euro zone). People who were ambivalent about the memorandum would not find an open space to debate. Individuals who had links with the conservative or socialist party were not welcome (Tsaliki, 2012).

Social movements draw symbolic boundaries, identifying who is (“us”) and is not (“them”) a member of the movement (Owens, Robinson, Smith-Lovin, 2010). Social movements also identify opponents. The development of an oppositional identity is a vital precondition for collective action (Morris, 1999, Kern, 2013). However, the distinctive element in the case of the Greek movement was that its boundaries were rigid and flexible at the same time. They were rigid in regard to

---

22 An anti-oppression workshop was established and the strategy of extensive networking with groups outside Occupy Boston (community-based groups or groups of the traditionally marginalized) was adopted (Juris et. al, 2012).
23 Sunstein argues that there are “two different accounts of group polarization. One account suggests that polarization reveals hidden beliefs and desires. A very different account insists that polarization creates new beliefs and desires.” (Sunstein, 2009, p. 30).
political forces that supported or did not actively oppose the Memorandum, while they were flexible in regard to other ideological opponents (e.g. forces of the populist right and staunch nationalists). Thus, in the Greek context opposition to the memorandum and lack of any affiliation to official political institutions became the dominant dividing line, defining opponents and protestors’ stand vis-à-vis other protestors. This remarkable coexistence of oppositional political forces would not have been possible without significant prior shifts in Greek political culture, which illustrate rigorous questioning of post-1974 representative democracy and the rise of new political cleavages in the Greek party system.

5. Post-junta democracy in question/ Political Cleavages

Many activists in the Square movement had ambivalent attitudes towards the past and its political legacy.\(^{24}\) This was evident in regard to the Polytechnio uprising and the subsequent post-junta period. Since the restoration of democracy in 1974, the students’ uprising against the junta at the National Technical University of Athens (Polytechnio) in 1973 has been one of the most prominent political symbols of popular struggles for democracy. In the Greek Square movement, protestors accused the existing political regime of being a phony democracy, violating citizens’ rights. Thus protestors’ slogans linked the Square movement to the Polytechnio uprising. A popular slogan was “Bread, Education, Liberty: The junta did not end in 1973”.\(^{25}\) The slogan

\(^{24}\) For a detailed analysis of the relationship between the events in December 2008 and the historical past see Kornetis (2010).

\(^{25}\) The slogan “Bread, Education, Liberty” was a prominent slogan in the Polytechnio uprising. The junta did not end in 1973, as the slogan of the Greek Square movement claims, but in 1974.
emphasizes historical continuity (between the Polytechneio uprising and the Square movement) in order to motivate citizens to reclaim democracy and citizenship in contemporary Greek society. However, it dismisses the whole post-junta era, which has been the longest period of democratic stability in Greece’s modern history. In the narratives of the Square movement ‘democracy’ was often a reference detached from any actual historical experience. Being detached from history and claimed by conflicting political forces, ‘democracy’ gradually became a floating signifier.

The shift in political attitudes towards the recent past reflects widespread anger with the two party system of the post-junta era. It also reflects broader changes in Greek political culture. Since the fall of the junta there has been exclusive two-party control of the government (by New Democracy or PASOK), due to the prevailing left-right cleavage. However, in the May and June 2012 national elections the influence of the traditional left-right cleavage subsided, while a new cleavage emerged between pro-Memorandum and anti-Memorandum political forces. This new cleavage cut across the left-right cleavage, leading to a process of massive re-alignment (e.g. the right-wing populist Independent Greeks took a clear stand against the Memorandum. On the other hand, the centre-left Democratic Left party, even though critical of the Memorandum, participated in the subsequent pro-Memorandum coalition government). The Square movement both incorporated and reinforced the political changes that were subsequently recorded in the

26 According to Mazower: “Greeks must not turn their back on the democratic legacy of the post-1974 era…People need to defend the achievement of the metapolitefsi”. See ekathimerini.com (2013), Mazower warns Greece is underestimating threat of Golden Dawn, 13 February, (available at www.ekathimerini.com/4dcgi/_w_articles_wsite3_1_13/02/2013_482908 - accessed on 20/12/2013).

27 There were further divisions within the anti-Memorandum bloc.
electoral results of May and June 2012. The movement comprised a plurality of diverse political groups belonging to the anti-Memorandum bloc. At the same time, the complex and sometimes contradictory influence of the two cleavages was evident in the participation of ideologically opposed political forces in the Square movement.

6. The extreme right

The ongoing economic crisis and the devastating social impact of the austerity policies (including poverty, unemployment, urban decay, shrinking social services, and the rising incidence of suicide) have been the strongest factors feeding the rise of the extreme right. Other contributing factors have been the rise of authoritarian elements in the political regime (e.g. the weakening of parliamentary procedures and escalation of police violence and surveillance) and the gradual legitimation of the extreme right by a growing section of the party system and the mass media.\(^{28}\) However, to understand the broad appeal of extreme-right frames in Greek society today, one must take into account not only existing problems in Greek society, but also pre-existing elements in Greek political culture. Since cultures encompass diverse and often conflicting elements, political actors select specific elements of a society’s cultural repertoire (Zhao, 2010). The extreme right has merged elements such as the post-civil war perception of the Left as an internal enemy that must be eliminated (today the extreme right portrays immigrants as the primary internal enemy), the deep distrust of

\(^{28}\) For instance, the interim three-party coalition government that was formed in November 2011, included the extreme right party LAOS.
the West, anti-Semitism and nationalism with racism, anti-parliamentarism and authoritarianism.\textsuperscript{29}

The extreme right perceived widespread public disaffection with representative democracy and political parties as a crucial opportunity to penetrate civil society by presenting itself as the only genuine anti-establishment force. Since the fall of the junta, several extreme-right political parties have participated in Greek national elections. Initially, these extreme-right groupings gave voice to traditional monarchists and supporters of the junta (Georgiadou, 2013). In the early 90s, however, the extreme right undertook a process of ideological renewal. It adjusted its agenda to contemporary challenges and embraced nationalism as the defining element of its ideology. The fight against what it termed illegal immigration became another prominent element of its agenda (Ellinas, 2013).

During the first days of collective mobilizations extreme-right groups tried to stage protests under their own banners in the upper square. This led to the reaction of left-wing activists, who expelled them from the square. Subsequently, there was no organized presence of extreme-right groups in the upper square. Still, the majority of extreme right political forces tried to capitalize on widespread public anger with the government, austerity policies and political parties. Like other countermovements, the extreme right adopted elements of the tactics and rhetoric of the political forces it opposed. \textsuperscript{30} The extreme right

\textsuperscript{29} For the post-civil war perception of the Left as an internal enemy and the extreme right’s contemporary portrayal of immigrants see Christopoulos (2013), Pantazopoulos (2012).

\textsuperscript{30} For instance in the U.S.A. white supremacists have appropriated slogans from the civil rights movement and have transformed them into demands for equal rights for whites. See Blee, Creasap (2010).
resorted to direct action (e.g. every night the TV channel extra-3 called on listeners to join mobilizations in Syntagma Square, banners that appeared in Greek squares against global governance reproduced the extreme right’s arguments that there is a global conspiracy involving bankers, political elites, Jews and masons to impose new secret forms of global governance). The extreme right also incorporated elements of the left-wing discourse on political dissent. The extreme-right blog ‘Social Insurrection’ (Koinoniki Exegersi) is a representative case. It cites Noam Chomsky, but at the same time it accuses politicians of national treason, demands their immediate punishment, adopts conspiracy theories and proposes the shutting down of all parties.31

Some extreme-right political forces distanced themselves from collective mobilizations. As the extreme right makes extensive use of social media to communicate its positions to the public, its blogs provide evidence of its internal divisions. For instance, the Hellas-Orthodoxy blog, responding to criticism by ‘patriots’, who were participating in the Square movement, issued a statement accusing the movement of promoting ‘global governance’.32 Likewise the hellasxg blog accused the Square movement of staging a fake conflict.33 The blog ‘Free Greeks’ (Eleftheri Ellines), on the other hand, acknowledges that ‘the movement’ (e.g. extreme-right political forces) does not have a unified stand on

31 Verbal abuse of the Left dominates in all extreme-right blogs. See www.koinonikiexegersi.blogspot.com/
collective mobilizations in the Greek squares. Still, even those elements of the extreme right that denounced the mobilizations took advantage of public anger to promote their agenda (e.g. the blog hellasxg covered all verbal or physical attacks on politicians).

7. ‘The Indignant’: Emotions and Cognition

The espousal of reactionary populist frames by many protestors in the upper square did not alarm all left-wing activists in the lower square. Many saw active engagement in collective mobilizations as the most important catalyst in raising and radicalizing political consciousness. Thus they treated prevailing frames in the upper square as the spontaneous, naïve expressions of individuals who had been secluded for years in their own private sphere and were, therefore, incapable of translating their rage into a political discourse. Accordingly, they often viewed demonstrators in the upper square as having been devoid of any political identity prior to their active engagement in collective mobilizations. However, demonstrators in the upper square were not simply ‘the Indignant’ lacking any political identity. They were not blank slates upon which new identities could be inscribed. Emotions of rage and indignation include cognitive and moral appraisal of the social order. Protestors in both squares were motivated to join collective mobilizations by their moral outrage. They shared an injustice frame that labelled the acts of political authorities as unjust. However, the

35 See www.hellasxg.blogspot.com/
36 See the analyses by Stavrou (2011), Sergi and Vogiatzoglou (2013).
normative priorities and value predispositions of participants were different. Thus passionate indignation was generated by cognitive evaluations concerning the violation of different moral values and principles. Accordingly, accusations of ‘national treason’ prevailed in the upper square, while accusations of ‘social injustice’ were predominant in the lower square. The protestors’ different normative priorities led also to the adoption of diverse diagnostic frames in regard to the causes of the injustice and the actors responsible for it. In the populist frames in the upper square, the causes were attributed primarily to the political establishment. In the lower square, on the other hand, the causes were less personified, since they were linked to a systemic crisis. Thus rage and indignation were tied to different diagnostic frames and consequently to different claims. In brief, elements of the protestors’ identity prior to mobilization were embedded in the frames they adopted and the claims they articulated while mobilizing. The protestors’ emotions of rage were not independent of their ideological positioning. During the Greek Square movement frames and oppositional frames competed in moulding the movement’s collective identity. Even though no overall collective identity preceded the collective mobilizations or was constructed through collective protest, there were strong partial (collective) identities in both squares.

Another significant factor motivating citizens to join collective mobilization was the collective perception of ‘interdependency in risk’ (Turner, 1996, p. 6). According to Turner, when the experience of risk is intensified, due to changing objective conditions or the subjective redefinitions of an existing situation, then a shared perception of ‘interdependency in risk’ emerges (e.g. “the misdeeds of a few can have
profound effects on my well-being”, Turner, 1996, p.12). This altered experience of risk initiates efforts to overcome an extremely negative situation by controlling the behavior of the few, who are depicted as responsible. In the Greek Square movement, the level of risk was perceived as unacceptable and unjust. Strong belief in the ‘interdependency in risk’ provided a crucial solidarity function in promoting collective action.

8. “Democracy out of Rage”?

The context in which the Greek movement emerged was favourable for social movement mobilization. The Greek movement succeeded in transforming the occupied squares into the primary sites of political contestation across the country. It may have not succeeded in its immediate goals, but it has had long-term political and personal consequences. Even after the Syntagma Square encampment ended, its impact was profound.

The Greek Square Movement was the outcome of significant cognitive and emotional shifts that took place in Greek society. The political consequences of these shifts became apparent when citizens publicly expressed their indignation in the Greek squares. The multiple expressions of rage and indignation in the Greek movement manifested the diverse, often conflicting, political identities of the protestors. This underlying conflict was not played out at that time. However, if it had been played out, it would have revealed that the interplay of emotional rage and political contention is no way straightforward. Advances in democratization and inclusive citizenship are only one of the possible outcomes of this complex interplay.
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