



revista
brasileira
de estudos
em
dança



Crisis of the common: the difficulty to establish community bonds and other ways of being together

*Crise do comum: a dificuldade para estabelecer
vínculos comunitários e outros modos de estar juntos*

Giancarlo Martins

MARTINS, Giancarlo. Crisis of the common: the difficulty to establish Community bonds and Other ways of being together. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos em Dança**, ano 01, n. 02, p. 103-120, 2022.



ABSTRACT

The crisis of the common highlights not only the difficulty in establishing community bonds, but also the very definition of what the common and the community will be. In this sense, it is necessary to return to the discussion, mainly to establish aspects that help us to identify the notions of community that mediate our daily bonds and artistic practices, in addition to investigating possibilities that incite the creation of affection and the cultivation of practices in community, of experiences that test other forms of relationship and interaction, whether affective, social or cognitive, which suggest the possibility of superposition between individual and collective, indicating new forms of life and relationships: other ways of being together.

KEYWORDS: Common; Communities; Ways Of Being Together.

RESUMO

A crise do comum evidencia não apenas a dificuldade em se estabelecer vínculos comunitários, mas também a própria definição do que venha a ser o comum e a comunidade. Nesse sentido, cabe o retorno à discussão, principalmente para estabelecer aspectos que nos auxiliem na identificação das noções de comunidade que mediam nossos vínculos cotidianos e práticas artísticas, além de investigar possíveis que incitam a criação de afeto e o cultivo de práticas em comunidade, que testam outras formas de relação e interação, sejam elas afetivas, sociais ou cognitivas, que sugerem a possibilidade de superposição entre individual e coletivo, indicando novas formas de vida e relacionamentos: outros modos de estar juntos.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Comum; Comunidade; Modos De Estar Juntos.

Crisis of the common: the difficulty to establish community bonds and other ways of being together

Giancarlo Martins (UNESPAR-FAP)¹

¹ Dance artist, professor, and researcher in the Post-Graduate Program in Arts and Undergraduate Dance Program of UNESPAR/FAP. PhD in Communication and Semiotics in Communication and Semiotics from PUC-SP. Joined the research team of the Rumos Itaú Dance Program and collaborated with the Dance Encyclopedia of the Itaú Cultural Institute.

E-mail: giancarlo.martins@unespar.edu.br
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1038-5701>

Communities and communities

In a culture where expressions like "please me", "answer me", "fulfill my desires" and equivalents reoccur, the relationships between subjects and objects of the world are guided by market logics that bet on the production of obsolescence. In these networks, aesthetic and ideological standards are created that often regulate our ways of existing. What is at stake in these regimes of visibility and interaction is a discourse of homogenization and control that has imposed very particular modes of interaction between individuals.

Zygmunt Bauman (2001a) points out that contemporary society is going through a process of important transformations. The solidity of institutions is undergoing a phenomenon of liquefaction, in which the concreteness of solids melts, transforming itself into a more volatile and shapeless liquid form. These liquefaction processes are taking place in all spheres: in public and private life, in human relationships, in the state, and in social institutions. In a way, the author explains the constitution of modern-liquid subjects with volatile, temporary, fluid, and uncompromised relationships, detached from networks of social belonging and guided, to a large extent, by consumer relations.

Lipovetski (2011) points out that such transformations have created a process of embodiment, defining a new form of social organization, in which the individualistic and narcissistic posture constitutes a value system that outlines new attitudes toward oneself, with others, the world, and with one's time.

One of the effects of these changes seems to be the tendency to immunization in relation to the community, previously pointed out by Roberto Esposito, and that works as a device with the ability to deactivate the creation of bonds.

In his trilogy *Immunitas* (2003), *Communitas* (2005), and *Bios* (2010), Roberto Esposito recovered the word of origin "communitas" in order to propose an ontology for "community", starting from the etymology of the Latin term *communus*, formed by the radicals "cum" and "munus". "Cum" means "that which connects and

binds us to an Other." It is what the experience of "being-with" suggests, which makes explicit the existence and the need of the other beyond myself. "Munus", in turn, carries three meanings: "onus", "officium" and "donus" (duty, obligation, gift). Therefore, "munus" has to do with "that which gives without receiving anything in return". It is a donation - a transitive act of giving.

Communitas is taken to mean "human association" based on the idea of mutual belonging, through the sharing, by the men who compose it, of a reciprocal gift through which their concord and relationship are cemented.

According to Esposito, organized society, from the Modern State on, in an effort of self-preservation in the face of all and any kind of threats, started to impose non-communitarian relations, structured only from contractual ties, never disinterested, with the purpose of guaranteeing, among other things, individual freedom and life preservation, creating devices to regulate social exchanges and relations. In this context, the community was sacrificed for the sake of supposed security. This denial of the community gave way to the defense of an immune project.

Reconnected to its own etymological root, *immunitas* reveals itself to be the negative, or private, form of *communitas*: if *communitas* is that relationship which, by binding its members to a commitment of reciprocal giving, endangers individual identity, *immunitas* is the condition of exemption from such an obligation and thus of defense in confrontations with its expropiative effects (ESPOSITO, 2010, p. 80).

Immunitas consists of a disobligation of the *munus*. It means the privation or denial of the relationship of *cum* (community), constituting "dispensation from the tax obligation that the community imposes on all its members" (ESPOSITO, 2007, p. 30).

The immunity paradigm has an intrinsic link with the concept of community: one is the content and object of the other. In other words, immunity is not a category that can be separated from the community; therefore, it is stated that no community is devoid of some immune system. Every community resorts to some type of immunization, indicating a symmetry relationship between community and immunity.

This condition has a paradoxical character. By becoming immune – not from simple contact with the influence exerted by the pathological agent, but precisely from the inclusion in the body of this same agent as an excluded and annulled element – an inclusion by exclusion is outlined.

In the immune paradigm, *bios* and *nomos*, life and politics are the two constituents of a single, undivided, set that gains meaning mainly from their relationship. Immunity is not just the relationship that connects life to power but the power to preserve life. Contrary to the presupposition of the concept of biopolitics – as the result of the meeting that at a certain moment is determined between the two components –, from this point of view, there is no external power to life, just as life no longer takes place outside power relations (ESPOSITO, 2010, p. 74).

Also, according to Esposito's analysis, the identification of the community and the attempt to establish its own identity determine a way to immunize it "from its constitutive absence of identity" (TARIZZO, 2007, p. 50).

The main impact of the immunization process on the community is the deactivation of the possibility of creating bonds, and imposing new modes of subjectivity production, with effects on the economy, culture, and consumption.

The crisis of the common seems to install in collective experiences and in their collaborative practices, a kind of standardization of relations, fomenting the homogenization of singularities for the collective, making them create a distance from the possibilities that, at first, had emerged as ideological and creative alternatives.

The perception of "community" liquefies. The modes of interaction and discourses that pointed to community practices and that distinguished themselves from the substantialist understanding of community are no longer characterized by their unique ways of life and actions, often returning to identity politics. This occurs because a managerial thinking begins to constitute them in order to, on the one hand, account for the creation and propagation of an image and, on the other hand, to propagate fictional and media existences, with the ultimate goal of the survival, at any cost, of its members.

There is, therefore, a radical change, for what was constituted as an alternative to the modes of artistic production, aiming at breaking with power and domination structures, now follows a logic in which both bonds and mutual belonging no longer conduct relations. Bonds are now supported by devices present both in the labor market, such as employability and consumption, and in interpersonal relations, such as narcissism and glory. The flattening promoted by these devices and clichés devitalizes the complexity of the phenomena, homogenizing individuals.

On the other hand, the engagement seems to have suffered distortion in the current political and social context that, enhanced by the narcissistic and individualistic tendency imposed by the current stage of capitalism, has been transforming the daily culture and its communication processes, having as a symptom the immunity of individuals in relation to the practices around the concept of community.

Not surprisingly, as Peter Pál Pelbart observes, we are living in a *crisis of the common*.

The forms that once seemed to guarantee men a common outline, and ensured some consistency to the social bond, have lost their pregnancy and definitely collapsed, from the so-called public sphere to the consecrated modes of association, community, national, ideological, party, union (PELBART, 2011, p. 28).

The crisis of the common evidence is not only the difficulty in establishing community bonds but also the very definition of what the common and the community are.

In this sense, it is worth returning to this discussion, mainly to establish aspects that can help us identify the notions of community that mediate our daily bonds.

The traditional concept of community is based on the idea of a common essence or substance that unites and identifies its members as equals, such as the notion of territory, identity, possession, customs, etc. This conception, propagated not only by common sense but also in academic environments, carries the nostalgia of a type of community that sustained - and still sustains - a large number of political-ideological actions of control and intervention

against differences and multiplicity, excluding singularity from the networks of relationships.

For Palacios (1990), the nineteenth century and the consolidation of industrial capitalism marks a rediscovery of the concept of community, with its use for the purpose of legitimizing the various types of social relations, whether the State, the church, the unions, the cooperatives, or even the revolutionary movements. "Community ties - real and imagined, traditional or constructed - come to form the image of the good society" (op. cit. p. 103).

These ideas were rooted in a model of society dating back to the feudal period, with the concepts referring to the community used as a mechanism to stop "the advance of society toward new forms of organization" (Ibid. p. 104), imposing a sociability that excludes singularity in a totalizing way. Some results are well known in recent human history: fascism, communism, Nazism, colonialism, and, more recently, phenomena such as luxury condominiums in big cities. These bonds are always supported by ideologies, devices such as the market, consumption, narcissism, and employability that reduce the complexity of the phenomena to clichés, to homogenize and exclude individuals.

Since the 1980s, authors such as BLANCHOT (2013), NANCY (2000), AGAMBEN (2013), and ESPOSITO (2003, 2005, 2010) have proposed a conception of community that points to places, different from those we are used to when referring to the community, almost always relating it to communion or fusion that leads to the gathering of elements with a view to creating a unity that builds a supra-individuality to be managed by an aggregating agent (boss, reason, power). What is glimpsed in these authors' discussion are possibilities of revitalizing the potency of the common. A community where what is held in common is nothing other than the self, the self that is shared.

In this sense, there is no communion or common being. For Nancy (2000), there is an *in-common* being, a *being-with*. An "*in-common* that cuts across all meaning." (op. cit., p. 99). What may share by the members of a community is precisely the absence of a

common identity. Paradoxically, the opposite of the traditional (substantialist) concept of community which, as said, is founded on a substratum that unites and identifies its members.

A bond that is formed not by what is in common, but by *nothing in common*. This opens up the possibility of the emergence of a type of community that was named by George Bataille as a *negative community*. A community composed of those who are not contemplated by the forms of representation in force. A community is constituted as the existence and not as an essence, promoting forms of community where identities are no longer stable and permanent, but temporary and unstable.

According to the philosopher Roberto Esposito,

Community is linked not to a plus but to a minus of subjectivity, that is to say that its members are no longer identical to themselves, but constructively exposed to a tendency that leads them to push their own individual limits in order to face their "outside" (...) that breaks all continuity between the "common" and the "own," bequeathing to it the improper-which returns to the foreground the figure of the other. If the subject of the community is no longer the "same", it will necessarily be an "other". Not another subject, but a chain of changes that is never fixed in a new identity (ESPOSITO, 2003, p. 18).

This chain of alterations, to which Esposito refers, constitutes another way of linking, which takes place from a desubjectivation – an experience of openness to the other and exposure of our singular and plural condition, of openness and exposure to the other and yourself. This type of relationship makes room for the constitution of the experience that incurs the destabilization of the traditional formations of relationship and sharing and their representations, establishing the event as potency.

There seems to be a relational approximation of multiple singularities around a choice. That is, community “in the most paradoxical way [...] is a denial of fusion, of homogeneity, of identity with itself.” (PELBART, 2011, p. 33).

Community, in this case, is nothing like the emptiness and delimitation suggested by the "individualistic-universalist" model, but "pure non-totalizable heterogeneity" that has little or nothing to

do with the political and media figurations that "pretend to hypostatize, represent, or expropriate it" (ibid., p.30).

For Blanchot (2013) the communal experience is only realized to the extent that it remains communicable and corresponds to openness (and sharing) with others, "it is that which exposes itself by exposing itself" (op. cit. p.30), that is, community relates very closely to the notion of sharing; however, it is not the simple placing in common, the sharing of something, but,

[...] community is what always occurs through the other and for the other. It is the space of the "oneself" - subjects and substances, [...]. It is not a communion that unites the "oneself" into a One-Self or into a superior Other. [...] The community occupies this singular place: it assumes the impossibility of its own immanence, the impossibility of a communal being as a subject (NANCY, 2000, p.26).

From this perspective, the community does not constitute the possession of a common shared among individuals, but, as Yamamoto (2012, p.6) points out, it is exactly the opposite: "the common expropriation of these individuals, the extraction of all their content, their subjectivity and interiority in favor of an Other."

In these terms, sharing builds a potential value that overflows beyond the context and can generate societal changes. It puts into the world a kind of relationship in which what one has in common is none other than the self, the self, and its discontinuous singularity.

There is a relational coming together of multiple singularities; that is, community experiences are not the search for an association with the other to form a "substance of wholeness". The need for the other comes from putting oneself in question; after all, "what I think I do not think alone" (BLANCHOT, 2013, p.17).

Quoting Esposito,

Community is never a place of arrival, but always a place of departure. It is thus the very departure toward that which does not belong to us and can never belong to us. For this reason, *communitas* is quite distant from producing a community, of a communion, of communion. It neither warms nor protects. On the contrary, it exposes the subject to the most extreme risk: that of losing, with one's own individuality, the limits that guarantee one's intangibility from the other (ESPOSITO, 2007, p. 20).

Paolo Virno (2013) is another author who has dedicated himself to the theme of communities, especially from the work discussions and changes in the understanding of the common. According to this author, due to changes arising from social practices and the speed of innovations, it is no longer even possible to speak of a substantial community. Even though traditional ways of life persist, change intervenes on individuals who are already used to sudden, sometimes unpredictable, changes” as such, with the indeterminate context of our existence” (op. cit. p. 17).

All these analyses and reflections point to the need to rethink various community configurations proposed from the beginning of the 20th century and organized by the bibliography of the 1980s.

There would be an instance of analysis that would not be restricted only to the constitution and dismantling of communities, but that would call into question other themes, among which the crisis of the common stands out and all the aspects that stem from this crisis, such as imprisonment or the lack of ties, the changes in time and the emergence of new power devices that characterize the so-called control societies, as studied by Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt to elaborate the definitions of Empire, based on the studies of Gilles Deleuze, Felix Guattari, and Gilbert Simondon.²

In the dance...

In the case of dance, the crisis of the common seems to install, mainly in collectives and in their collaborative practices, a kind of standardization of relations, fostering the homogenization of singularities in favor of the collective, making them create a distance from the possibilities that, in principle, had emerged as ideological and creative alternatives.

² This article will not go into the discussions of these authors, however it would be imprudent not to mention them, since the difference between sovereign power and institutional power is detected in this connection, especially that of Deleuze, Negri, and Hardt, pointing to the importance of the concept of the multitude, as a collective of singularities, instead of the notion of the people as a mass, from the proposals of Thomas Hobbes.

The perception of “community” through dance is liquefied. The modes of interaction and discourses that pointed to community practices and that differed from the understanding of the substantialist community are no longer characterized by their unique ways of life and actions, often returning to identity politics. This occurs because managerial thought begins to constitute them in order, on the one hand, to handle the creation and dissemination of an image and, on the other hand, to propagate fictional and mediatic existences, having as their ultimate goal survival, at any cost of its members.

There is, therefore, a radical change, since what was constituted as an alternative to the modes of artistic production, with a view to breaking with structures of power and domination, began to follow a logic in which both bonds and mutual belonging cease to lead to relations. The bonds are supported by devices present both in the labor market, such as employability and consumption, and in interpersonal relationships, such as narcissism and glory. The flattening promoted by these devices and clichés devitalizes the complexity of phenomena, homogenizing individuals.

Thus, the community experience in dance becomes exposed to a modeling system, which empties the resistance potential.

As the artist and researcher Newton Goto (2002) points out, it seems that

[...] the greatest risk for heterogeneous circuits occurs when this possibility becomes mere style: aestheticization of politics instead of politicization of art. Collectives for collectives' sake, as well as art for art's sake... Neo-Nazis and corporate society groups also form collectives. If something that should be a critical resistance articulated theoretically and materially in society becomes a mere manufactured difference, a fake resistance, easily assimilated in the contemporary "anything goes", as Hal Foster noted, then the social traps are more subtle and sophisticated. If only style prevails, devoid of values, the heterogeneous circuits become circuits in bionecrosis, mere stepping stones to visibility in the same networks of power of the traditional system. [...] Moreover, the fashion for the multiplication of collectives can even establish a passive suppression of the individual in the name of the collective, as in a "dictatorship of the collective process". Or still, it may come to foster cultural ghettos, without symbolic exchanges with society (GOTO, 2002, p. 412).

As Mesquita suggests, "This shows that no manifestation is so resistant as not to be assimilated and standardized by the market. The most radical gesture yesterday is the mass marketed fashion today (MESQUITA, 2008, P. 212).

It is worth asking, and then, despite the cooptation and dependency mechanisms between artists and the market, artists, communities, organizations, and institutions still seek to act, or at least create breaches, in the mercantile circuits and logic. And yet: what other practices or ways of being together can still be constituted as micro-politics of resistance?

Other ways of being together

Artists present themselves as researchers and thinkers who challenge, in their work, anthropological and philosophical consensus about social orders, communication networks or the bonds between individuals and their ways of grouping (CANCLINI, 2012, p. 50).

Not rarely we discuss the emergence of experiences that test other forms of relationships and interaction, whether affective, social, or cognitive. These suggest the possibility of overlapping between individual and collective, indicating new ways of living and relationships that here I will call other ways of being together, which signal the emergence of "other ways of sharing, of living collective experiences and creating strategies of availability to the other" (GREINER, 2014, p.27), creating recognition of the other and understanding that singularity is only defined, precisely, in the relationship with the other, as a set of cooperating singularities that "expresses potency not only as a set, but also as singularity" (NEGRI, 2011, p. 413).

If, on the one hand, these other ways of being together seem to emerge, pointing to new processes of collaborative integration, on the other hand, the individualistic and narcissistic tradition, which hovers in the current stage of late capitalism, keeps creating devices that make community bonds unfeasible. However, as KESTER (2002, p.122) points out, "the real power of art lies precisely in

its ability to destabilize and criticize conventional forms of representation and identity."

To complexify this debate, it is worth recalling the reflections of Judith Ravel (2008). According to this researcher, it is necessary to break with the mechanisms that transform an experience that proposes new perspectives and actions into another power, or into just a "parenthesis containing a fragile liberation, quickly reabsorbed" (op. cit., p.1). Even because of organized resistance, there is no guarantee that it will not become a new power - almost always modeled and co-opted. The question, finally, seems to be how to resist and escape the dialectic power/counterpower and its derivations within the contemporary social-political context and create operators capable of acting in the gaps, experimenting with ways of belonging that escape the established. How to constitute oneself in view of the projection (of the possibility) of other ways of life.

For Giorgio Agamben, the strategy would be to act in such a way as to profane the devices of power, which, as said before, refer to the means by which we are captured, conditioned, and controlled in our way of acting, in the processes of subjectivation.

Every device implies a process of subjectivation, without which the device cannot function as a governing device, but is reduced to a mere exercise of violence. Foucault thus showed how in a disciplinary society, devices aim, through a series of practices and discourses, knowledge and exercises, at the creation of docile but free bodies, which assume their identity and their subject "freedom" in the very process of their subjection (AGAMBEN, 2009, p. 47).

Profaning is about returning something that has been taken away from common use, thus breaking with the structure of the devices. As the author explained, profanation is opposed to sacralization. "To consecrate (*sacrare*) was the term that designated the departure of things from the sphere of human right, to desecrate, in turn, meant to restore them to the free use of men" (AGAMBEN, 2007, p. 65), that is, to restore to common use that which was taken away by sacralization. In these terms, it means subverting, or rather, deactivating the devices of power, proposing other uses and relations, distinct from the sacred, "it means opening up the possibility of a special form of negligence, which ignores separation, or rather,

makes particular use of it" (ibid, p. 66). Profaning creates means the creation of new possible uses that, in a way, more than creating a new normalization, deactivates its potency by rendering it inoperative, enabling the emergence of new categories. "Profaning does not mean simply abolishing and canceling separations, but making a new use of them, playing with them" (ibid., p. 75).

In this sense, the proposal is to identify what they see being tested in dance by some artists. These are other ways of being together, far from the substantialist logic of community, which does not even aim to form a group that names or identifies them. Such experiences have constituted ways of grouping that escape (or seek to escape) categorization and constituted models. These cannot be identified in the usual terms and create in the world a type of sharing in which what one has in common is nothing other than oneself, the very being that one shares with another "anyone."

There is evidence of a kind of non-community community that is no longer defined based on the assumptions conceived during the 20th century and that until then, seemed to mark some traditional understandings of community.

In his book "The community that comes" (2013), Agamben already indicates another path when he proposes the idea of a community that takes place in its happening, a community becoming composed of the being that comes: the "any" being.

The any, for Agamben, is a singularity that is not bound to the existing dichotomy between individual and universal; it does not suppose "singularity in its indifference to a common property, but only in its being as it is (...) singularity as any singularity" (op. cit., p. 10). In this context, the individual starts to dispense with a property that binds him to a certain group or class, and he becomes potency and not the essence of a community that does not propose to be communitarian. That is, "[...] the any would not be a model of 'what to do' and 'when', but [...] would be a potency capable of effecting a small displacement of meaning and limits, towards a discrete 'how to do'" (SEDLMAYER, 2008, p.143)

One can state that any singularity has no identity, it is not determined in relation to a concept, but neither is it indeterminate. It

is determined through its relation to an idea, that is, to a (provisional) totality of possibilities.

With any singularity, Agamben seeks to think of the community as an event that takes place in the sphere of language and power. For Sedlmayer (2008, p.144),” the coming community would not be tied to the future time. It would always be arriving, resisting both the collective and the individual.”

Just like Blanchot's unconfessable community and the in-operative community proposed by Nancy, the coming community destabilizes and calls into question the state's logic of representation and ways of belonging and sharing, as it is composed of individuals without identity or essence. However, being constituted from the common and whatever, it works with other assumptions and that, unlike Nancy and Blanchot, do not absolutely need to be guided by disinterest and identification, but also by transitory interests not necessarily given a priori by criteria of identity and identification. The eventful nature of the communities discussed by Agamben points to the provisional trait of the discussed communities that seems to mark the understanding of community today.

According to Saidel (2013, p.449), according to Agamben's analysis, the common is not a transcendent essence, but a coexistence of any singularities that give rise to a community without essence and without any foundation of belonging.

The common come to be thought of as the resistance to singular differences, since “the logic of singularity, [...] implies the coincidence between being and its ways, thus transforming bare life into a form of life. (SAIDEL, 2013, p.449, author's translation)³

Thinking about the community from this other ontology implies understanding that the community can be configured in other ways than just because of the sharing of identification between its members, which always results in the exclusion of the difference of what is considered foreign to the order. It is about experiencing a

³ In the original: La lógica de la singularidad, por el contrario, implica la coincidencia del ser con sus modos, transformando así la nuda vida en forma-de-vida.

way of sharing differences, as constructing a political, subjective life space.

Thus, immanent, transitive, and evolutionary ways of together privileging the process, not the product, as they do not always generate a specific product. The changes occur not only in the vocabularies, in words, but in the actions that are spoken of, in the establishment of practical relationships (perhaps disordered and occasional), and, nevertheless, singular.

This hypothesis does not see the common extinction, but its translation into diverse contexts and practices also appears in the research on art and community proposed by Pascal Gielen (2011). This author examines that almost as an antidote to the negation of the common; there are initiatives that incite the creation of affection and the cultivation of practices in the community that, in a way, are "diametrically opposed to the equally strong desire for the individualization of artistry in modern times" (op. cit., p. 6).

Perhaps these new forms of collectivity can challenge economic and political interests because,

Within a neoliberal world in which individuality, personal gain, competition, and risky speculations have become the leading morale of the day and govern the social fabric, the community probably gives rise to associations which may sound naive, but which are no less revolutionary within the current hegemony. When the community does not retreat onto itself, but consequently uses its principles to defend an unknown other and the other, she might offer an unexpected ideological counterforce. In short, nowadays the community still stands for an alternative way of life. (GIELEN, 2011, p. 32-33).

In these other ways of being together, there is a common interest and the sharing of personal interests. Such collaborations seem to create bridges in the collective, more effective than the individual search, because by sharing knowledge, there is an evolution beyond individual experiences, expanding knowledge and producing complexity.

After all, the isolated being is, historically, only an abstraction. Already in Blanchot's texts, it is made explicit how experience can only be realized to the extent that it remains communicable and

corresponds to opening to others. A movement "that provokes a relation of dissymmetry between me and the other" (BLANCHOT, 2013, p.36).

It is important to note that sharing does not cancel out singularization. Experiences have evidenced that sharing environments stimulates the development and bring about punctual environmental changes. "When we want something to happen whose complexity is beyond the capabilities of a single person, we need a group" (SHIRKY, 2001, p.108).

By proposing other ways of living together, a potential value is built that overflows beyond the group and can generate societal changes. A type of relationship is established in the world with the ability to create operators capable of destabilizing the established order, playing a political role of resistance to the power devices that feed the immunity of individuals in relation to the collective.

Despite the regrets...

Over time various experiences and contexts of collaboration have emerged, been extinguished, and others have emerged. This instability of ways of living together brings up a few questions. There is a dilemma that has always been present. Do communities still exist? Or rather: are they still possible in this phase of late capitalism?

According to Sennett (2012), group life is part of the evolutionary process of humanity and is a contingency of humanity (we cannot live in isolation), and, as such, it is likely that group life is what connects us to other living species. To be alive is always, to some extent, to be in a group.

We must remember that extreme precariousness puts in check very primary aspects of life, of what constitutes a person (as a person) and his relationships. To discuss community and ways of being together is not enough to describe groups that share copresence. "Being together" here implies a radical availability, an openness to the other. This "how to be open to the other" has also been explored extensively by numerous authors. The answer is never unique, and the proposals are always in motion.

In the state we are in today, perhaps it is the instance of the common, of openness to the other, that can, in fact, create new bonds. Provisional and fragile. Even so, politically able to glimpse new ways of being together. Perhaps this is one of the most important functions of Art today.

References:

AGAMBEN, Giorgio. **A comunidade que vem**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora, 2013.

_____. **O que é o contemporâneo? E outros ensaios**. Chapecó: Argos, 2009.

_____. **Profanações**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2007.

BAUMAN, Zigmunt. **Modernidade líquida**. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 2001a.

BLANCHOT, Maurice. **A comunidade inconfessável**. Brasília: Editora UNB, 2013.

CANCLINI, Nestor. **A sociedade sem relato: antropologia e estética da imanência**. São Paulo: Edusp, 2012.

ESPOSITO, Roberto. **Bios: biopolítica e filosofia**. Lisboa: Edições 70, 2010.

_____. **Nilismo e comunidade**. In: PAIVA, Raquel (org). *O retorno da comunidade: novos caminhos do social*. Rio de Janeiro: Mauad X, 2007. p. 15-30.

_____. *Immunitas: protección y negación de la vida*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 2005.

_____. **Communitas**. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 2003.

GIELEN, Pascal. **Creativity and other fundamentalisms**. Amsterdam: Mondriaan, 2013.

_____.; BRUYNES, Paul (eds.). **Community art: the politics of trespassing**. Amsterdam: Antennae Valiz, 2011.

GOTO, Newton. **Sentidos (e circuitos) políticos da arte: afeto, crítica heterogeneidade e autogestão em tramas produtivas da cultura**. In: Rizoma.net, 2002. p. 405 - 416. Disponível em: <http://www.intervencaourbana.org/rizoma/rizoma_artefato.pdf> Acesso em 21 ago. 2022.

GREINER, Christine. **A performance e o risco da inoperância do comum**. In: TEIXEIRA, Ana (coord.). *Cozinha performática*. São Paulo: Terra Editora, 2014. p. 27 – 35.

KESTER, Grant H. **Colaboração, arte e subculturas**. In: Rizoma.net, 2002. p. 122-136. Disponível em: <http://www.intervencaourbana.org/rizoma/rizoma_artefato.pdf>. Acesso em 21 ago. 2022.

LIPOVETSKI, Gilles. SERROY, Jean. **A estetização do mundo**: viver na era do capitalismo artista. São Paulo: Cia da Letras, 2015.

MESQUITA, André. **Insurgências poéticas**: arte ativista e ação coletiva (1990-2000). 2008. 429p. Dissertação (Mestrado em História Social) Programa de Pós-graduação em História Social, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo.

NANCY, Jean-Luc. **Do ser-em-comum**. In: DIAS, Bruno Peixe; NEVES, José (coord.). *A política dos muitos: povo, classe e multidão*. Lisboa: Tinta da China, 2011.p. 419-423

_____. **La comunidad inoperante**. Santiago do Chile, 2000.

NEGRI, Antonio. **Para uma definição ontológica de multidão**. In: DIAS, Bruno Peixe; NEVES, José (coord.). *A política dos muitos: povo, classe e multidão*. Lisboa: Tinta da China, 2011. p. 407-418.

PALACIOS, Marcos. **Sete teses equivocadas sobre comunidade e comunicação comunitária**. *Comunicação e Política*, Salvador, v. 9, n. 11, p. 103-110, 1990.

PELBART, Peter. **Vida capital**: ensaios de biopolítica. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2011.

SAIDEL, Matias. **Ontologías de lo común en el pensamiento de Giorgio Agamben y Roberto Esposito**: entre ética y política. ISEGORÍA. *Revista de Filosofía Moral y Política*. n. 49, jul.-dic., p. 439-457, 2013.

SELDMAYER, Sabrina; GUIMARÃES, César (org.). **O comum e a experiência da linguagem**. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2007.

_____. **A comunidade que vem**. In: PUCHEU, Alberto (org.). *Nove abraços no inapreensível: filosofia e arte em Giorgio Agamben*. Rio de Janeiro: Beco do Azogue: FAPERJ, p. 139-147, 2008.

SENNETT, Richard. **Juntos**: os rituais, os prazeres e a política da cooperação. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 2012.

SHIRKY, Clay. **A cultura da participação**: criatividade e generosidade no mundo conectado. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2011.

TARIZZO, Davide. **Filósofos em comunidade**: Nancy, Esposito, Agamben. In: PAIVA, Raquel (org). *O retorno da comunidade: novos caminhos do social*. Rio de Janeiro: Mauad X, 2007, p. 31-62.

VIRNO, Paolo. **Gramática da multidão**: para uma análise das formas de vida contemporânea. São Paulo: Annablume, 2013.

Received on October 31st, 2022.

Approved on December 07th, 2022.

REALIZAÇÃO



UFRJ

PPGDAN
UFRJ

Anda
associação nacional de
pesquisadores em dança