

**Polona Mozetič**  
**— Workers' Dormitories:**  
**From Private Property to Public**  
**Forum and Back Again**

**Particular places invite, more or less previously defined, particular forms of behaviour, and prohibit others. In this way places reproduce dominant social relations and bodily practices. Activities that oppose expected social behaviour therefore often take the form of spatial transgressions that disturb the socio-spatial order. As such they signal processes of changing perception of how individuals, groups, and communities perceive their place in the dominant order of things. Just as power is inscribed into space, resistance also manifests itself through space.**

**When they provide privacy, places have emancipatory potential for individuals. As Habermas pointed out, the bourgeois public sphere was based on bracketing economic status: the bourgeois public sphere was premised on the public conversation of private individuals, a conversation between those citizens whose private property and familial intimacy produced a subjectivity that was essentially positioned outside of the public sphere. However, for the working classes the crowded, unsanitary workers’ housing hardly provided the space that was a comparable scene of psychological emancipation.<sup>1</sup> For some workers these living conditions have not significantly changed since the epoch described by Habermas. The migrant workers’ private sphere, which is materialised in the institution of the Workers’ Hostel, is designed to be an additional source to experience exclusion and alienation, and consequential disempowerment.**

**Then again, places as venues of communication and interaction have the potential to forge communities. The public sphere allows the formation of solidarities, the public presentation of identities and new issues and the establishment of informal networks of communication.<sup>2</sup> Shared places have the power to integrate individuals in shared**

concepts of reality. For rights like freedom of speech and freedom of association<sup>3</sup> to be effective and appropriate, sufficient and adequate places are required where individuals can communicate and interact. Workers’ Dormitories do not provide any kind of space that invites public discourse. In fact, in dormitories the public discourse is discouraged and rendered impossible. It is forbidden and sanctioned. As a result, dormitory space makes impossible scripts of workers’ encounters that can potentially challenge social and political domination.

When faced with the non-existence of shared space within the dormitories, workers also experience the disappearance of genuine public space in general. Despite the continued existence of parks, promenades, squares and other types of traditional public places, these are not the places that invite migrant workers to initiate a public discourse about migration policies. Traditional public places therefore cannot function as alternative venues to fill the lack of shared space in the Workers’ Hostels. In general, the spectacular character and features of the architecture that surrounds us do not invite or encourage public discourse. Existing public space is designed mostly to facilitate commerce and recreation, rather than expression.<sup>4</sup> In this manner it effectively limits the types of people that gather in such places.

However, speech from the margins has not been completely silenced, since migrant workers living in hostels are gradually appropriating some sort of (temporary) collective space inside the dormitory space in the form of workers’ assemblies. Workers of the World, previously invisible, are thus gaining social visibility. Their aspiration makes them face different obstacles, especially as a result of legal

considerations that emerge in consequence of the private ownership of compounds that provide housing for migrant workers.

### Temporary Economic Migration in a Nutshell

The issue of temporary migration programmes is highly controversial. Some critics argue that such programmes are both unworkable and undesirable in a liberal democracy. This argument is primarily based on the fact that many of the guest-worker programmes in the past – most notably the *Bracero* programme in the United States (1942-64) and the *Gastarbeiter* programme in Germany (1955-73) – failed to meet the stated policy objectives, while generating a number of unanticipated consequences. These included the non-return and eventual settlement of many guest workers. The slogan “There is nothing more permanent than temporary foreign workers” has been a popular summary statement of the apparent failure of past guest-worker programmes.<sup>5</sup> As a consequence, contemporary migration policies try to develop innovative measures and institutions to avoid mistakes of the past. These measures involve the ambiguity of the migrant workers’ residence status in the country where they look for work.

In Slovenia the policy of economic migration<sup>6</sup> is driven by the goal of alleviating labour shortages. Mechanisms for regulating the number of annual admissions of migrant workers from the so-called third countries (i.e. countries that are not members of the European Union) are based on the system of quotas. The government sets an annual quota for the number of work permits issued to migrant workers.

This system is accompanied by a labour market test that is meant to ensure that migrant workers are only admitted after employers have seriously and unsuccessfully searched for local workers to fill the existing vacancies. As a result, migrants are employed in shortage occupations only. Local workers (i.e. Slovenian citizens and citizens of the member states of the European Union) enjoy the right to preferential access to the national labour market.

Migrant workers from non-member states are admitted and employed as part of the temporary employment permit and temporary residency permit. Migrant workers whose temporary work permits, temporary residence permits, or labour contracts have expired and who have not been accorded another legal status, lose their right to reside in Slovenia and are required to leave its territory under the threat of deportation.

Migrant workers’ residence and employment in Slovenia depend on different temporary work permits. Not all migrant workers coming from so-called third countries share the same formal status. Different types of work permits affect their legal situation. Some workers are admitted under *Seasonal Permits*, which are valid for less than a year. They are typically issued to address strictly temporary labour shortage. A *Work Permit* is valid for one year and is renewable for the same period of time. Such a permit requires that a migrant worker is employed by the employer specified on the work permit only. In other words, a migrant worker with a work permit cannot compete with local workers on the labour market. In order to enter the country a migrant worker must have received a job offer. Once s/he has obtained a work permit, s/he is not free to change employer if the present employment is unsatisfactory. The only alternative to unsatisfactory employment is

to return home. Some migrant workers succeeded to obtain a *Personal Work Permit*. This type of permit provides a migrant worker from a non-member state a more agreeable legal status. A worker is entitled to a personal permit after a two-year employment with the same employer. Such permit has a three-year validation and provides the right to freely change the employer. However, the legislation specifies the skill level required for the migrant to get the three-year personal work permit. In addition, workers are not well informed about the possibility and conditions to gain a personal permit. The share of migrant workers who are employed by means of personal work permits is consequently relatively small.

The described framework of legal statuses based on citizenship, work, and residence arrangements contributes to the inequalities in terms of rights, legal protection, and social entitlements among groups of migrant workers of different and between migrant workers and local workers.

The construction industry, which has become the mainstay of the Slovenian economy,<sup>7</sup> employs a substantial proportion of male migrant workers, especially from Bosnia and Herzegovina. Economic migrants from Bosnia and Herzegovina are filling vacancies primarily in low-skilled and labour-intensive jobs. In the construction industry migrant workers are especially welcomed, since labour shortages are likely to cause delays in building and add to the costs of construction. The strategy of importing exclusively workers for the so-called ‘deficitary’ occupations, that are in general not appealing to local workers, has led to the representation of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a country of construction workers and other low-skilled workers (“Bosnians are good construction workers!”). Migrant workers are thus racialised as inhabitants of inferior geographical

areas. Furthermore, their status as migrant workers is often exploited to fuel fear of competition with local workers and xenophobic sentiments in general.<sup>8</sup>

### Dormitory Labour Regime

Distinct legal statuses of workers (re)produce the segmented labour market. Some institutional mechanisms like the Workers' Hostels additionally represent migrant workers as cheap and unprotected labour forces.

Many migrant workers are living in housing provided by the employer. Since obtaining work permits is closely intertwined with granting temporary residence, employers usually provide housing for low-skilled migrant workers. Workers' Dormitories or Workers' Hostels are special institutions where many temporary migrant workers live. These dormitories are situated all over: in different parts of the cities, even in the city centres in the strictest sense, in the suburbs and in rural areas.

The Workers' Dormitories are extremely overcrowded and many of them do not meet the basic sanitary and living standards. Nevertheless, the poor living conditions of these places alone would not justify labelling them as institutions typical of the migration policy. Some additional characteristics of this housing arrangement for migrant workers make that the Workers' Hostels cannot just be considered neutral loci for the housing of migrants; they are an important factor in the scheme of the temporary employment of migrant workers in selected low-skill occupations.

Occupying dormitory space has implications for the migrant workers on the level of situating their daily lives. Living in a Workers' Dormitory implies a social positioning that affects their employment and how they experience life

in general. It is characteristic of the Workers' Dormitories that they provide different commodities for workers and their employers. Apart from housing the workers, dormitory arrangements enable the employers to organise the daily commuting of workers to the production (construction) sites in the most efficient and inexpensive manner. By doing so, the workers' time is efficiently managed in order to prolong their working time.

Dormitories do not only help extend the working day; they also increase the workers' dependency on their employers. Workers living in a dormitory are legally not considered tenants. To support the statement that a migrant worker is formally not a tenant, some characteristics of the workers' living arrangements in the hostels distinguish them from residential tenancy, especially the absence of a contractual provision for the payment of rent. Workers do not pay rent themselves. Since employers either rent these dormitories or own such premises, they effectively deduce the rent directly from the wages.<sup>9</sup> As a consequence, the use of dormitories lowers wages.

Furthermore, the recognition of full tenancy would have impaired the employer's ability to flexibly use the dormitory space (or more accurately: beds) until they comply with specific procedures and legal guaranties. Instead, the employer can easily move workers from one dormitory to another in order to house them in the closest proximity of the construction sites. When a worker is transferred to a different construction site, he may easily be relocated to a new Workers' Hostel, one that is in the most optimal distance of the working site.

Dormitory space embodies additional aspects of domination over migrant workers. Since dormitories provide housing for men only, they bear the pejorative name

“boarding-house for single men” (in the Slovene language: *samski dom*). This term denotes not only gender, but also the marital status of the resident. However, workers living in dormitories are often neither single nor unmarried. They often support wives and children who have stayed in the countries of origin. The term “single” therefore signifies the lower status of the migrant worker, trapped in the dormitory regime. It unfolds a migrant’s inferior working identity inscribed not only within labour relations, but within sexual relations as well.

The dormitory living regime enforces the workers’ return to their countries of origin once their labour is no longer needed. The dormitory regime effectively keeps the workers away from their families and friends. Formally migrant workers have the right to family reunion. However, workers living in dormitories cannot exercise this right. Besides strict formal conditions that render family reunions impossible, housing arrangements in the dormitories discourage even short-term visits of family members or friends. Sharing a room with 3 to 6 comrades is an insurmountable obstacle to inviting family members or friends. Visits cannot take place without disturbing roommates or feeling embarrassed *à propos* relatives or friends.

To conclude, the dormitory labour regime for migrant workers can be considered an informal or silent instrument of the policy of economic migration. The use of dormitories to accommodate migrant labour has become a systemic feature of the management of economic migration in low-skill occupations. Its aim is to draw on youthful migrant labour for short periods of time only. The dormitory labour regime enforces the policy of economic migration, which tries to combine the country’s need to meet its labour market requirements, the aim to maximise the developmental impact

of economic migration, and concerns about the permanent settlement of migrants.

### Exercise of Workers’ Expressive Rights in Dormitory Space ... from private property ...

Migrant workers are not only economically exploited, they are also politically neutralised. They occupy a precarious place in society. Often they do not know what their rights are. Their situation is further complicated by the fact that many do not speak the language of the country they work in. These guest workers have only a limited union tradition or legacy of labour activism to draw on. Because of the rootless nature of migrant workers’ lives, it is practically impossible for them to exercise political power. Caught in a relationship with a particular employer who provides not only work but housing as well, workers’ negotiating powers and their mobility rights are seriously diminished. Workers’ Dormitories are an additional expression of the determination not only to exploit, isolate and exclude, but also to politically neutralise low-skilled migrant workers from the so-called third countries, who embody the “European Other”.<sup>10</sup>

Workers’ Hostels are spatial forms that presuppose certain social practices of the residents, neighbours, visitors and passers-by. The expected behaviour is partly determined by the fact that Workers’ Hostels are not official state institutions, but privately owned premises. Property right gives exclusive use and enjoyment to its owner, who is allowed to exclude all others from interfering with it. If a compound has the status of private property, methods of control to some extent cannot endanger the countervail-

ing rights such as free speech and freedom of association. When the control is exercised by the state, these rights constitute at least potentially limits on control. While individuals and groups may put claim to these rights *à propos* the state only, owners of private property are not bound by them. For example, refugees may not be able to leave a government-run refugee camp, but they would have more freedom to protest against the conditions there than if they were released and staged a demonstration at the privately owned shopping mall.<sup>11</sup> Quite the opposite is true for the dormitory regime. Freedom to enter or leave a Workers’ Hostel might not be disputed. Yet, the possibilities of migrant workers to use the dormitory space to stage protests are considerably limited.

In some Workers’ Hostels the owners decide on the rules of behaviour that the residents and anyone who enters the dormitory have to stick to. In some hostels the owners claim their authority by explicitly prohibiting any political activity inside the dormitory space. Furthermore, the workers cannot partake in the shaping of the dormitory life. Even though there are no written prohibitions, political activity is implicitly rendered impossible, since hostels offer no gathering space within the dormitories. The architecture and design of these places are such that they control the environment and the activities in it and mute the residents.

While optimally integrating (trapping) migrant workers into labour relationships, the Workers’ Hostels contribute to the fact that migrant workers exist beyond visibility and experience political and cultural exclusion from mainstream society. Migrant workers are expected to just work in the country, not to make social claims. The desired result is to transform the workers into mere spectators of public life and to prevent them from actively participating in it.

While this passive attitude increases the workers’ labour flexibility, it also reinforces their social immobility. Migrant workers are supposed to form not only an imported proletariat that leads a marginal and cultural existence deprived of political and civil rights,<sup>12</sup> but also a non-integrated and volatile labour force.

... to the public forum ...

However, the existing network of power relations in the dormitory labour regime is not impenetrable; it offers possibilities for resistance. Migrant workers struggle against exclusion, which is reflected in the effort to institutionalise their active participation in the everyday life and politics of the Workers’ Dormitories. They have organised assemblies as a stepping stone to establishing and practising public space inside the dormitory space.

Organising an assembly emerged from the desire to (re)capture public space in the workers’ dormitory, to establish and maintain a ‘space’ in which the workers could assert their informal collective power over managers, bosses and hostel owners. Anders Corr pictures the emancipatory and empowering potential of an assembly in his book *No Trespassing*. The author describes his earliest memory of housing struggles. His mother and he survived on welfare and lived in a low-rent district. Their landlord, Mr. Shady, wanted to evict the residents of the building, refurbish the building and raise the rent beyond their means. Corr recalls that his mother took him, a five-year-old, to the meeting with the neighbours. He describes his experience: “A Black man with an afro and a cigarette, he gestured with his fist and threatened something to the effect of, ‘If he tries to evict me, he’ll be shady all right.’ Even now, I can feel my eyes

widening. I feel scared at the allusion to violence, but at the same time safe. Ensnared with a group of angry neighbors packed into a small room, I felt protected, and indeed I was. [...] [S]o from early in life I witnessed the efficacy of solidarity against landlords.”<sup>13</sup>

The first assembly occurred at the Workers’ Hostel on Poljanska Street situated almost in the city centre of Ljubljana. It was organised in December 2007 by the workers living in this Hostel and activists of the local Social Centre.<sup>14</sup> Since this Workers’ Hostel provided no suitable rooms, the assembly took place on the staircase. The assembly organisers, however, had to surmount some barriers that threatened the organisation of workers’ assemblies at the dormitory. A dispute emerged between the assembly organisers and the hostel owner regarding the issue of social practices allowed in the dormitory.

The owner of the Workers’ Hostel on Poljanska Street issued detailed house rules that among other things prohibited visits after 8.30 PM. Nevertheless, the assembly organisers insisted on starting the assembly at 8 PM sharp. The owner’s house rule thus conflicted with the intention of the activists who planned to participate in the assembly but were no dormitory residents. In addition, union activists even made their presence at the assembly depend on receiving prior permission from the owner. For this reason, the owner was previously informed about the intent to organise the assembly, yet was not asked for permission. The owner did not directly prohibit the assembly. Instead, the owner suggested that the assembly be held before 8.30 PM according to the house rules.

The owner’s right to maintain discipline in the dormitories and to exercise sovereignty over his property was mirrored in the house rules that regulated the behaviour of

the dormitory residents. Of course, the purpose of the house rules is to maintain order in the dormitory since many people live close to each other. Certain rules of conduct are therefore reasonable if it makes individuals who share the same living space co-exist peacefully. Restriction of visiting hours recognises the right of residents to enjoy peace and quiet at night, a time dedicated to rest and sleep. If an individual receives visitors at inappropriate hours he disturbs his comrades. In doing so, he effectively claims that his individual right to have visitors is superior to the right of his fellow-workers to rest. Such behaviour cannot be considered legitimate. However, a workers’ assembly is a different matter altogether. An assembly is a gathering of the majority of workers accommodated in the Workers’ Dormitory. The purpose of the assembly is to deliberate about common issues and take collective decisions. Such assemblies are convened only from time to time and are announced in advance. An additional consideration should be given to the fact that workers who live in dormitories work long hours. After work they need some time to wash, eat and rest. Therefore, 8 PM seemed to be the most appropriate time to start an assembly. At that hour the majority of workers was expected to actually be in the hostel. In addition, the appointed time was considered sufficiently early so as not to disturb the workers who did not intend to participate in the assembly. To sum up, a workers’ assembly was considered an event that legitimised an exceptional departure from the house rules despite the owner’s demands.

Besides the social practices permitted in the hostel, the dispute was about the symbolic meaning and values attached to the dormitory space. This experience revealed the conflict between the private property interests of the dormitory owner on the one hand and the freedom of expression

and association on the part of the workers and activists on the other. The right of expression is directly connected to the concept of “place”. These rights need breathing space to survive.<sup>15</sup> To be effective, expressive and associative rights require ample and adequate places in which speakers and listeners can connect, communicate and perhaps even confront each other.<sup>16</sup> Participation and dialogue cannot materialise without space.

As a rule, property owners are not required to open their property for the sake of free speech. However, Workers’ Dormitories should be considered quasi-public in nature, despite the fact that they are privately owned. It is a quasi-public space, since it operates as a self-contained community for a significant number of persons.<sup>17</sup> In addition, as an informal institution of the migration policy it functions as a mechanism of official control of the population of migrant workers.

Disregarding house rules and the owner’s suggestion were forms of spatial transgression, a rupture in the dormitory’s structure of power. In the described circumstances, acting against house rules challenged particular social inequalities of the migrant labour regime. By this means a public forum was established within the dormitory space for different actors to communicate, such as workers-residents, union representatives, political activists, journalists, and even the representatives of the hostel owner and employers. Since there are no comparable precedents, the event marked a shift in terms of political spaces. The assembly functioned as a public forum where the participating workers articulated their social positioning and questioned the dominant narrative of neoliberal migration policy.

Workers forced private property parties to show respect for free speech. By imposing a temporarily shared

space on the dormitory labour regime, they symbolically degraded its authoritarian structure. They generated a space that challenges the power relations and serves the development of resistance. They even proved to themselves and others that an alternative to the dominant relations and the hierarchical order exists.

An assembly in dormitory space can be regarded as an exercise in democracy, if democracy is identified with some notion of people collectively managing their affairs through an open and relatively egalitarian process of public discussion.<sup>18</sup> Workers left their rooms and gathered on the staircase, which became a locus for a distinct group of individuals who saw themselves as actors in public space. Strengthening this kind of space implies broadening the concept of democracy in order to link it with the freedom to construct spaces for recognition, the freedom to dispute given identities and the freedom to innovate at the political level.<sup>19</sup> The political participation of this social group in the public sphere became possible through spatial appropriation, which implied not only a practical occupation of space but also the appropriation of the image of the public forum.<sup>20</sup>

Such spatial transgression can further be understood as a step to reinvent citizenship, not in its legal sense of course, but as a practice and project. As Saskia Sassen pointed out, through civil and workplace struggles disadvantaged subjects fought for and gained formal rights. These struggles to remake citizenship continue.<sup>21</sup> Emergent political practices often involve hitherto silent or silenced population groups or organisations. Through their destabilising effects, these dynamics and actors are producing operational and rhetorical openings that allow new types of political subjects and new spatialities for politics to emerge.<sup>22</sup>

### ... and back again ...

The right to assemble in and use public space is not only relatively new, but always hotly contested and only gradually granted by those in power.<sup>23</sup> For migrant workers, who are strongly subjected to social exclusion, it is not enough to use and thus produce available public space. Therefore, they had to actively take it.

Nevertheless, almost a year after the first workers’ assembly at the Hostel on Poljanska Street it became evident how easily the idea of a public forum inside the dormitory space be overlooked. The step back unfortunately involved an artistic project that referred to the screenings of the documentary film entitled *Brotherhood and Unity* (2006) in the Workers’ Hostels. Marija Mojca Pungerčar’s film portrays migrant workers on a highway construction site and in the hostels or boarding houses where they live. The artist organised the screening in four selected Hostels, including the Hostel on Poljanska Street.

Pungerčar aimed to show the film to the social group that was featured in it but had not seen it yet since this group has no access to exhibitions and festivals.<sup>24</sup> Her argument in fact tied in with a reactionary notion of culture that corresponds with a value judgment that determines who has access to culture and who does not have access.<sup>25</sup>

The screenings of the film started at 8 PM. To ensure undisturbed screenings the author had asked the owners of the selected dormitories for permission. However, she did not seek any accordance with the workers who lived in the particular hostels and who – at least symbolically – already appropriated some shared space in the dormitories. This attitude was quite incomprehensible, since the screening of the documentary was part of “Museum in the Street”, a

larger project of the Museum of Modern Art that aimed to challenge precisely the loss of public space.<sup>26</sup>

The presentation of artworks in public space can sometimes function as a mechanism for intervention and subversion of dominant conditions of certain spaces. The content of an art project as well as the manner of its presentation – if the two can be set apart – have the potential to question the existing narratives of domination and hierarchical ordering in society. However, this was not the case here. By not including the voice of the “Other” the art project did not show any sensitivity to the genealogy of the notion of public forum in the dormitory space.

Even if the artist did not intend to use art for the purpose of activism or resistance, the project could not be considered impartial. In this case art was not exhibited in a neutral locus, but in a highly contested space. In the conflict about which party controlled specific aspects of dormitory space and about the meaning of that control, the artist implicitly (though most likely unintentionally) sided with the Hostels’ owners. By complying with illegitimate restrictions on free speech and the freedom of association in dormitory space, she did not only decide not to use art to challenge the authority or disturb the geometry of control, she clearly positioned herself within this geometry.

### To Conclude

There is a great contrast between repulsive buildings that serve as Workers’ Dormitories and modern buildings that are arising at construction sites. By exploiting migrant labour cities have been reinventing themselves with spectacular spaces of consumption at their centres in order to position themselves in the global battle. Yet this veil of ap-

pearance conceals the marked class, ethnic, and gendered polarisations. If the former probably corresponds with desires that fuel cross-border mobility, the latter reveals the actual experience of the migrants.

Appropriating public forums has the potential to change the ways in which migrants have been excluded and alienated from society on the basis of their ethnicity, class, and gender. A forum of a workers’ assembly is a space that symbolically challenges the inequalities. However, it is also an actual space that provides opportunities for new ways of self-empowering and self-organising.

1. Margaret Kohn, “The Power of Place: The House of the People as Counterpublic”, *Polity*, Vol. 33, 2001, p. 511.

2. Alberto Melluci and Leonardo Avritzer, “Complexity, Cultural Pluralism and Democracy: Collective Action in the Public Space”, *Social Sciences Information*, Vol. 39, 2000, p. 510.

3. Expressive rights derived from the freedom of speech (freedom of expression) guarantee an individual to speak freely. Freedom of speech is closely related to, yet distinct from, the freedom of assembly and association, which is the right to come together with other individuals and collectively express, promote, pursue and defend common interests. Freedom of assembly is often used in the context of the right to protest. Freedom of speech and freedom of assembly and association are recognised as human rights, political freedoms and civil liberties. For example, European Convention of Human Rights recognises freedom of expression (Article 10): “Everyone has the right to freedom of expression. This right shall include freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas without interference by public authority and regardless of frontiers.” The Convention also recognises the freedom of assembly and association (Article 11): “Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and to freedom of association with others, including the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.” These freedoms are subjects to limitations.

The normative meaning and function of speech rights have its roots in the political philosophy. Neoliberalism and participatory democratic theory invoke competing philosophical assumptions about the core questions underlying determinations of speech rights. For a distinction and further elaboration on this question see Laura Stein, “Understanding Speech Rights: Defensive and Empowering Approaches to the First Amendment”, *Media Culture Society*, Vol. 26, 2004, p. 104-9.

4. Timothy Zick, “Property, Place and Public Discourse”, *Journal of Law & Policy*, Vol. 21, 2006, p. 173.

5. Martin Ruhs, “The Potential of Temporary Migration Programmes in Future International

Migration Policy”, *International Labour Review*, Vol. 145, 2006, p. 7.

6. On different models of temporary migration programmes, see Ruhs *supra* note 4.

7. Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia, *Gross domestic product, 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter 2008*: [http://www.stat.si/eng/novica\\_prikazi.aspx?id=1849](http://www.stat.si/eng/novica_prikazi.aspx?id=1849). Accessed October 2008.

8. Heather Merrill and Donald Carter, “Inside and Outside Italian Political Culture: Immigrants and Diasporic politics in Turin”, *GeoJournal*, Vol. 58, 2002, p. 167.

9. This is apparently not a new feature of the employer-worker relationship. The question “Does he [employer] not deduct the rent from your wages?” is one of one hundred listed in *A Workers’ Inquiry*, written by Karl Marx in 1880. A complete version of *A Workers’ Inquiry* can be found on the Marx and Engels Internet Archive at <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1880/04/20.htm>. Accessed October 2008.

10. Ian Ward, “Identifying the European Other”, *International Journal of Refugee Law*, Vol. 14, 2002, p. 219.

11. Matthew G. Hannah, “Space and the Structuring of Disciplinary Power: An Interpretative Review”, *Geografiska Annaler*, Series 79 B, 1997, p. 174.

12. André Gorz, “Immigrant Labour”, *New Left Review*, Vol. 61, 1970, p. 28.

13. Andres Corr, *No Trespassing*, South End Press, Cambridge (MA), 1999, p. 6.

14. On the Social Centre Rog see Andrej Kurnik and Barbara Beznec’s article “Resident Alien: The Rog Experience on the Margin” in this book.

15. Timothy Zick, “Speech and Spatial Tactics”, *Texas Law Review*, Vol. 84, 2006, p. 581.

16. Zick, *supra* note 3, p. 173.

17. Frederick Kaplan, “Access to Migrant Labor Camps; Marsh v. Alabama Revisited”, *Chicago-Kent Law Review*, Vol. 55, 1979, p. 285.

18. David Graeber, *Possibilities: Essays on Hierarchy, Rebellion, and Desire*, AK Press, 2007, p. 331.

19. Melluci, Avritzer, *supra* note 2, p. 521.

20. Bülent Batuman, "Imagination as Appropriation: Student Riots and the (Re)Claiming of Public Space", *Space & Culture*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 2003, p. 261.

21. Saskia Sassen, *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2006, p. 278.

22. Sassen, *supra* note 20, pp. 278-9.

23. Don Mitchell, *The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space*, Guilford Press, New York, 2003, p. 14.

24. See the project's webpage: [http://www.3via.org/index.php?htm=bratstvo\\_in\\_enotnost/kinosloga](http://www.3via.org/index.php?htm=bratstvo_in_enotnost/kinosloga). Accessed October 2008.

25. Suely Rolnick, Felix Guattari, "Molecular Revolution in Brazil", *Semiotexte*, MIT press, Cambridge (MA), 2008, p. 23.

26. On the project's web page (<http://www.mg-lj.si/node/189>) one can read the following: "With the new global order and the subsequent different conceptualization of space, public space has literally disappeared. [...] In the context of the Museum in the Street project, artists, theoreticians, and activists will explore and intervene in the so-called urban antagonisms, that is, those aspects of the city that are both present and at the same time invisible, marginalized, and repressed, making them in this way visible in a new, artistic context." Accessed October 2008.