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The European City has up to now only rarely been characterized as a city of crisis. However, against the backdrop of current political shifts that challenge the European project of urban solidarity and tear the ideal of democracy there is an urgent need to reflect on the general and current status of crises in urban life and society. Therefore the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space (http://skuor.tuwien.ac.at) Wien – in collaboration with the City of Vienna Visiting Professorship of the same name – dedicated the academic year of 2016 to a critical approach to the European City. Under the annual theme of 2016 “Urban Culture, Public Space and the Present – Urban Solidarity and European Crisis” the Centre offered integrated lectures, a seminar as well as a practical exercise at the intersection of urban sociology, urban studies, political science, planning theory and urban design aimed at interdisciplinary and international master students as part of the curriculum of Spatial Planning at the Faculty of Architecture and Planning at TU Wien.

Both as normative project and as conceptual framework, urban theoretical accounts as regards the European City have been shaken by diverse crises of knowledge, politics, culture, economy and society. Scholars have developed new models, which try to answer some of those challenges with a view to economic activity, local government, cultural policy, urban planning, everyday life or scientific reasoning about the city: throughout the lecture series “The European City: A Conceptual Framework in Crisis” concepts of the Entrepreneurial City, the Culturalised City, the Global City, the Postcolonial City or the Rebel City have been introduced in the past summer term and critically discussed in relation to urban solidarity and their relevance for urban practice and planning. These lecture inputs have been combined with lecture units from critical urban theory and planning theory regarding Post-Positivist Planning Theories: Performative Planning, Insurgent Planning, Relational Planning, Counter Planning and Agonistic Planning.

How do these concepts and urban scholars address urban cultures and public spaces in their overall conceptions of the urban, urbanization processes and the city, and which roles and meanings are attributed to public life and everyday cultural expression in these writings? The lecture combined two perspectives from urban and cultural sociology and from public space research and urban cultural theory (both within urban studies) to offer multiple entry points into understanding the city both as a medium and a solution for the crisis, but also as its main sphere where an understanding of crisis, and its multiple creative and destructive situations, is generated.

With this reader we want to share the summarized theoretical inputs from the summer term’s lectures as well as give an insight into the students’ work in both seminar and exercise where those inputs were reflected upon and turned into empirical projects. The contributors to this volume are the City of Vienna Visiting Professor 2016, Prof. Dr. Sybille Frank, the Head of the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space, Ass. Prof. Dr. Sabine Knierbein, as well as Elina Kränzle MSc from the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space. We would like to thank Cansu and Mucella Yapici, both scholarly activists, who held a guest lecture on urban transformation in Istanbul and shared their experiences of the Gezi Park movements, bringing in first-hand experiences of urban crises in Europe.

While we are writing new (urban) crises emerge: The political situation in Turkey is getting more alarming by the hour and our thoughts are with all colleagues who are directly involved in or affected by political struggles connected to the emerging regime. Public spaces in other European Cities witness acts of rightwing extremism and agitation through spatial conquistas of another kind, and international translocal identities gain new meanings in shared urban societies, as the protracted refugee and migration crisis unfolds.

Finally, we would like to say merci our motivated group of students in the summer term’s module for their vivid participation in the courses and their creative and passionate projects. We would like to thank the City of Vienna as well as the Faculty of Architecture and Planning at TU Wien and the Department of Spatial Planning. We highly appreciate their continuous material and institutional support through which the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space has come into being since 2008, and has grown internationally since. The intensive teaching and learning within and beyond academia would not have been possible without them.
# LECTURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture Outline. The European City. A Conceptual Framework in Crisis</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sabine Knierbein, Sybille Frank</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The European City. A Normative Concept and its Present Challenges</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sybille Frank</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Space under Siege. Urban Restructuring and the ‘European City’</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sabine Knierbein</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Crisis. Negotiating the German Colonial Past in Berlin’s African Quarter</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sybille Frank</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Crisis. The Entrepreneurial City</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sybille Frank</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Body under Pressure. The Political and Politics of Affect(s)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sabine Knierbein</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Crisis. The Culturalised City</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sybille Frank</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contested Everyday Space. Non-social Movements and Insurgent Planning</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sabine Knierbein</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived Space Dialectics. Combined Activism and Relational Counter Space</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sabine Knierbein</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Crisis. The Global City</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sybille Frank</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Unsilenced. Urban Resistance Against Increasing Social Inequality</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sabine Knierbein</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Crisis. The Right to the City</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sybille Frank</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Space Unbound. Urban Emancipation and the Post-Political City</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sabine Knierbein</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bibliography
## SEMINAR ESSAYS

- **From Public to Private. The European City in Crisis?**
  
  *Nicole Hauder*  
  
  Page 23

- **From Communicative to Performative to...?**
  
  *Michael Masching*  
  
  Page 29

- **The Global City and its Intensifying Effect on Urban Social Inequality**
  
  *Triin Liis Palm*  
  
  Page 35

- **The (Small-Scale) Political in a Globalised Context. Taking a Look at the Danube Canal**
  
  *Clara Rosa Rindler-Schantl*  
  
  Page 40

- **From Heritage to the Everyday Life of the Present**
  
  *Klara Seltenhammer*  
  
  Page 44

## STUDENT PROJECTS

- **Exploring Urban Lifeworlds. Introduction to the Exercise**
  
  *Elina Kränzle*  
  
  Page 51

- **The Power of Bodies and Gender**
  
  *Michael Maschnig, Vanessa Sodl*  
  
  Page 52

- **Social Interactions. Detecting and Observing Meeting Points**
  
  *Sonja List, Klara Maria Seltenhammer*  
  
  Page 53

- **Tramline 49**
  
  *Balázs Cserpes, Benjamin Peneder*  
  
  Page 54

- **Roofless but not Homeless. The Importance of Home**
  
  *Agnes Daniel, Andreas Höbausz*  
  
  Page 55

- **Let’s Talk with the People! Project Schwedenplatz**
  
  *Yuquing Hu, Lina Moßhammer*  
  
  Page 56

- **Street Politics. Artistic and Vandalising Modifications of Election Posters**
  
  *Maximilian Jäger, Moritz Starzer*  
  
  Page 57

- **Youth in Döbling. Living in Vienna’s 19th District**
  
  *Marvin Linke, Clara Rosa Rindler-Schantl*  
  
  Page 58
The lecture units offered by Prof. Dr. Sybille Frank started with an introduction to the concept of the European City as it was prominently developed by German sociologist Walter Siebel. Siebel defined five characteristics of the European City that were each put under scrutiny in one of the following lecture units. At the same time the characteristics were used as a starting point to delve deeper into diagnoses of a European crisis, that have been the annual theme of the City of Vienna Visiting Professor Programme in 2016, and to differentiate and investigate various crisis phenomena on the spatial level of the (European) city. In this process, each characteristic was identified with a specific field of crisis. As a result, a heritage, political, cultural, economic and social crisis were identified and critically assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Fields</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The European City: A Normative Concept and its Present Challenges</td>
<td>Historic development, the European City as a normative concept, current transformations and challenges (Bahrdt, Siebel, Siebel and Wehrheim, Weber)</td>
<td>The European City as a city for male husbands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Crisis: Negotiating the German Colonial Past in Berlin’s African Quarter</td>
<td>Prevalence of a pre-modern heritage (but: heritage crisis!)</td>
<td>Afrikanisches Viertel, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Crisis: The Entrepreneurial City</td>
<td>Fordism and post-Fordism, the entrepreneurial city, new urban politics (governance/public-private partnerships), new urban policies (city marketing/festivalization), loss of democratic control (Frank, Hubbard and Hall, Häußermann and Siebel, Mayer)</td>
<td>New Potsdamer Platz, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Crisis: The Culturalised City</td>
<td>Symbolic economy, culture, image consumption, liminal space, urban redevelopment, creativity, self-culturalization (Reckwitz, Zukin)</td>
<td>Bryant Park and South Street Seaport, New York; Disneyland, Disney World and Celebration, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Crisis: The Global City</td>
<td>Transnational city networks, global cities, global hierarchies of cities, the power of place, local workforce, social divides (Musil, Sassen)</td>
<td>City rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Crisis: The Right to the City, Class Antagonisms and Fading Solidarities</td>
<td>Austerity urbanism, right to the city, new social movements, lower classes, poverty, urban precariat, middle classes, mentalities, stigmatization, solidarity (Dörre, Harvey, Koppetsch, Mayer)</td>
<td>Different coping strategies, mental illnesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lecture Units offered by Ass. Prof. Sabine Knierbein are all organized around a threefold structure to connect public space-based and urban culture-centred research to deeper social and political theories and more recent accounts in planning theory and practice. Each lecture comprises the following sections:

1. **Urban Studies**: Understanding how cities and urban societies currently work in Europe and beyond: Empirical evidence or theoretical concepts relating to public space + cultures

2. **Political Science**: Getting to know a political science position to explain changing urban phenomena: Normative and interpretative theoretical frameworks sustaining a more systematic understanding of social change

3. **Planning Theory**: Learning about post-positivist approaches in planning theory. Planning approaches (theory/practice) suitable to deal with issues and concerns relating to the lived spaces of cities and current modes of transformation of urban societies

The following table shows a summary of each lecture unit’s accord, as well as the linkages between the six respective units in urban studies; in political science and in planning theory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Studies (1)</th>
<th>Political Science (2)</th>
<th>Planning Theory (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Space under Siege. Urban Restructuring and the 'European City’</td>
<td>Governmentality (Foucault)</td>
<td>Post-Positivist Planning (Allmendinger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PostFordist urban policies, birth of ‘neoliberal’ urban policies, growing urban inequalities (Madanipour, Knierbein and Degros, Tauss)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Body Under Pressure. The Political and Politics of Affect(s)</td>
<td>Politics of Affect (Massoumi, Hardt, Thrift)</td>
<td>Performative planning (Altrock and Hünig, Helbrecht and Dirksmeier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embodied space: role of embodied action, body-politics (Moore, Low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contested Everyday Space. Non-Social Movements and Insurgent Planning</td>
<td>Social non-movements (Bayat)</td>
<td>Insurgent planning (Miraftab)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday urbanism, ordinary city (Crawford, Hou, Kaika and Karaliotas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived Space Dialectics. Combined Activism and Relational Counter Space</td>
<td>Feminist critique of public space (Ruddick)</td>
<td>Relational planning (Knierbein)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public space activism and housing activism combined (García-Lamarca, Elzanowski)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Unsilenced. Urban Resistance Against Increasing Social Inequality</td>
<td>Presentist democracy (Lorey, Rancière, Swyngedouw)</td>
<td>Counter planning (Purcell, Sandercock)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban movements against rising urban inequality (Maharawal, Tyler)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Space Unbound. Urban Emancipation and the Post-political City</td>
<td>Politics of dissent (Mouffe)</td>
<td>Agonistic planning (Hillier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Post-Political and Its Discontents (Wilson and Swyngedouw, Watson)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This lecture unit introduced students to the concept of the European City as it was coined and put up for discussion by urban sociologist Walter Siebel (2004, Siebel/Wehrheim 2006). I presented the five characteristics of the European City that Siebel registered and delineated the many challenges that, according to Siebel, the European City faces today. By this, this lecture unit was meant to lay the groundwork of the following lecture units: in the each of the following units we revisited one of the five characteristics of the European City model in order to address the ideological foundations of the concept, and to discuss arguments against its normative framework.

Characteristics of the European City

According to Siebel, the first characteristic of the European City is the presence of a (pre-modern) heritage. For him city dwellers are surrounded by urban structures and buildings that stem from the foundation phase of modern Western civil society and that also testify to the bourgeois ideas behind the European City. Its second trait is the idea of the city as being a place of hope and emancipation. Siebel sees a twofold emancipation at work (Weber 1978): first, from feudal power relations and traditional social ties by the creation of a community of free urban citizens (“citoyens”); second, from the closed economic circuit of the rural home to a congregation of free participants in the market (“bourgeois”). Thirdly, the European City is the place where an urban way of life developed that was based on a polarity between public and private spheres (cf. Bahrdt 1998). While public space is the realm of market transactions, civic action and democracy, private space is devoted to production (work) and reproduction (home). The forth attribute is centrality. Siebel mentions the market square, the town hall and the church as testimonials to the European City being an economic, political and cultural center. A strong influence of public administration is the fifth feature. For Siebel, the European City has not only been structured capital but also by the ideal(ies) of urban professional elites. Public provision of infrastructure, public land ownership, long-term urban planning, social housing and public welfare schemes established the idea of the city as a collective affair.

In a nutshell, the image that Walter Siebel depicts of the European City is that of an ideal type. He regards it to be threatened in manifold ways.

Current Challenges

According to Siebel, first, New Urbanism and post-modernism have led to a simulation of built urban heritage while the exclusivity of the built forms of the European City has been noted: the Christian church has to yet been joined by the minaret. Moreover, the city has turned from a place of hope and emancipation (albeit only for the male citoyen/bourgeois) into a place of fears, marginalization and social exclusion for all genders: downward social mobility threatens social integration and cutbacks in social services lead to social insecurity. As to the polarity of public and private spaces the boundaries have dissolved between them: for example, shopping is practiced in private malls and no longer in public market squares. CCTV surveillance and the public use of cellphones violate the anonymity of public space while the intimacy of the private sphere has been perforated by TV home stories or the internet. If we look at Siebel’s centrality argument we see that the contrast between urban and rural spaces is disappearing as well. Instead of center-periphery relations space is structured in the form of networks and nodes, while suburbanization has given rise to metropolitan agglomerations. Lastly, the influence of public administration, as well as regulation and welfare provisions, have decreased. Public and social services have been reduced while public land and infrastructure have been sold to private investors. Through this, the interventionalist role of public urban authorities has eroded.

Siebel concludes that the European City was the nucleus of Western modernity. While he appreciates that it is changing with social change, he also says that there are good reasons for defending some of its features against change, for example ideas of social integration and of a powerful local state.
The three parts of this lecture (1) address different interpretations of patterns of urban restructuring (e.g. neoliberal), (2) offer a political science-inspired reading of Foucault’s theory of governmentality as an explanatory frame for a historical analysis of urban restructuring, and (3) establish a connection to post-positivist planning theories.

(1) In the first part of the lecture, we will investigate how public spaces are used and transformed into core catalysts of processes of urban transformation and capital accumulation in European cities by five categories: (1) economic revival; (2) social inclusion; (3) cultural diversity; (4) environmental care; (5) urban governance. Public spaces are broadly understood as crossroads, where different paths and trajectories meet, sometimes overlapping and at other times colliding; by presenting case studies of public space design and development projects as well as by introducing core theoretical findings from public space research, the lecturer will analyze how these processes interact with market forces, historic legacies, social norms and cultural expectations; and whether and how the activities of municipalities relate to the needs and experiences of their citizens and dwellers, exploring new strategies and innovative practices for strengthening public spaces and urban culture.

(2) This part connects an understanding of the relations between capitalism as a socio-historic phenomenon, urban restructuring, public space and the European City. While neoliberalism is usually coined as a US American project that surged especially in the course of the global oil price shock 1973 and finds its first political expressions particularly in Reaganomics (USA) and Thatcherism (UK), we will broadly discuss Foucault’s (2008 (2004)) findings on the initiation of the German neoliberal project in the course of national state restructuring after the 2nd World War. Foucault proposes a certain way to understand how governing is achieved by elaborating on the concept of “governmentality” which means the art of government. As a social theorist, Foucault was interested in government as an activity or practice, and in arts of government as ways of knowing what that activity consisted in. He understood power as ‘guidance’ and enquiries into the practice of governing the forms of (self)government, as ‘the conduct of conduct’ (Lemke 2000, 50). Hence, although power is an omnipresent dimension in human relations, power in a society is never a fixed and closed regime, but rather an endless strategic game. With this analytically sharpened perspective, Foucault explains how the neoliberal political project came into being initially as a way of thinking in economics, and later as a practice of governing.

(3) This part elaborates an understanding of planning as a form of governmentality: practices shaping the actions of others and strategies for the management of a population. Foucauldian analysis of planning as a form of power is not to attempt to correct the misuse of technical rationality, nor dissolve power in ‘perfectly transparent communication’, but to show the unwitting effects of these regimes of practices, to break free of the common-sense acceptance of categories, to open up ways of thinking differently (Huxley 2002, 145-6). Allmendinger (2002) points to the fact that there was a changing understanding of the social world in the 1960s and 1970s, as the steady belief in naturalism dominating the social sciences and planning for most of the 19th century began to diminish at that time. What was called into question was the understanding of the universalisation of conditions of knowledge; the neutrality of observation; the givenness of experience and the independence of data from theoretical interpretation (positivism). Now data, theories and disciplines began to be understood as belonging to larger social and historical contexts in which they were applied, changed and developed (post-positivism). One way of post-positivist planning has been well-distributed both in the anglosaxionian and german-speaking planning communities, that is, pragmatic communicative planning (Selle, Germany, since 1991), collaborative/communicative planning (Healey, UK, in 1993/1997) and deliberative planning (Forester, USA, in 1999). An overview regarding less broadly acknowledged and more recent forms of post-positivist planning will be introduced in successive lecture units, namely performative planning (unit 5), insurgent planning (unit 7), relational planning (unit 8), counter planning (unit 10) and agonistic planning (unit 12). These all bear many thinks and steps in common, however, their particular genealogy, i.e. the story of how they came into being and the social theory, philosophy or just geopolitical context differs.
This lecture unit interrogated the first characteristic of the European City: the omnipresence of urban structures and buildings from pre-modern times that constitute the material heritage - and thus also testify to the founding ideas as an intangible heritage - of the European City. In order to fulfill this task the ongoing dispute over street names in Berlin’s Afrikanisches Viertel (African Quarter) was presented (Foerster et al. 2016, Engler 2013).

In 1899, Berlin named two of its streets Togo Street and Cameroon Street. Togo and Cameroon had been proclaimed the first German colonies in 1884. By 1958, long after the formal end of German colonial rule in 1919, all in all 22 Berlin streets had been named after African regions that had been colonized by the German Empire, or after German colonial protagonists. It was as late as in 2004 that several NGOs, such as an association called Berlin Postkolonial, called for a renaming of those streets in the Afrikanisches Viertel that had been dedicated to the founders of the German colonial empire. Specifically, they suggested that Nachtigalplatz, Petersalle and Lüderitzstraße should be renamed in favour of female individuals representing anticolonial and antiracist resistance. Through this demand they ignited a still ongoing, fierce dispute over the heritage status of the German colonial past, and over how this heritage should be represented in public space.

In order to present the most important arguments for and against a renaming I will briefly introduce the example of Nachtigalplatz here. Gustav Nachtigal was a German explorer of the African continent. He was appointed Imperial Commissioner in 1884 and founded the German protectorates of Togo, Cameroon and German South-West Africa in order to enforce German trade interests on the West African coast. Those who oppose the renaming of Nachtigalplatz say that Nachtigal’s groundbreaking research on Africa justifies dedicating the square to him. Those who support the renaming of Nachtigalplatz underline Nachtigal’s formal involvement in German colonial rule that, they say, cannot be outbalanced by his scientific work.

Why did those in favor of a renaming not succeed to push their demands through up to now? The answer is: because of the authoritative discursive power of ‘traditional’ Western notions of temporality and spatiality that prevail (not only) in Berlin. These notions are used to establish groups of ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ and to exclude the NGOs from heritage-making processes (Ashley/Frank 2016, Hall 1999). In the case of temporality conflicting ideas about the duration of German colonialism occur. While those who oppose the renaming of, for example, Nachtigalplatz limit the period of German colonialism to the ‘short event’ of formal colonial rule, regarding it to be a closed chapter of history, those in favour of a renaming interpret German colonialist and racist thinking as a powerful social relationship until the present day. In the case of spatiality, those who oppose a renaming exhibit an essentialized, territorial notion of space and place that draws a boundary around the Afrikanisches Viertel and promotes an affective and exclusive idea of home and thus competence, while those in favour of a renaming advocate an extroverted relational sense of place which includes a consciousness of its entanglement with the wider world (Massey 1991).

In sum the debate about street names in the Afrikanisches Viertel demonstrates that disputes over temporality and spatiality take center stage in disputed processes of heritage-making. Moreover it shows that the European City concept lacks a critical viewpoint on its imperial heritage. By this it fails to acknowledge that authoritative European heritage discourses are powerful and predominant means of constructing and excluding ‘others’.
This lecture unit tested Siebel’s second trait of the European City: the city as a place of hope and emancipation. It presented the concept of the entrepreneurial city as it was elaborated by social scientists Phil Hubbard and Tim Hall (1998). They argued that the entrepreneurial city emerged in the 1970s in reaction to a change within the capitalist system from Fordism to Post-Fordism. Fordism was the period of growth-oriented organized capitalism that had its heydays from the 1930s to the 1970s. It was supply-oriented and relied on rationalized mass-production of standardized goods. Local public administration and urban planning professionals widely adopted politics that balanced social inequalities.

In the 1970s the oil crisis, deindustrialization, the rise of the service sector, computerization and globalization led to a deep crisis of Fordism. It was followed by a demand-oriented disorganized capitalism: post-Fordism. Post-Fordism is, by way of contrast, characterized by the flexible production of differentiated consumer goods, by specialization and by internationalization of capital and labour (Mayer 1994). The social state was slimmed down and cutbacks in financial grants from the national state gave rise to a Post-Fordist city that dedicated itself to proactive economic policies. Because of its striving for profit-making and conscious risk-taking the Post-Fordist city has also been called ‘entrepreneurial city’.

With Hubbard and Hall (1998) four characteristics of the Entrepreneurial City can be identified. The first two belong to what they call New Urban Politics. These are marked by a trend from government to governance. While government refers to traditional modes of governing, governance denotes the creation of conditions that ensure the continuing capacity to govern, given empty public coffers and inflexible organizational structures on the local level. The strategies that local administrations deploy are, first, the development of endogenous local potentials, and second, the creation of public-private partnerships for urban development. The latter are project-oriented and may take the form of expert committees, agencies, redevelopment companies, private equities, urban design or development projects. They are most often founded for carrying out mega-projects in central locations. Through public-private-partnerships private and half-private actors that often take over public land ownership or public tasks are integrated in local urban planning and decision-making processes. This process is justified as ‘professionalization’ of urban development and public authorities (Hubbard/Hall 1998).

The second two characteristics of the Entrepreneurial City belong to the realm of New Urban Policies. The first is city marketing; the second is festivalisation (Häußermann/Siebel 1993). City marketing has become a new content of local policies since the entrepreneurial city increasingly thinks of itself as a commodity that has to be advertised on an international market of urban ‘locations’. As a result, investments are being made in displays of history (to enhance local ambience), as well as in exciting city centres and, now turning to festivalisation: events in order to fuel local narratives of uniqueness and pride, as for example during the redevelopment New Potsdamer Platz in Berlin (Frank 2003). By using mega-projects to testify to their capacity to act, political leaders also try to demonstrate their competence and flexibility to react to accelerated social change.

If we look back at Walter Siebel’s idea of the European City as a place of hope and emancipation for the citoyen and bourgeois we can see that both of these ideas have eroded: The power of the citoyen to shape the polity of the city, as well as that of the bourgeois to shape its economy, is cut by the rising influence of private actors (such as non-elected experts and companies), thereby leading to a loss of democratic action and control.
The lecture unit will (1) offer an understanding of embodied protest as an affective form of staging dissent and thereby shaping ‘the political’ in the city. In a successive part (2) it will explain the concept of ‘politics of affect’ to link the empirical and methodological reflection to a wider strand of thoughts in social theory. Finally, (3) a transfer will be established between considerations linking embodied space conceptions, politics of affect and a new strand in post-positivist planning, that is, performative planning.

(1) While much of urban writing on the public and private space has been influenced by conceptions of space that built especially on the discursive construction of space, this unit will offer an entry perspective into conceptions of space that discuss social relations through aspects of body, performance and action, thus relating to feminist theory and arts theory. By taking on a particular perspective from the field of radical anthropology on the embodied dimension of protest (Moore 2013), different examples of bodily action in urban space will be explored and discussed. Does it make a difference to expose your body on a public street or to twitter your claims into the virtual worlds that social networks make use of? Do people using their bodies as a resource in protest want to make a political claim, or is their spatial approach different from framing discursive claims? Embodied space allows for a social anthropology perspective to theorize (public) space as it includes the body as an integral part of spatial analysis and fosters the creation of place through spatial orientation, movement and language.

(2) Since the 1990s, a debate of affects/affectivity has been conducted across many disciplines, driven by cultural and feminist studies. This approach combines the focus on the body (feminist theory), with a focus on affect (queer theory, cultural studies). Theories of affect address the minds’ power to think (reason) and the body’s power to act (passion). They force us constantly to pose the problem of the relationship between mind and body with the assumption that their powers constantly correspond in some ways (Hardt 2007, ix). Affects are experiences that derive from spatial encounters, not always conceivable in language, but sensed bodily (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2011). Understanding space as relational (i.e. as materially constituted through social relations) means to include the affective dimensions of embodied space and bodily spatial action (e.g. occupations). In this vein, affection assigns a relational moment, through which the capacity to act is decreased or increased through the encounters between bodies, affected or/and affecting each other (Massumi 2008). In (urban) human geography, affect has been related to an approach coined non-representational theory (Thrift 2007) which sought to alert geographers to the (a) embodied and performative nature of practice; (b) to much of which consists prior to reflexive or cognitive thought; (c) to use an understanding of affect to overcome certain pitfalls of traditional models of social and spatial enquiry which maintain dualisms between theory and practice, and between thought and action. Non-representational theory includes much of the non-intentional and non-discursive aspects of everyday life into an understanding of space and links this to the way politics and the political work beyond reason, using a combination of reason and passion, of thinking and acting. Thrift as well used the concept of “performance” to understand “the art of producing the now” (Dirksmeier/ Helbrecht 2010), the urban present conditions of everyday life. “The greater our power to be affected (…) the greater our power to act” (Hardt 2007, x).

(3) Performative planning makes use of Thrift’s previous understanding of public space as relational: In the context of shrinking cities in Eastern-Germany, planners are confronted with new challenges that are not the result of conflict over land use, but rather of a lack of interest or passions to engage with developing the city and the urban condition. Recalling on Lefebvre’s urge to center praxis as any point of departure for further theoretical reflection, performative planning reconstitutes public space as a sphere where praxis and theory meet, where public spaces are considered as socio-spatial settings related to urban environments and social practices. Performative planning for public space thus means more than physical design; it is also concerned with social settings and activities (Altrock and Huning 2015). This lecture unit commented on a potential cultural crisis of the European City. It took up Siebel’s third characteristic of the European City: the city as the site of an urban way of life that is shaped by the separation and polarity of public and private spheres.
European cities have faced a range of challenges in the realm of culture in the past. Although she wrote about the role of culture in US-American cities, it is worthwhile to consult the writings of urban sociologist Sharon Zukin (1991, 1992, 1995) in order to better understand these challenges. Zukin argued that culture has been incorporated into a new urban ‘symbolic economy’ since the 1970s. For her, deindustrialization and globalization have resulted in a dominance of market over place. By this she means that places tend to look more and more the same all over the world: they are designed for visual consumption. The symbolic economy is an economy that produces symbols to be marketed and consumed as commodities. It aims at the production of spaces as sites, and of an image-enhancing urban culture. What she has in mind are urban redevelopment projects to be found all over the world, such as historic waterfronts, gentrified quarters, iconic architectures and revitalized city centres. She concludes: “Culture is intertwined with capital and identity in the city’s production systems” (1995: 12).

Zukin expounds that the rise of an urban symbolic economy has led not only to a commodification of city landscapes but also to a spatial blurring of public and private spheres. This process has led to a liminality of urban spaces. With this term she names a process of transformation of urban space from one status to a new one for which no shared norms do yet exist. She states that in today’s cities we experience manifold liminal spaces that form a liminal public culture: “spaces that used to stand alone – representing ‘pure’ nature or culture in people’s minds – now mix social and commercial functions, sponsors, and symbols” (Zukin 1991: 38f.). The examples she gives for this are the redevelopment of Bryant Park in New York, where a “domestication by cappuccino” took place in the framework of a public-private Business Improvement District scheme, and South Street Seaport in the same city, where the removal of fish from the fish market made the redeveloped seaport a viable shopping and leisure place after all.

The lecture unit also portrayed Zukin’s famous work on the Disney theme parks which she regards as being the prototypes of both the symbolic economy and of liminal public space. Zukin argues that Disney theme parks illustrate the façade of power (by showing and marketing a nice façade of the corporate power of the Disney Company) as well as the power of façade (since Disneyland’s liminal spaces have by now become a model for urban public space, and even for entire cities, as the city Celebration near Orlando developed by the Disney Corporation illustrates). She observes that, in today’s cities, public urban spaces, such as parks and streets, have been gradually transformed into liminal spaces, such as shopping malls, entertainment centres and gated residential communities. According to Zukin, these liminal urban spaces are clean, secure and designed in a way that racial, ethnic, class, etc. differences are aestheticized and fear is controlled: “Learning from Disney World promises to make social diversity less threatening and public space more secure” (Zukin 1995: 52).

Adding to this, German sociologist Andreas Reckwitz argues that the strategic way in which current European cities approach culture has also impacted on everyday lives and self-perceptions of urban dwellers. He indicates that urbanites of today’s culturalized cities increasingly adjust their lifestyles to proliferating demands for ‘creativity’. According to Reckwitz, urban dwellers stage themselves as non-interchangeable ‘creative subjects’ and thus behave as individuals very similar to cities. While Zukin showed that the separation of public and private spheres have been replaced by liminal space, Reckwitz demonstrated how the urban way of life is marketized through the constant self-culturalization of urban dwellers.
This lecture unit consisted of three parts linking everyday urbanism (urban studies) to non-social movements (political science) and insurgent planning (planning theory): (1) While international public space research offers a plethora of approaches to adopt, appropriate and act in public space through changing everyday practices, (2) political science is currently discussing the theory of "social non-movements" that challenge the Western notion of social movements as form of civic self-organization in cities' public space through a focus on quite silent everyday acts of spatial resistance. The lecture will (3) establish a link between these recent ways of challenging architecture and planning education through the focus on the everyday dimension of urban space, and will offer an introduction into related strands in planning and design, that is, insurgent planning.

(1) In the past decades, alternative urbanisms including the power and features of everyday life have enriched the spectrum of public-space-focused urban design interventions (e.g. everyday urbanism, ordinary city, insurgent planning, insurgent public space, etc.). All these contributions stress the relevance of lived space dimensions for planning and architecture. Design within everyday space starts with an understanding and acceptance of the life that takes place there. This approach works against the grain of professional design discourses based on abstract principles, (quantitative, formal, spatial, or perceptual) as professional abstractions inevitably produce spaces that have little to do with real human impulses (Crawford 1999, 7-8). The everyday has as well been subject to social theory and philosophy, especially in French thinkers' works coined "Critique of everyday life" (Lefebvre 1947, 1961 and 1981), "Perspectives for the Conscious Change in Everyday Life" (Debord 1962) and "The Practice of Everyday Life" (de Certeau 1984). Lefebvre, Debord and de Certeau studied everyday life under capitalism as a way of Marxist critique, but also used the altering potential of this way of studying to induce and outline potentials for social change.

(2) In contemporary political science, everyday life and everyday practice has been reconsidered from a more worlded, global-South-leaning perspective: Bayat (2010) has analyzed how the urban subaltern (i.e. migrants, refugees, unemployed, underemployed, squatters, street vendors, street children, and other groups living their everyday life in conditions of (urban) informality) produce social change through quite silent everyday acts, which are often individual, not collectively connected. However, as economic globalization has steadily pushed more and more people into precarious living conditions and informality, the masses of people that change the world through more quiet everyday acts induce a social change that is different from how most of the urban movements in the Northern hemisphere work: "These masses of largely atomized individuals, by such parallel practices of everyday encroachments, have virtually transformed the large cities of the Middle East and by extension many developing countries, generating a substantial outdoor economy, new communities, and arenas of self-development in the urban landscapes; they inscribe their active presence in the configuration and governance of urban life, asserting their 'right to city'" (ibid., 15).

(3) Miraftab (2009) has revised Western notions of radical planning (referring to the works of John Friedman and Leonie Sandercock) by elaborating the concept of insurgent planning, thus introducing four aspects into a critical planning approach: (a) a critical analysis and understanding of the structural forces that marginalize and oppress people; (b) an understanding that a problem must be attacked simultaneously at multiples scales; (c) an objective to pursue both material and political rights through planning action; (d) an approach to engage state and state-like formations (ibid., 46, referring to Friedman). That way, the practices of insurgent planning acknowledge what the hegemonic drive of neoliberal capitalism tries to obscure: the potent oppositional and transformative practices that citizens and marginalized populations invent outside global capitalism’s definition of inclusion. Insurgent planning practices strip ‘democracy’ and ‘inclusion’ of their formalistic elements, recognizing the importance to counter-hegemonic movements of choosing their own ways of constituting their collectivities and their participation.
How can we develop a sense of care for what is absent and silent in public space analysis and cultural research? And why is this important? This lecture will offer three ‘crossovers’ between the fields of public space and housing research: (1) Public Space and Housing Activism Combined. The case of Spain (urban studies); (2) Silences and absences from public space and housing research. A feminist critique (political science); (3) Reestablishing spatial dialectics: Public space as relational counter space (planning theory).

(1) Cities in Europe witness an increase in urban inequalities which is visible and can be analyzed at the interface of public space and housing research. As a case study, the Plataforma de Afectados por la Hipoteca (PAH; Platform for Mortgage Affected People), a Spanish housing movement, will illustrate how the struggles and resistances to push for the right to housing and for public space to reinstitute democratic decision making in praxis have been successfully intertwined. As a consequence of the Great Spanish Recession and the global economic crisis of 2008, the financialization of housing affairs, a massive increase in unemployment rates and risky types of offering credits to consumers in unstable situations, many single and family households have lost their homes while entering in a circuit of indebtedness for live, mortgage burdens, foreclosures, eviction and dispossession. The PAH has brought seemingly private fates which produced feelings of guilt and shame out of the private realm into the public sphere through public space assemblies. However, deliberation in public space was not enough to get back space for evicted families, groups and individuals, so the PAH also went into the formal, legal and political channels to propose new types of social work (obra social) and to reclaim vacant housing stock that belonged to state-financed bad banks where all the risky credits had been accumulated. With that type of combined dialectical focus on city publics and city dwellers, their spatial practices and patterns of acting space, the PAH has not just analyzed structural causes, patterns and results of neoliberal urbanization resulting in the increase of precarious living conditions, poverty and discrimination, but they have also paved an alter politics: paving new ways to de-privatize assets that belong to banks that have been saved by public taxes. That way, the PAH has brought silences and absences that exist in the private realm into the public debate, and re-framed what was considered as individual and personal failure a structural problem of public concern.

(2) This section links to these empirical findings as it echoes a feminist critique to the concept of public space. Feminists rightly claim that public space debates often do not include the fates of those subaltern and marginalized urban populations for whom to become public in public space would mean a threat: this relates for example to a whole range of professions working in grey laboring conditions in the private households, such as nannies, housekeepers, gardeners, etc. Many of them are underpaid as their employees make use of their precarious and informal condition. This critique sheds a light on the private-public relation the other way round, as it criticizes the silences and absences in public space that get visible once we carefully analyze the ethnography and the living and working conditions of und(der)paid labor and reproduction in the private realm.

(3) The concept of relational planning stems from the family of approaches that coin public space as relational (Knierbein 2015). These approaches are about (a) transdisciplinary approaches to city making; (b) context-specific and people-centered urban development tactics and (c) social space based conception of public space and urban cultures as approaches to conceptually recover the lived spaces in the city; (d) a focus rather on ‘inclusion through action’ (performative, material) then on ‘participation through discourse’ (communicative, symbolic); (e) alternative development paths of planning and urban design activities beyond traditional capitalist modes of territorial urban restructuring (post-growth, etc.). Combining housing and public space research and relational planning that works with dialectical fields of planning action can support the public articulation of critique especially in favor of human rights and against structural conditions that increasingly limit the everyday lives of urban dwellers, both in the centers and peripheries, in housing units as well as in public space. Dialectical ways of enquiry need to be (re)established in order to analyze the absences and silences from public space in private space and the relations between them (and vice versa). A precondition for this type of research is a basic understanding of space as lived space.
This unit took up the forth aspect that Walter Siebel claimed to be typical for the European City: the idea of centrality and the interdependence of city and hinterland. It introduced the global city model that was mapped out by urban sociologist Saskia Sassen (1991, 2005). It reasons on new patterns of economic and spatial organisation of urban life that were induced by globalisation processes since the 1990s.

In her theory Sassen argues that the integration of cities in the world-wide economy has established new transnational networks between cities. She observes a new global hierarchy of cities that is no longer structured by ‘classic’ features such as city size or population but by the function that cities adopt in the transnational economy. Cities that succeed in acquiring central positions in this global network perform as economic and geopolitical centres. Among them a global network starts to evolve, which is why Sassen names them “global cities”. For her, New York, London and Tokyo were the leading global cities of the 1990s. They have since been joined by cities such as Dubai, Sao Paulo, Sydney, Mumbai, Johannesburg or Singapore.

For Sassen, global cities function as command and control centres of the globally interconnected (finance) economy. They are the locations of headquarters and perform as centres of management, coordination, service, legal, IT and/or finance operations that are needed to sustain international enterprises’ geographically dispersed networks. They are sites for the production of services and innovations as well as markets for the distribution and consumption of the latter (cf. Sassen 1991: 3-4). It is one of Sassen’s central arguments that cities that share the same hierarchy level resemble each other more in effect than cities on different hierarchy levels within a national territory or a region. At the same time she emphasizes that global cities are not just transterritorial nodes in the sense that they connect sites that are not geographically proximate. She insists that they are also place-centred. By this she means that many of the infrastructures and resources necessary for carrying out global economic activities are not hypermobile but deeply embedded in place so that the global materializes, and is acted out, in local places (Sassen 2005).

The strong relationship of global cities to place also implies their dependence on a local workforce. Following Sassen, in global cities we witness growing numbers of well-paid high-level professionals working in specialized finance and service firms, as well as growing numbers of low-paid workers (e.g. in manufacturing) and of low-profit services (e.g. catering, cleaning, childcare – tasks that are often performed by immigrants). Correspondingly the rise of global cities has perpetuated deep social divides in urban labour markets, as well as growing inter-urban and intra-urban inequalities. Ironically, according to Sassen, major cities have thus also become sites for the transnationalization of labour and of the formation of translocal solitary movements. The transnational grid of powerful cities therefore also warrants a networked terrain for political engagement and resistance (Sassen 2005). Sassen calls for scholars to investigate the multiplicity of presences and work cultures in (global) cities, and to look not only into the world of corporate cultures but also into the ways in which informal and low-income occupations contribute to the managing, servicing and financing of (global) cities, thereby sustaining “the work of globalization” (Sassen 2005: 32).

Coming back to the concept of the European City we see that the idea of the city as being an economic, political and cultural centre that is connected to its (national or regional) hinterlands can no longer be maintained. While in the past Downtown or the Central Business District constituted the centre, it may now assume, as Sassen shows, the form of a metropolitan area consisting of a regional grid of nodes connected by conventional infrastructures, or of a transnational centre that is constituted via telematics and intensive transnational transactions. The current popularity of world-wide city rankings that classify cities according to their economic, political, cultural or educational features is just one symptom of new complex global spatial hierarchies and entanglements that have involved new spatial orders, fortunes, contradictions and conflicts (Musil 2014).
This unit is an attempt to better understand that the current waves of urban protests are inherently linked to rapidly changing structural conditions and the decline of (national) democracies. It (1) offers an insight into the post-occupy struggles in public space against a new tech-led gentrification (San Francisco), (2) emphasizes recent political theory accounts that seek to explain the omnipresent democratic deficits of state governance and (3) establishes a link to what Purcell denominates as “counter hegemonic planning”.

(1) The city has long been the site of social and political struggles. As the manifestation of social organization, power, and politics, urban settings are also places in which those relationships are contested and sometimes overthrown. In 2011, urban resistance returned to the headlines of global news media through global incidents such as the Arab Spring protests and the Occupy Wall Street Movement.

In Brazil, rounds of Free Fare Movement protests joined by thousands of young people, students repeatedly forced the local governments to cancel the increase of bus fare. In Taipei, university students took over the country’s Parliament building and occupied it for 24 days in protest against the passage of a trade pact with China that would further erode the nation’s economy and democratic institution. Yet as well cities in Europe increasingly witnessed the resurgence of emancipatory struggles and practices of resistance: In Greece, Portugal, and Spain, the indignados movements organized demonstrations against austerity policies. In Stuttgart, protestors demonstrated against the redevelopment of the city’s main railway station by occupying the public park that would be vastly destroyed by the redevelopment. In Istanbul, citizens protested against the proposed urban design project foreseen for Gezi Park near Taksim Square by setting up encampment on the park. Yet there are even more recent acts of urban resistance visible. The case study of the google bus blockades in San Francisco, in combination with a case study on the market and state-led privatization of a football pitch in SF’s Mission District, in which tech-workers from the Silicon Valley are not just the new gentry to habit the houses where former communities of color (Afro-American and Hispanic-Americans) have been displaced through gentrification along the google bus routes, but also ‘hire’ a sports pitch which is part of the everyday life of young people of color, who grew up using the pitch continuously.

(2) The second part will dive deeper into explanations for the current pitfalls or market-and-state led governance regimes. Rancière for instance states that democracy is “not a political regime” (Rancière 2010, 3, cited in Lorey 2014, 50), nor “a type of constitution, [or] a form of society. The power of the people is not that of a people gathered together, of the majority or the working class. It is simply the power peculiar to those who have no more entitlements to govern than to submit” (ibid. 2006, 46-7, cited in Lorey 2014, 50). Democracy, in this sense, is the constituent power of “those who have no part – which does not mean the ‘excluded’ but anyone whoever” (ibid. 2010, 60, cited in Lorey 2014, 50). The demos corresponds not to a people, but “the one who speaks when s/he is not to speak, the one who part-takes in what s/he has no part in” (ibid. 2010, 32, cited in Lorey 2014, 50). With the reference to Rancière’s fundamental critique of representative democracy, Lorey (2014) expands on this thought as a critique of representative democracy as a form of bourgeois democracy by developing the concept of ‘presentist democracy’ which she claims has been practiced through the principle of horizontality in the recent civic uprisings globally. For her, the modern promise of coming democracy has remained unfullfilled, as the political democracy remains separated from an achievement of claims of social equality. For her the struggles taking place to achieve democracy (democrácia real ya!) take place in the ‘now-time’ (‘Jetztzeit’), but that does not mean they are untouched by the past. The now-time is specifically not a temporality that remains as an immediate presence, as an authenticity of body and affect only. It is constructive temporality, in which the slivers of history are newly composed, in which history persistently emerges. The now-time is the creative midpoint, not a transition of the past into the future.

(3) In this third part of the lecture, we will follow the argumentation of Purcell (2009) who asks how planners can best resist neoliberalization: Through communicative planning or counter-planning which supports the emergence of counter-hegemonic movements? He states that “democratic resistance to neoliberalism must explicitly and directly
challenge the foundations of the neoliberal project and argues that what planning requires is a democratic alternative not rooted in liberal or deliberative tradition (ibid., 141). That way, he denounces the first and well-distributed way of post-political planning as an art of governing that is rather a support (or a part) than a critique (or a counter-hegemonic project) of neoliberal urbanization, while concluding that planners must learn from counter-hegemonic movements’ struggles, and must make it their business to actively nurture them, for they offer us a way out of the wilderness of neoliberalism. Reclaiming power through political mobilization is our best hope for creating more democratic, more just, and more civilized cities.” (ibid., 160).
Lastly the status of the fifth feature of the European City, regulation and welfare, was addressed by looking into recent diagnoses of a social crisis in Europe. After joining the overall shift towards ‘austerity urbanism’ (Mayer 2013), most European cities have faced a spread of social movements that claim their right to the city (Harvey 2012). Political scientist Margit Mayer (2013) detected a deep social divide in these new urban protest movements. One the one hand, she explains, there are activities of middle-class subcultural milieus – artists, ‘creatives’ and squatters – that often contribute to gentrification processes by marking urban space as attractive. On the other hand there are ‘urban outcasts’ (poor or homeless people) who are most affected by austerity politics and social welfare cuts. Mayer observes that in contrast to middle-class movements their protests are less visible, less researched and more policed.

It is worthwhile to delve deeper into the current situation of the urban lower and middle classes to better understand the nature of their protests. In his work on the ‘underclass’ sociologist Klaus Dörre (2008) explains that, until the 1990s, poverty existed mostly outside tariff- and legally protected wage work. It was thus restricted to ‘marginal’ groups. In the current era of globalization and deregulation, however, poverty also hits those members of society that are integrated into the labour market. Rapid increase in sub-standard employment, expansion of the low-wage sector, and fading chances for upward mobility have led to poverty now often being the fate of skilled workers and academics. As a consequence, an urban precariat has emerged. It includes people who involuntarily work under temporary contracts, in minor employment, internships, one-Euro jobs or self-employment. They have little job security, little influence on their work situation, poor access to health or safety standards and struggle to earn a living through work, albeit being economically active. They long for stable employment but circulate between different subsidized and non-subsidized jobs, unemployment, social benefits and ‘activation measures’ of various sectors of government. Dörre concludes that we live again, like in the 19th century, in a situation where capitalism has recourse to a vast ‘reserve army’ of workers. He says that in light of eroding solidarities the social question is back on the (urban) political agenda.

If we devote our attention to the middle classes, recent writings of Cornelia Koppetsch (2013) come into focus. The sociologist found out that members of the middle classes in Germany all share a deep fear of downward social mobility. From surveys and interviews Koppetsch learned that bourgeois values of achievement orientation, modesty and social responsibility that were characteristic for the middle classes throughout the 20th century have faded out, giving way to an appreciation of competition, active distinction from the lower classes, open demonstration of wealth, and a siege mentality that is aimed at protecting social privileges. Koppetsch identifies conformity as being both the new mentality type and a coping strategy of the middle classes. By this she means that ‘investments’ in the body, education, the private sphere of partnership and family, and shifts towards conservative values are gaining currency. Members of the middle classes tend to stick with their kind, which is why an increasing number of them prefer to live in gated communities.

Coming back to the ideal type of the European City we see that the notion of the city as a collective affair, structured not only by capital, but also by bourgeois idea[l]s of social inclusion, has lost ground, giving way to class antagonisms. While the so-called ‘underclass’ is dispersed, the middle classes limit their solidarity to people of the same status and often stigmatize lower-class people as ‘lazy’, ‘unwilling’ or ‘social parasites’. Although counterexamples exist, most urban middle-class protests are not directed against political or economic structures but towards improvement of (their) urban quarters.
This unit introduces (1) the concept of the post-political thought in urban theory, (2) links it back to earlier thinkers who have stressed the importance of dissent and agonism to constantly revive democracies in practice and (3) outlines current strands in planning theory that work in the line of these new positions in contemporary social theory.

The lecture will give insights into a new book project titled Public Space Unbound (Knierbein, Viderman, forthcoming) that has been initiated through new innovative forms of transdisciplinary teaching the practice and theory of urban emancipation at the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space in 2014.

(1) Post-political thought has recently entered urban studies debates quite prominently through a publication called "The Post-Political and its Discontents" (Wilson and Swyngedouw 2015). These authors have stated that "the gathered insurgents have expressed an extraordinary antagonism to the instituted - and often formally democratic - forms of governing, and have staged, performed and choreographed new configurations of the democratic" (ibid., 3). They characterize processes of post-politicisation with the following aspects: (a) depoliticisation; (b) disappearance of the political; (c) erosion of democracy; (d) weakening of the public sphere; (e) politics of ethnicized and violent disavowal; (f) exclusion and containment of different political-economic models. While facilitating a transfer of core political theories on post-political thought to the realm of urban studies, they present three core thinkers of post-political thought, that is, Jacques Rancière, Chantal Mouffe and Ernesto Laclau (and differentiate the nuances of their positions). In summary, they state that "[i]n post-politics, political contradictions are reduced to policy problems to be managed by experts and legitimated through participatory processes in which the scope of possible outcomes is narrowly defined in advance. The people’ - as a potentially disruptive political collective - is replaced by the population - the aggregated object of opinion polls, surveillance, and bio-political optimisation. Citizens become consumers, and elections are framed as just another 'choice', in which individuals privately select their preferred managers of the conditions of economic necessity" (ibid., 6).

(2) The second lecture part explores the theories developed by Chantal Mouffe. As Mouffe (2000) has stated, liberal democracy has always been based on a democratic paradox between the liberal and the democratic strand of political thought: The paradoxical balance between freedom (liberal tradition) and equality (democratic tradition), which the Keynesian welfare state mode was still able to keep more or less, contributed to the fact that sporadic civil unrest would not gain global momentum or permanence during welfare-state provision, as the social material well-being was still secured in the Western world. Yet this paradox has been accompanied by another dilemma (cf. Purcell 2009, 144-5), i.e., liberal democracies have long been adept at managing and legitimating social inequality. Their characteristic separation between the public and private spheres allows them to claim the existence of a formal political equality even when manifest social inequality is present. Under Keynesian policies, that deficit was mitigated by significant material redistribution and the meaningful inclusion of organized labor in public decision-making (cf. ibid.). Yet those accommodations were central targets of the neoliberal agenda and were significantly eroded (Purcell 2009). As a result, actually existing neoliberalism has increasingly exacerbated this democratic deficit that has long troubled liberal democracy (ibid.). In her theories, Mouffe states that to keep liberal democracy alive, dissent needs to be cultivated within agonistic struggles (by adversaries), to prevent that political passions are misguided into extremist political forms of agonistic struggles (between enemies). Agonistic struggles are thus part of the constant renewal of the balance between equality and liberal thought, whereas antagonisms prioritize freedom over equality.

(3) Current modes of post-positivist planning, however, are heavily consensus-based, while dissent is not cultivated in planning schools (to foster a vivid balance of consensus and dissent to come to decisions). Yet formal participatory modes of communicative and collaborative planning have been applied that often tend to use consensus-building and majority-decisions, while (in)advertently flattening the contradictory voices (often of minority or marginalized groups) calling for a more radical and egalitarian democratic project and reality. As consensus-based liberal democracy has been criticized as a tool to silence out citizens and to leave reasoning about decisions to managers, politicians and experts in processes
of multilevel governance, this has strongly fostered process of de-politicization and post-political situations. Jean Hillier (2002) has thus been advocating a dissent-based conception of agonistic planning, and has simultaneously asked what Mouffe’s agonistic democracy would look like at an urban scale of decision-making. Agonistic planning acknowledges (a) that planning practice will always be agonistic; (b) that this recognition of agonistic reality is important; (c) that still some form of agreement or consent to an outcome of the debate will be needed; (d) that it is impossible to be sure that this (planning) decision will be good and just rather than unjust, racist, fickle, capricious. She proposes to rather accept and incorporate the messy reality of conflictual consensus (Mouffe) to revive democratic decision-making in agonistic respect, than to not acknowledge the fact that deliberation and consensus-building are also hegemonic tools of a current landscape of power that the neoliberal model strongly patronizes.
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1. Introduction
The European city is a specific urban formation that – in the same characteristic – appears nowhere else. Max Weber saw in it the birthplace of rationalism, capitalism and bureaucracy and defined five characteristics to distinguish the medieval European city, the “occidental city” from the rest of the world’s urban accumulations. More recently, Walter Siebel (2004: 12) named five characteristics of the European city. Not every feature can be found equally in every city in Europe. And only in their sum they describe that ideal type of city, which appears only in Europe. The ideological model thus includes the presence of a pre-modern heritage in the everyday life, the city as a place for hope and emancipation (politically, economically and socially speaking), a polarity between public and private spheres (in a social, functional, legal, material-symbolic and normative dimension), an urban-rural contrast (centrality, size, density, mix) and the influence of public administration (regulation and welfare). (Siebel 2004: 13-17)

All these characteristics are subject of the current social change. The characteristics change in their quality, lose their connection to each other or disappear entirely. It seems like the European city is losing its social base. (Siebel 2004: 18). In other words, the European city is in a crisis. Current challenges appear in each of the mentioned characteristics. The presence of a heritage is facing a ‘heritage crisis’. The place for hope and emancipation transformed as a political crisis. The polarity between public and private undergoes a cultural crisis. The urban-rural contrast is under an economic/spatial crisis. And lastly, the influence of public administration has to deal with a social crisis. It is striking that most of these crisis have some common features or sources, like the pre-eminence of private actors, big companies, capitalism and privatisation; or in other words: neoliberalization. This essay will focus mainly on the political but also on the cultural and social crisis of European cities and will analyse the urban resistance against increasing social inequalities. Afterwards in chapter 4 the paper gives some examples to undermine the theory and discusses the consequences for the population. At the end, the paper puts in question the current form of democracy and gives ideas of a new way in doing so.

2. Current challenges and transformations in cities
This chapter looks at the political as well as the cultural crisis inclusive their origin and consequences. Focus is laid on the shift from public to private actors.

The European city was regarded as a place of hope and emancipation. But the productive potential of the city as a place of learning and integration is at risk. The rise of the entrepreneurial came into being in the 1970ies with the change from Fordism to Post-Fordism. With this transformation, at least three parallel trends in the urban politics could be identified. First, a focus on proactive economic development strategies. Second, an increasing mobilization of local politics as subordination of social policies to economic and labour market policies. And third, the expansion of local political action to involve not only the local authority but a range of private and semi-public actors. (Mayer 1994: 317).

The political aim thus became to boost the local economy, create jobs and growth, increase the fiscal revenues, attract economic investments and (inter)national elites and tourists. This resulted in a development from government to governance. Strategies are amongst others the development of endogenous local potentials and the creation of Public-Private-Partnerships for urban development. (Hubbart 1998: 8 ff.)

"Alongside the new forms of public-private collaboration in economic development and in social service provision, explicit public-private partnerships have also emerged in urban renewal and urban physical development programmes. Faced with both tight budgets and increasing redevelopment tasks many city governments have explored new ways of planning and financing urban redevelopment. In order to upgrade their central business districts, to refashion old industrial sites and to develop attractive new projects, they have entered into partnerships with large investors, developers and consortia of private firms.” (Mayer 1994: 322)
Private and half-private actors were integrated in public planning and local decision making and it is getting harder to detect the boundaries between the private and the public sectors. As another result, one of the formerly central functions of the local state politics, the provision of collective consumption goods and welfare services, is pushed in the background. Furthermore, through the domination of private and economic interests, a loss of democratic control and intervention can be identified. Cities transformed from a place of hope and emancipation to a place of marginalization and exclusion. The polarity between public and private spheres is changing or even dissolving. This is related not only to a political but also to a cultural crisis. In the view of the legal dimension, one can find a shift in legal boundaries towards more privateness. Private shopping malls for instance restrict behaviour. Or in a bigger scale, there are entire towns under private law, such as the small town Celebration run by Disney Group. Deindustrialization and globalization have led to a dominance of the market over place. Places are designed for visual consumption and as a result they tend to look more and more the same – just imagine (private) shopping malls on the outskirts of cities. One can see a process of de-differentiation, homogenization, capitalization and beautification. (Zukin 1992).

3. Neoliberalization – who gains and who remains?
The massive signs of privatization can also be viewed from the neoliberal perspective. The neoliberal politics had their comeback in the 1970ies and their main argument is that a society functions better under market logic than under strong national state interventions. This idea was, among others, given weight by the elections of Thatcher and Reagan. Capital, private interests and competitive markets became the most important items on the agenda and the regulation of capital by the government was reduced to a minimum. (Purcell 2009: 141-142) But neoliberalization causes problems. It produces high material inequalities, because it rewards winners and punishes losers. The social inequality increasingly questions formal equity and thus produces a democratic deficit. As Purcell (2009: 144) states: "Their characteristic separation between the public and private spheres allows them to claim the existence of a formal political equality even when manifest social inequality is present. [...] One longstanding critique of liberal democracy is precisely that democracy demands a much more far-reaching notion of equality than liberal democracy allows."

A result from this agenda is the increasing control of capital over social life. The state sources more and more decisions out to the free market. Thus, powerful actors gain power to control the peoples’ fortunes and places. "The disciplinary forces of competitiveness and capital mobility give large corporations significant control over public policy. [...] [N]eoliberalization produces a democratic deficit because it transfers power from democratic citizens to corporations" (Purcell 2009: 144-145)

The outsourcing of governance comes along with privatization or semi-privatization. The state increasingly privatizes its functions of government, like urban development, and consigns them to private actors as corporations, private firms, private-public partnerships etc. Neoliberalism sees competitiveness as a good thing. But these new authorities are often not subject to any kind of direct democracy. "Citizens might have formal decision-making power, but their range of decisions can become so narrow as to not really be decisions at all". (Purcell 2009: 145-146)

4. Caution! Private property
This chapter shows examples and looks at private actors as city planners in different scales to undermine the theory above. In the second part the consequences for the inhabitants are summarized and discussed, followed by protest movements and brief part about “The Right to the City”. The crisis of democracy leads to new ideas of democracy, which will be briefly introduced at the end of this chapter.

New Potsdamer Platz, Berlin
New Potsdamer Platz in Berlin illustrates a typical process in the entrepreneurial city. Private companies (Sony, Daimler Benz AG) took over the development and design of the place in the framework of public-private partnerships. At the end, the companies did not stick to their original plans and the city lost control over the development process. Finally, all traces of history from after 1933 have been vanished from Potsdamer Platz in the course of the construction process. The remains from the history before 1933 have been preserved, but not according to monument preservation laws. Instead, they were cut into pieces and newly arranged by the companies. Population got informed, was invited to watch the mega project and to celebrate the new design of the urban quarter. But what got lost with this festivalization of the construction site was real participation; population could not involve or take part in the planning process. The city got a new design but lacked of options for democratic intervention and control.

Celebration, Florida
Even though not in Europe, it is worth mentioning and taking a look into the small US-American town Celebration in Florida. The city was built on the principles of “new urbanism”, like compact, pedestrian-friendly and mixed-use
neighbourhoods, walking distances to activities of daily living, few traffic, transit corridors, diverse population, resource efficiency or a job-housing balance. Furthermore, “Cities and towns should bring into proximity a broad spectrum of public and private uses to support a regional economy that benefits people of all incomes. [...] Streets and squares should be safe, comfortable, and interesting to the pedestrian. [...] A primary task of all urban architecture and landscape design is the physical definition of streets and public spaces as places of shared use.” (CNU 1996)

Even though Celebration cannot fulfill everything the “Charter of the New Urbanism” states, it is regarded as one of very few examples of “New Urbanism”. The town was planned and built entirely private, namely by the Disney Corporation. There are long waiting lists for the houses and a selection process limits the population. There is a pattern book where ‘clients’ can choose their preferred house type. To guarantee visual unity, the inhabitants have to stick to rules regarding the house paint, curtains, lawn, plants, garden care, car size etc. The aim is to be attractive for families, to create cozyness, prevent criminality, to ensure cleanliness, healthcare and education. As a result, we can see a clear process of homogenisation, both in the built environment as well as for the people, who are all of the same social type.

As in the example above, private investors got active in city planning. Also in Celebration, this comes along with restrictions for the population. There exists a community association, but people have no chance to vote. The town manager is appointed by the Disney Corporation and proposals of the community association may be turned down by a Disney veto. This is a clear loss of democracy.

Business Improvement Districts, London

Another development that can be observed, particularly in London but also in cities in mainland Europe, are the “Business Improvement Districts” (BIDs). The concept originated in Canada in the late 1960s. BIDs are demarcated, mostly inner-city neighbourhoods, which are managed by private, commercial operators for a certain period of time. All companies in the area pay a fixed tax contribution and gain, in return, the full decision on the use of the space. The BIDs take care of the public space, its cleanliness, waste collection, security, etc. The only condition is that the space must remain accessible to all. The city is thus saving money by placing administrative tasks in private hands. For the operators it results in improved marketing, the business community has control of the streets and the quality of the public space can be improved. As a result, security services often increases and surveillance cameras are increasingly being installed. Often it is prohibited to skateboard, roller skate or even eat, drink or take pictures in BIDs.

Even if this is done under the cloak of safety, there is also a clear disadvantage for the population and the city, which can no longer take part in decision making processes. A problem that could be seen here is that the BIDs are spreading and taking over larger parts of cities. Only certain groups gain the advantages, others are excluded. (vgl. Peclaner and Zehrer 2008; Laborey 2013)

“Tech Boom 2.0”, San Francisco

The last two examples are again not from Europe, but they show in a very exemplary way the processes of privatization and gentrification as well as the social inequalities and resistances that occur in the city. Manissa Maharawal (2017) analyses struggles over public spaces and the fight for urban commons on the basis of two examples, the “Google bus blockades” and the altercation at Mission Playground. The observed enclosure of public space is not unique to San Francisco, it is an indicative of neoliberal entrepreneurialism in urban governance that privileges corporate investment and real estate development above all other interests (Brash 2011, cited after Maharawal 2017). The conflicts over public space in San Francisco are happening within the context of the so called “tech boom 2.0”. These particularities relate to the political economy of the technology industry in the region (Silicon Valley) and its use of the city as a testing ground for new privatizing technologies, which are often at the margins of legality. (Maharawal 2017)

The “tech boom 2.0” is related to a rapid gentrification in San Francisco in the last few years. The city became more expensive and unaffordable particularly for the Black and Latino residents and those with lower socio-economic backgrounds. Subsequently the share of these population group declines, while the general population of the city is growing. Also homelessness and evictions increased, while the tech boom precipitated a building boom in the same time. As a reaction to all these issues, the residents developed movements and protests, to fight for the maintenance of the urban commons. Particularly the Mission district, a traditionally low income neighbourhood, has been hit hard. In this district many of the key political struggles, protest actions and everyday altercations have occurred and it is also the area where the two case studies have been analysed. (Maharawal 2017)

The first one is about the Google bus blockades. It is common that technology companies like Google, Apple, Facebook or Microsoft use private buses to pick up their employees in San Francisco to take them to their jobs in Silicon Valley. What is crucial is that these private tech shuttles use the public bus stops. The remaining population feels excluded and complains that the private buses slowed down the public transportation system. “A common refrain from the residents in the city’s Mission district was the sense that the technology industry was taken
over the city’s public spaces, building exclusionary private transportation infrastructures and flouting laws while doing so.” In the same time a socio-spatial impact of these privatized transportation infrastructure occurred, as there was a clear increase of displacement and eviction along the tech shuttle routes. (Maharawal 2017)

Finally a group of 40 people showed resistance and blocked a large Google bus from continuing its way. This was only the first of a series of bus blockades as a sign against the take-over of the city by the tech industry. The protest aimed to bring attention to the tech-led gentrification and the government’s collusion in the process. The protests against privatization of public infrastructure soon made national and international headlines as a symbol of the gentrification and displacement caused by the technical industries. (Maharawal 2017)

The second case study related to the San Francisco’s tech-boom is about the Mission Playground soccer field. This field has usually been used by a young, mostly Spanish speaking community from the neighbourhood. The boys felt save there and always played after the seven pick-up system, which is open to join for everybody. This worked out well until a group of tech employees arrived with an official paper claiming that they had paid for the use of the field. The new group with the paper-permit for the field tried to kick the youth out of it. But they refused, claiming that they have lived in the neighbourhood their whole life and the field has always been used for the seven pick-up games. One of the boys filmed the discussion and the video quickly went viral in internet. (Maharawal 2017)

Finally community groups and politicians got involved and “the conflict was transformed from a momentary altercation in public space into a media storm in the public sphere, and ultimately into a political debate about public space, dispossession and belonging in the city”. Maharawal (2017) furthermore states:

“This particular conflict over the use of public fields, and the permitting system that has facilitated their privatization, is the continuation of a citywide struggle over the charging of fees and generating of revenue at San Francisco’s parks and public spaces. […] [R]esidents and community groups […] saw it as a move away from treating parks and open spaces as vital public assets, maintained with public tax revenue, towards treating public space in the city as privatized goods that are dependent on wealthy donors, pay-to-play, licensing revenue and […] increasingly leased to private organizations.” (Maharawal 2017)

In both examples, as well as in the three ones above, parts of the population got excluded, precluded from something or restricted in their behaviour. Previously public or non-commodified spaces were transformed into (implicitly) privatized spaces (Maharawal 2017). Private interests and the pursuit of profit are replacing democracy and social just. The consequences will be further analysed in the following chapters.

Discussion of the consequences

In the examples above, Celebration is the exception. Even though a whole city is under the power of one private player, the residents moved there by choice. People knew before moving there that the town is managed by the Disney Corporation. They basically voluntarily give up their democratic rights in order to have a structured environment surrounded by people of the same social type living in the same model houses. In the other examples the cities transferred parts of their functions to private actors without asking the population that already lived there. As one can see in the example of Berlin, even the city lost control over the project and the residents had no chance to raise their voice against the mega-project including demolition of cultural heritage. A similar situation can be found in Business Improvement Districts. The city gives the right to the BID, run by private property owners and businesses, to develop the district. Even though it is meant to improve the environment, the residents neither have a voice to vote whether for or against installing a BID, nor to being part of the decision making processes regarding the implementations of new actions. As seen in the examples of San Francisco, it is a specific social group that gathers in one city. Big technology companies but also the existing environment for small start-ups attracts a vast number of tech employees, which are mostly young, educated, white men. The tech companies and employees, even though maybe unconsciously, started a process of gentrification and cast out parts of the original inhabitants with a lower socio-economic background.

But not everybody accepts these changes without resistance. Protest movements like demonstrations or blockades are no rarity, as seen for instance in the example with the google bus blockades. Resistance starts at a small scale like in the Mission Playground, but it can quickly increase to a global issue, as the 2011 occupy movements. Cities have always been places of social protests, but Andrej Holm (2011) found in his research about urban protest movements that there was an overall increase of local citizens’ initiatives in the last years. What is striking to see, that, for the first time, many educated citizens participate in the protests (“revolt of the middle classes”). They demand, for instance, a better quality and provision of communal public services and infrastructure, they protests against displacement, or for more open spaces in the cities. Urban protests in the entrepreneurial city are directed against new contents and objectives of urban entrepreneurial politics (that attract investors, elites, tourists, etc.) as well as against new forms and styles of urban policy (like festivalization or
public-private partnerships). The movements are directed particularly against urban policies that put commercialization and profit strategies on the top of the agenda (i.e. profit of investors, building companies, banks and parts of the political class). (Holm 2011; cited after Frank 2016)

The urban protest movements unified under the slogan “Right to the City”, which can be traced back to Henry Lefebvre in 1968. The right to the city claims the right to non-exclusion from the qualities and provisions of the urbanized society, and the right to the collective re-appropriation of urban space by social groups that are marginalized. The right to the city includes, according to Lefebvre, not only the use of urban spaces, but also access to political debates on future urban development paths. (Holm 2011; cited in Frank 2016)

**Recommendations for real democracy**

Different authors have already discussed the emerging issue about a new form of democracy (see e.g. Rancière, Lorey, Purcell). Lorey for instance developed a concept of presentist democracy in the way of common self-governing as practising equality through horizontality. The concept is a form of direct democracy, but it involves more than this. It is “an instrument of the constituent power of the indefinite demos that is ‘the power to undo all partnerships, gatherings and ordinances’ in the logic of the unified ‘One of collectivity’ and ‘the distribution of social ranks’” (Rancière 2009, cited after Lorey 2014: 11). Horizontality is an instrument of self-government; it seeks to break through existing hierarchies in making collective decisions. It involves social regulation, new forms of organization and subjectivation. Horizontality is not entitled to gather everyone in the same time, but rather to create a social place where people feel empowered to speak or to take part in common challenges. It seeks to create a space for heterogeneity and multiplicity, in which privileges and inequalities can be consciously dealt with. It is based on affirmation, as empowering, with social inclusion as a principle. Horizontality is not the end or the goal itself, but rather “only a means in a process of common self-government, of organizing, which does not revert to the logics of political representation and state institutions”. (Lorey 2014: 13)

Purcell (2009) in contrast states that communicative and collaborative approaches are not the best to confront neoliberalization. In his view, radical counter-hegemonic mobilizations are more promising, because their goals are not to neutralize power relations, but to transform them. Purcell claims that a strategy of counter-hegemonic struggle is required to achieve a transformation of existing power relations. “For planning, that transformation requires counter-hegemonic planning practice that can destabilize the current hegemony and establish an alternative one”. (Purcell 2009: 158)

5. Conclusion

To sum up, the essay showed how different developments are leading to various crises in the city. The former “European City” according to Max Weber or Walter Siebel does not exist anymore in its original form. Rather we face transformations that lead to heritage, political, cultural, economic and social crises. Amongst the biggest problems are neoliberalization and therewith the process of privatization. As the examples in chapter 4 illustrated, with the ongoing privatization in urban development issues, parts of the population get excluded, precluded from something or restricted in their behaviour. More and more public or non-commodified spaces are transformed into privatized spaces and the inhabitants have no voice in the process. Private interests and the pursuit of profit are replacing real democracy and social just. Consequently, raising inequalities and dissatisfaction with the ongoing development are leading to more and more urban protest movements. The predominant democracy nowadays is not working anymore for everybody. More and more people or whole groups get marginalized and excluded. Thus it would not be adequate to speak about real democracy. Consequently, if democracy is not working anyway, we should seek a new way of democracy, of real democracy. Cities should not prefer the system of liberal justice to social justice. There is probably not THE solution against the crises, but a first step would be to listen to the peoples interests, to their demands and their right to the city.
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“I’ve learned that people will forget what you said, people will forget what you did, but people will never forget how you made them feel.”

- Maya Angelou

Since the end of the 20th century one particular question always came to the mind of planners: “How to include people affected by planning into the process of decision-making?” While the origin of participation lies in urban activism and was fought for by people, we experience today that since the first modern urban movements a lot has changed. With the rise of Neoliberalism not only the distribution of power and decision-making changed but it also changed social movements as well as the structure of our societies. This text will follow urban social movements in the first world from the 1960’s to now and look at how planning adapted to different developments. Margit Mayer’s article “First World Urban Activism” (Mayer, 2013) will provide a framework for the text giving a more detailed background to how those two approaches developed alongside political and social developments of the time. The conclusion of this text is an attempt to find solutions to issues inherent to planning and to include the aspects of affect and experience into the toolset of urban planners by looking at game design principles.

First Wave of Urban Mobilization (1960-1980)
The first urban social Movements this text will focus on arose in the 1960’s. Mayer describes the motives for those movements as “triggered by the norms and standardization of the Fordism- Keynesian city, its functional zoning, suburbanization, urban renewal and the ‘in hospitability’ of urban spaces [...]” (Mayer, 2013:6). They also challenged the partly more authoritarian and bureaucratic methods that municipalities at the time used. The demands were more participation in decision-making processes as well as better (social) infrastructures. Those movements where mainly composed of the youth, students, migrant workers and, depending on the location communities of marginalized people of colour. And although there were a lot of different movements at the time, creating what Mayer (2013) describes as “vibrant infrastructure(s) [...] and a host of [...] self-managed projects”, which ultimately spawned different (local) organisations, these movements more or less acted independently from each other. Mayer again describes this as a schism between the culturally- disconnected and people who where excluded from the system.

Later, in the 1980’s, when the first wave of neoliberalism and austerity policies hit, local governments had to cut their budgets. They started to open up towards those movements by approaching them in cooperation. The policy at the time was to transform “protest into program” (Mayer, 1987). This allowed the authorities to ‘outsource’ some of their tasks while giving certain movements more stability and influence on decision-making. This ultimately changed urban planning approaches towards more communicative and inclusive approaches but also led to a divide between the now established movements and groups whose needs where not addressed (Mayer, 2013).

The Communicative Turn and Communicative/ Collaborative Planning
The communicative turn emerged within that socio-economic context of the 1980’s. Its aims can be summarized as “collective decision making with the participation of all those who will be affected by the decision or their representatives [and] decision making by arguments offered by and to participants who are committed to the values of rationality and impartiality.” (Elster, 1998: 8). This notion defined the discourse of urban planning theory as well as practice. While there has been a lot of debate concerning several aspects of communicative planning the general paradigm was widely accepted and rarely discussed (Tewedwr-Jones, Allmendinger, 2002:206). In the conclusion of their book “Planning Futures- New Directions for Planning Theory” Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger describe that with “[...] the collapse of the comprehensive-rational approach in urban planning theory, [...] it is not surprising to hear the claim at the present time that there is a new paradigm emerging around which both academics and practitioners can unite.” They also point out the vague nature of the theoretical term “communicative turn” as, in their opinion, “there is not one turn but a multitude of approaches that focus on such a level of generality as to preclude detailed analysis and practical application.” (Tewedwr-Jones, Allmendinger, 2002:213).

Although there is a multitude of different approaches to communicative planning Healey
society” (Luhmann, 1982:253-255).

1. ‘getting started’; meaning that somebody, a group, an institution, planners, etc. decide who might have a stake in a certain matter, and also when and where, also meaning in which ‘arena’ that process might take place.

2. ‘routines and discussions’; this is related to three different aspects namely: style, language and representation. Style refers to style of language, sensitivity to cultural differences as well as room arrangements and questions of who is speaking when and so on. The aspects of language refer to Habermas’ “theory of communicative actions” (Habermas, 1981) while representation means that everybody should be able to partake in the discussion either directly or via representation.

3. ‘making policy discourses’ refers to a process or mechanic to filter and structure information, arguments, opinions and so forth. This is very often the most obscure part of communicative processes, as Healey herself doesn’t give a definitive answer on how a strategy can emerge from such a process. (Tewdwr-Jones, Allmendinger, 2009:212)

4. ‘maintaining consensus’ revolves around the question on how to implement the agreed on policy into formalised institutions.

But there are some fundamental issues with this. Healey (1997) describes the context of collaborative planning as: “[...] a democratic enterprise aimed at promoting social justice and environmental sustainability.” But is it? At its core the communicative approach to planning resembles arguably more of a competition for the best argument in disregard to majorities, votes or general opinion. Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger even describe it as “[...] either a suspicion of or a more balanced attempt to situate free-market economies: [...]” (Tewdwr-Jones, Allmendinger, 2009:214). They also argue that the collaborative and communicative turn as a whole should be considered more of “a world-view based on a participatory perspective of democracy” rather than a theory. Tewdwr-Jones and Allmendinger also go into more detail on their concerns for planning practice, discussing the role of the individual planner, their attitude and suspicions towards more participation as well as the sometimes not very democracy-friendly institutional environment with which they are confronted. It’s reasonable enough to ask our selves as planners in the wake of the current political crises and the frustration of the people with our democratic systems whether we are actually adding to democracy or diluting it down, fostering what Luhmann calls a “centreless society” (Luhmann, 1982:253-255).


In the 1990’s the trend to incorporate formerly critical movements into the policies of Neoliberalisation continued. The idea was to “transform [...] urban conditions into local assets useful in the intensifying interurban competition” (Mayer, 2013:8). Mayer describes that former ideals of social movements like autonomy and self-reliance were transformed into civic engagement, in the sense of private or market driven actions, aimed at individualisation and competition. During this time neoliberal-governing techniques like private-public-partnerships emerged. While protest against these policies as well as against the waves of gentrification, which accompanied them formed the existing, now professionalized community-based organisations were more and more absorbed by the local authorities that they were opposed to in their beginning.

With the dot.com crash in the early 2000’s and the stagnation of growth rates and wages new policies were implemented that effectively replaced many states’ well-fare with a workfare System, for example Hartz-IV. This led to even stronger social divides as, together with the flexibilisation and transformation of many jobs, more people were thrown into precariousness. Especially youth, students, creatives and parts of the lower middle classes now started to struggle. But although recent austerity cuts, like the ones that followed the financial crisis of 2007-2008 now affected even more people there is also a big social fragmentation, which made mobilisation for unified urban movements more difficult. Mayer (2013) explains this through the rise of creative city policies, as "local authorities nowadays eagerly jump on (sub)cultures [...] in order to harness them as location-specific assets [...]." In other words, creatives or sometimes even countercultural activists are given access or leave to appropriate spaces in deterring neighbourhoods. As those spaces get charged with cultural capital they are given to investors that transform it into economic capital resulting not only in gentrification but also creating a divide between different movements, as local authorities implemented inclusive and repressive strategies at the same time (Mayer, 2013: 11-13). While a lot of cultural movements now struggle with being instrumentalized, more political movements, especially when fighting for the rights of more marginalized groups are facing more and more repressive measures, policing and disenfranchisement. Additionally different interest groups are pitted against each other. Mayer also argues that one of the main problems are the different experiences that divide different movements: "But even before accounting for differential forms of state repression, [...] we have to recognize the huge distances in terms of cultural
and everyday experiences between comparatively privileged movement groups and the ‘outcasts’ [...]. The reality of those different experiences creates all kinds of hurdles for connecting their shared interests in contesting neoliberal urbanism.

This lead in the early 2010’s to new forms of urban movements like Occupy, Indignados or the Gezi Park movement. In contrast to former urban movements in the first world they did not only protest against Neoliberalisation and Austerity cuts but “[...] they also invented, practiced and consolidated-at least temporarily- new common spaces for socialisation and political action, thereby sparking a new radical-democratic process” and furthermore “[...] expressed new progressive visions of the appropriation of urban space and the production of radically socializable spaces.” (Mayer, 2013:13). Although these movements created a lot of attention and gained traction within the population rather fast they did not impact the actual politics of Neoliberalisation very much. However after the encampments were dispersed a lot of activists joined local movements and expanding into the neighbourhoods and communities, bringing the gathered experiences with them. Mayer again describes that those cooperations first caused a lot of internal struggles but often led to different divisions to be bridged (Mayer;2013:14).

In his article “Taking Up Space: Anthropology and embodied protest” Sheehan Moore (2013) explains the reasons for what might be called a “carry-over effect” as follows: “Occupations and similar forms of protest [...] rewrite the parameters of those spaces and allow us to participate, feel and hope differently, even if only briefly. When it’s over, we might be ‘haunted’ [...] by what was made possible during those minutes, days, or months, even as the immediate causes of the occupation fade from memory.”

In summary the successes of the recent wave of urban movements lies in their strategies to put action before discussion, emphasising embodiment, experiences and affects. As discussed this leads to the phenomena that these forms of protest don’t focus as much on engaging a political discourse but rather on creating and opening up new spaces to allow new possibilities to emerge. As before I want to analyse how some of these approaches are carried over and implemented into planning theory by looking at the performative turn in human geographies and the implementation of affects into analysis and planning.

From a Communicative to a Performative Turn in Planning Theory

In the 1990’s the idea of using performance as a tool to analyse everyday encounters was adopted by human geographers. The term performance has its roots in the connection of theatre theory and social sciences and was first developed by dramaturge and university professor Richard Schechter back in the 1960’s.

In their paper “Intercultural Interaction and ‘situational places’: a perspective for urban cultural geography within and beyond the performative turn” Dirksmeier and Helbrecht (2010) write that “[...] performance implies a notion that action is also symbolic, public, as well as social. With its emphasis on practice accompanied by a symbolic and communicative dimension performance can help to analyse the affectivity of human action”. Affectivity or affects were most famously defined by Spinoza as two parallel developments, namely the mind’s power to think and the body’s power to act. This includes not only reason but also what is described as passions and emotions. In reference to Spinoza’s Hard summarized this as”[…] both our power to affect the world around us and our power to be affected by it, along with the relationship between these two powers”. (Hardt, 2007:ix). So affects can be interpreted as actions as well as passions and as Spinoza writes his idea of an ethical and political project involves a constant effort to transform passions into actions. Hardt later adds to this that “The greater our power to be affected (…) the greater our power to act.” (Hardt, 2007:ix).

This implies a shift in human geography away from representationally oriented approaches to everyday experiences and interactions. It is argued that: “[…] on the one hand it allows framing the research process differently and on the other hand gives space to address new questions […]” (Dirksmeier, Helbrecht, 2010:40).

So how can these concepts be implemented in urban planning? In their contribution to the book “Public Space and Relational Perspectives- New challenges for architecture and planning” (2015) Altrock and Huning use Martina Löw’s approach to relational space as the foundation to their approach, which can be summarised by characterising public space as: “relational arrangements of living beings and social goods” as well as “the simultaneous practice of placing (groups of) human beings and things and, on the other hand, the need to link together objects perceived/seen to form space” (Löw, 2006:120). They then define ‘performative planning’ as: “[...] planning activities that do not follow the traditional means-ends logic of planning as the production of place, but focus instead on planning itself as performative practice aiming to set the stage for multiple interventions by a variety of stakeholders, citizens and artists.” (Altrock, Huning, 2015:150)

To further underline this they present two case studies from shrinking cities in eastern Germany.
The projects presented were part of the 2010 IBA in Saxony-Anhalt which relied on artistic and temporary interventions into public space with the aim to raise awareness of current issues and to activate the local inhabitants to engage in public space and spatial matters. In both case studies, which were located in Aschersleben and Magdeburg, the planning environment could be characterised by “an extreme loss of vibrancy and of perspective” putting planners in a position where “Instead of having to mediate and build consensus between competing interests, planners face a lack of private [...] engagement in urban development, and frequently find themselves as the only agents holding any stakes in it at all.” (Altrock Huning, 2015:148). In both cases artistic interventions in public space were used effectively to activate local actors and institutions starting a process of private engagement in urban development as well as controversy and debate altering the general state of both cities. In reference to Brückner (2010) they argue that “performative planning exercises often lead to long lasting involvement by civil society, which either individually or collectively takes over responsibility for stabilising achievements.” (Altrock, Huning, 2010:160).

This is made possible by directly involving the inhabitants by changes in their immediate environment contrasting the often very slow and abstract processes which can be found in more traditional communicative and collaborative planning, thus leaning towards a more affective approach.

But there are some inherent flaws with the concept of performativity. Going back to the performative turn in human cultural geographies Dirkmeier and Helbrecht point to the unstable nature of performance studies as they are reliant on everyday encounters, which are per definition temporary, swift and the actions analysed are rooted on a subconscious level. Performatve planning on the other hand struggles with the problem of having very little to no theoretical basis of it’s own. The big difficulty, as mentioned, lies in the consistency of such approaches and the inherent danger of merely creating mere spectacles that again might fuel gentrification or creative city policies. Altrock and Huning argue that maybe liberal arts could be an answer to create a theoretical framework, or at least different instruments and approaches but in the end resort to saying that such an approach can only be taught by practice. But looking at their interpretations of the projects one can see that it merely describes the results of performative planning and looking at the performance itself rather than looking at what causes the people to engage in performance and bodily action and in doing so creating a shared experience that is so essential to many recent social movements.

Conclusion

Looking at the different approaches of current social movements in comparison with performative planning projects there is one key similarity. Both approaches revolve around the principle of taking action first, creating a shared experience for all people involved. By doing so ideological or political differences as well as interests can be put aside at first to later, when there is already an established commonality, remerge to give variety and creating different branching groups that are merely connected by a shared experience rather than by institutions or organisations. As discussed this allows to gap differences between the everyday experiences of different social groups as the core of those experiences is far less defined by actual political involvement or protest but by everyday actions and tackling challenges of self-organisation, of protesting not in a political sense but by simply living differently.

For performative planning this should be the central focal point: creating experiences that show what is possible and that stay or ‘haunt’ participants as Moore described it when talking about the student protest at McGill University. To not empower them politically, as we as planners and even official governments at the moment struggle for power over decision-making, but to give them the feeling of empowerment and to show that their actions matter and can have an immediate impact.

But how can such strategies be implemented in planning, where we work with much more rigid frameworks and restrictions? An argument can be made that if we as planners want to implement performance into our field we need to think outside the box and look at how other disciplines and professions deal with questions like this. For the affective turn in human geographies they looked at theatre theory and adopted several principles. But in contrast planning is far less scientific as it is our job to make decision and only use analysis as basis for our work and the fact that we always operate under a condition of incomplete information.

Geographer Nigel Thrift defines performance as “the art of producing the now” (Thrift, 2000:577) and “engineering the moment” (Thrift, 2003:2021). This is where parallels to game design arise, as this is a field that revolves solely around the question of creating (shared) experiences and engagement. In his Book “The Art of Game Design- A Book of Lenses” Jesse Schell (2008) describes the relationship between a game designer, games and experiences as follows:

“Ultimately a Game Designer does not care about Games. Games are merely a means to an end. On their own they are just artefacts- clumps of cardboard and bags of bits. Why is this? [...] When people play games they have an experience. It is
this experience that the Designer cares about. Without the experience, the game is worthless.” (Schell, 2008:10)

It can be argued that the same logic applies to planning. Because what is a plan, like a Master plan, which is not necessarily legally binding, worth when nobody interacts or engages within the planning? When there is nobody that experiences the changes? This is also true for performance in planning. But for this we as planners need to shift our perspectives as not the performance itself is so important but the experiences we offer to participants.

For example in MMORPG (Massive Multiplayer Online Role Playing Games) there are several design principles that can open new perspectives for planning as well. As these games rely heavily on player cooperation to overcome different challenges designers use the term of “social difficulty curve”. The idea of this principle is that cooperation with others might be frightening for many players, especially when they just started the game. From a game designer’s perspective this problem can be solved by giving the player time to explore the game on their own terms first, before slowly introducing cooperation mechanics. This is done in a way that it is not necessary in the early stages of the game to cooperate but it gives you just a little bit of an advantage until the players are comfortable with interacting with total strangers and start to embrace it, allowing them to open up a whole new facet to the game.

“Bartle’s Taxonomy” is a study that looks at player behaviour. The central question of the study was “For what reasons are people playing this game?”. The result of this study was a categorisation in four different kinds of player types. Each type has different expectations about their experience and is interested in different aspects. They also influence the number of players in other groups as synergies and antagonisms come to play. As a lot of games struggled with one group outnumbering another the easiest solution is to give new incentives for the other player types to counter that imbalance.

The last principle that I want to shortly address is the question of how to balance complexity, meaning how much rules a player has to understand in order to play, and depth, meaning the number of meaningful choices that emerge out of a rule set. A game that has high complexity but offers little to no depth in how the player can make use of what he learned is resulting in extremely frustrating experiences as the learning process is just not worth the effort. Depth on the other hand is, per definition always desirable, but more depth also requires more complexity. Balancing those two principles is key to designing a good game and forces a game designer to always question how much they ask of their audience and what they can provide them with in return. All of those principles are designed to create engaging experiences and to make sure that nobody gets left behind by not giving the player a feeling of being overwhelmed by certain difficulties or challenges.

Looking at the recent history of communicative planning from a game design perspective it can be argued that it is a history of frustration, of slow moving processes and abstract strategic discussions that are not only excluding people without certain skills but are solely focussed on what the authorities or the planners think is important, ignoring the expectations, motivations and skills of the people they participate. In the terms of game design we very often create participation processes that are either extremely complex and offer no depth or processes that are very shallow altogether. This communicative approach is, if seen from this perspective, nothing more than pitting different people together in a room until they reach some sort of result, which in our current ever-changing times often can’t or won’t be implemented. This is because local authorities are very often either not interested or lack the effective means to do so. Even worse is the focus on a competition for the best argument within an arena, as described earlier, because it can also mean that certain groups are being played out against each other or miscommunicate intentions, albeit they might have similar aims. It is effectively implementing what human geography calls post-politics; a System or ideology that is designed to foreclose political movements outside the capitalist or neoliberal consensus. Also looking at the guidelines provided by Healey we can argue that they already resemble a game, but without considering as such anybody cares to declare what the actual rules are to this game and who decided on them. To stay in the terminology used; it’s a rigged game. And the only way to win a rigged game is not to play it. So what options are there?

I would argue that in performative planning we as planners need to make sure to design planning processes that are first off giving everybody equal opportunities, not only to speak out but to get comfortable with the matters at hand. Secondly, we should make sure, that, paralleling Bartle’s Taxonomy, we design processes that are engaging to people. This is important as we rarely consider what people can bring into a process beside their everyday experience, which although sometimes very helpful to us as planners, might not be what people expect out of or want to bring into a participation process. Although we live in times where individualisation is a key part to our societies but in planning we still treat all people we engage in planning as more or less the same, when in fact
there might be people who can and maybe want to bring their skills into the process but are kept from doing so by discussion on topics which are chosen by local authorities and planners. The last point I want to make is in regards to the balance of depth and complexity. I want to argue that it would be our job to break down complexity to help understand people affected by planning what is going on. But also, maybe more importantly, we urgently need to balance that high complexity with a certain amount of depth. This might be achieved by giving people the feeling of each process that they achieved something and that the time and effort they put into it was worth it. Looking at the more recent social urban movements this can be accomplished by overcoming small challenges. This is important as only by letting people achieve even small victories, you can create what Moore referred to as 'haunting feeling of what was made possible'.

The last thing I want to address is the question of how to implement performative planning into planning education. This is probably the strongest argument I can make to support this theory; teach students how to create a game. For example, let’s make a studio where the only task is to come up with a game, like a board, card or social game. By doing this, students can understand how the rules they create affect people and what sort of experience comes out of that. Using methods like game testing, where you just observe how people play your game and for example try to exploit some rules you didn’t formulate well could teach you a lot. Not just about games but also on how to create experiences and ultimately, at least in my opinion, how to be a better planner.
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1. Introduction
Saskia Sassen introduces the concept of a ‘global city’ in her paper from 2005. She explains that whilst world cities, defined by international trade, have existed for centuries the concept of a global city is contemporary and a result of recent developments of deregulations, digital innovation, privatization and the growing number of national economic participants in the global market. The global city follows, but redrafts, Walter Siebel’s definition of centrality as a characteristic of the European city as the urban-rural contrast becomes even more apparent. Whereas the city and the rural have been traditionally interdependent - existing in symbiosis - contemporary and global cities are increasingly integrated into, and dependant on, world-wide economies. One of the key points defining a global city is the demand for high-level specialised professionals and high-profit specialised services which, according to Sassen, contributes to an increased spatial and social inequality in such urban environments. This paper will look into solid examples of global cities, such as London and San Francisco, in order to establish relationships between Sassen’s concept of international urban settings, developments in information technology and problems of gentrification and social inequality. Naturally, the paper will also briefly examine theories of reworking current democratic societies, and discusses urban activism against inequality.

2. The Global City: Centrality in a New Form
Centrality, the urban-rural contrast is according to Walter Siebel one of the five characteristics of a European city. The city is the centre for the political, economical and cultural activities and provides a density of people, interactions with ‘strangers’ and innovation. However, this attribute of centrality has in the recent decades taken a new form. Whilst the urban and the rural interdependence still exist, some contemporary urban environments are much more dependent on other, foreign, urban locations; cities such as London and San Francisco, in order to establish relationships between Sassen’s concept of international urban settings, developments in information technology and problems of gentrification and social inequality. Naturally, the paper will also briefly examine theories of reworking current democratic societies, and discusses urban activism against inequality.

But it has also enabled other cities to increase their significance on the global level. The economic activity has increased as a result of globalisation which allowed corporations to grow significantly - to an extent where they compete with national governments as power holders (Sassen, 2005). The globalisation and the growth of multinational corporations have also increased demand for skills to manage the various aspects of cross-border trading and capital flow. Central management departments strategically locate themselves in global cities; functional spatial environments which have significant resources for such economic activity. Significant corporate headquarters often develop a need to manage all sides of the growing international business; services such as accounting, PR, legal representation are thus being subcontracted by one central office. In addition to the demand for expertise skills comes also the need for a non-expert work force to cater for the activities and service requirements of the professionals. This influx of highly-skilled and non-expert workers into global cities such as London and Amsterdam has resulted in a growing income gap (Musil, 2014).

Spatial Effects: Decoupling and Distance Neutralised
With global city theory an idea of spatial rearrangement arrives with it; distance is neutralised and cities that are ranked as global actors are becoming increasingly similar to each other, and decoupled from their national economies. Some urban regions have taken a position such as financial or IT centres in a worldwide context and a large portion of their capital flow occurs with similar global cities. Technology allows information and financial flows to be electronic and occur instantly, thus cutting the distance between cities such as London, New York and Tokyo.

Also the physical distance of these places tend to contract as technological development spurred by demands for economic growth. As for instance, flight tickets have become more available to the general (mostly Western) public over the last decades. Further basis to the idea that cities worldwide are becoming closer and increasingly similar to each other is established by the Globalization and World Cities Research Network (GaWC). GaWC has produced research on hierarchy of cities and produced a ranking based on the cities’ network connectivity and their integration into the global economy. This has put cities such as...
London and New York or San Francisco and Vienna together (Globalization and World Cities Research Network, 2012).

After the economic instability and crisis in the late 2000’s further research has been conducted on the notion of decoupling of the European global cities and their respective national state. An empirical study by Musil shows that several of these cities have indeed had a stronger growth performance than the national results of such, further decoupling the city from its surroundings.

Despite these indications, however, most European global cities had a growth similar to the national figures hence the theory of decoupling is not universally applicable in this sense. In his study cities are categorised according to the type of capitalism and economic system in their respective national states. Here Anglo-Saxon cities, with tendencies towards liberal macroeconomic arrangement, showed a slightly stronger economic growth than the national average. Scandinavian cities, on the other hand, indicated a smaller growth than the national trend (2014, Musil).

“The global city particularly has emerged as a site for new claims: by global capital, which uses the globalcity as an “organizational commodity,” but also by disadvantaged sectors of the urban population, frequently as internationalized a presence in global cities as capital.”

(Sassen, 2008)

Social Effects: Whose City is it?
The notion of a global city and its effects on mobility and work force also demands a discussion of the social aspects of this development. As mentioned, the cities that grow into environments for international trade requires manpower and thus the cities are also enormous job markets. The income level of workers may differ significantly depending on the position they hold or work they carry out. Low paid workers carry out services for the high income takers. Related to this, it is argued by Sassen that the social polarisation in global cities has increased as a result of the economic activities and that it has an effect upon urban and spatial forms. She writes “The global city particularly has emerged as a site for new claims: by global capital, which uses the global city as an “organizational commodity,” but also by disadvantaged sectors of the urban population, frequently as internationalized a presence in global cities as capital.” Whilst recognizing that the city has always been a site for inequality cities have now introduced a new and more serious form of polarization that is accompanied by homelessness, large income gaps and job insecurity - also among the middle classes. (Sassen, 2008). When international investors are a significant group of actors, and the cities compete with other cities in order to attract financial capital, it tends to affect urban space; city branding, mega events, or attraction of creative industries require space.

In a dense urban environment this frequently leads to the redevelopment and ‘washing’ of areas considered unpleasant and rundown – areas that are home to the marginalised citizens of the city (Musil, 2014). This is especially true if the locations are near to the city centre or near key attraction points such as stadiums. However, forcing the already economically challenged population out of areas is to further marginalise them. The very direct effects of such actions include possibly creating longer commutes to work locations, removing long-standing local businesses - or less perceptible implications such as eradicating the sense of value in society and/or belonging.

3. The Global City Exemplified

Both London and San Francisco are cities of the global typology that are affected by increased inequality and the privatization of spaces and homes that previously have been provided by the state. The cities have successfully managed to profile themselves on the global market and whilst large financial headquarters often are attracted to the business climate of London, San Francisco is home to multinational tech companies such as Dropbox and Apple. The two cities will be used to discuss how the globalism and the quest to reach an international crowd of developers and investors contribute to a new form of urban social and economical inequality.

Mission Playground is Not For Sale and San Francisco’s Tech Industry

With the development and potential of making profits from information technology certain cities have developed into large hubs of knowledge and skills in the field. Namely locations such as San Francisco and particularly the adjacent Silicon Valley have profiled themselves as regions where IT businesses can be provided with both the highly-skilled labour and the innovative environment required for economical growth. For the prospects of large capital flows this niche is great news for a city like San Francisco, but for the marginalised citizens of the city the effect of such profiling has had negative effects and recent urban resistances have made this issue evident. The local term “tech boom 2.0” describes the urbanization issue in San Francisco and the massic eviction that has flushed through the city. Whilst Silicon Valley is the home to global IT companies, a significant portion of the immigrated high-income technology employees have their living arranged in central San Francisco. In 2014 an urban conflict received particular attention; local teenagers and corporate employees were seen arguing about the use of a football field, in the Mission district, which the corporate employees supposedly had rented. The field had up until recently, however, been a public provision in
Although this is a sparse example of affected areas, it has largely been home to the Latino population in San Francisco (Mahawaral, 2016). Although lately the number of Latino residents has decreased as a result of an increase in demand and prices of property. Also, the number of evictions is growing and the San Francisco Anti-Displacement Coalition (SFADC) claims it’s a crisis where the number of cases is higher than in over ten years. The main bases for the evictions are “no fault” or “low fault” by the tenant and the coalition hints that the surge in evictions overlap with a sharp rise in property prices. (The San Francisco Anti-Displacement Coalition, 2015). This housing crisis has lead to a surge in homelessness, but simultaneously the city has introduced new anti-homeless policies. The entry of tech employees and the forced exit of low-income Latino residents in the Mission district is just one example of how a sudden concentration of capital may influence urban public spaces. Alan Badiou writes: “Let us call these people, who are present in the world but absent from its meaning and decisions about its future, the inexistent of the world.” He means that the national state has various resources of diminishing people into the realm of the inexistent, such as refusal of legal documents or raids on train stations (Badiou, 2012). These reductions of the existent seem to also appear on the San Francisco property market. According to SFADC there are weak regulations for landlords producing false or exaggerated allegations for evictions, making it difficult for tenants to fend themselves against unfair contract terminations. (The San Francisco Anti-Displacement Coalition, 2015).

Just One Gear on My Fixie Bike: the New Population of London’s Council Estates

Paul Watt examines the issues accompanying the desires to attract foreign investment and cleaning up urban environments in order to appear more attractive to international capital holders. Whilst London as a global city is strongly subjected to social and economical inequality, it is clear from Watt’s article that whilst inequality exists it should not show. In the run-up to the Olympic Games, hosted by London in 2012, the city underwent a number of large state-led regeneration projects mainly in the East areas of the city. East London has a long history of being home to the working classes and ethnical minorities and does not benefit from a similar financial prosperity of other boroughs in the city. It is an area dense with social housing but recently it has been strongly impacted by gentrification. In the article from 2013 Watt mentions the influx of “middle-class gentrifiers” into areas of London Fields and London Docklands, although this is a sparse example of affected areas. Social housing estates, such as such as Clays Lane Estate, Carpenter’s Estate and Heygate Estate are often deemed too expensive to refurbish by local councils, and thus regeneration plans are introduced as a method of dealing with the deteriorating state of post-war dwelling units from the 1960’s and 1970’s. These types of projects tend to receive some level of opposition from the residents; the disruptive effects on the sense of community and unethical social cleansing are common arguments used against the regeneration processes. Furthermore, the Right to Return policies are questioned and there is a general sense that the measures will not benefit the local population. The key issue addressed in the article is the use and dedication of urban land in order to provide for the Olympic Games of 2012 and young Londoners with uncertain living arrangements express their frustration over the large quantities of land and state funding not being used to provide new units of affordable housing instead. The Olympic village and an adjacent shopping centre were built on large grounds in Stratford, East London, providing facilities for tourists, international sport teams, and media (Watt, 2013). This is directly linked to Mayer’s point about neoliberalisation of urban governance and the investor-driven upgrading of urban environments.

Services that used to be more open, often public and affordable are becoming a target in the course of continuing the competitiveness on an international playfield and anyone who is trying to undermine the desired economical exchanges is sought to be displaced or transformed and restructured into the neoliberal system and way of living. This conflict regarding urban land and urbanization often leads to the poor, who suffer from income insecurity and financial challenges, to eventually give way for private-property rights (Mayer, 2013). David Harvey explains the phenomenon; “Urbanization, we may conclude, has played a crucial role in the absorption of capital surpluses, at ever increasing geographical scales, but at the price of burgeoning processes of creative destruction that have dispossessed the masses of any right to the city whatsoever.” He also explains that historically these collisions between social groups have a tendency to end in revolt. However, it is highlighted that the issue of urban processes are much more complex due to the current global scale of the topic. Despite the fact that there are frequent revolts and calls for change on a local level around the world, these urban forces are yet to connect in a more global way for them to have a significant impact. Harvey states that, in order for the dispossessed to take back control of their right to the city, broad social movements have to occur and demand “democratic control over the production and utilization of the surplus” (Harvey, 2012).
4. Achieving Equality Through a Different Democracy

The commodification of urban life in the interest of the few (i.e. property owners and developers) is a sort of “democracy-cum-capitalism”, as Eric Swyngedouw names it. In order to challenge this existing adaptation of democracy and to achieve consensual urban design the polis has to be reclaimed by the inexisten. Swyngedouw writes that this requires the enacting of the polis and revolves around redesigning the urban as a political field for disagreement. Referring to Rancière, he states that the political is not about consensus and preservation of order; a political field is characterized by conflict and variations in opinions - the true form of democracy. However, urban activism, even when radical, often fails to properly undermine the constituted order as such opposition is often expected. (Swyngedouw, 2015). Purcell supports this statement: “...neoliberalism seeks to actively to co-opt and incorporate democratic resistance.” (Purcell, 2009).

The alternative is the announcement of rupture and disagreement to be carried out through collectivised spaces designed for the commitment to equality. A political idea requires a place or localisation, if you like, to emerge and establish itself. The place offers unity and enables a small crowd that is representational of many to contract and exist in an intense state of being. (Swyngedouw, 2015) Isabella Lorey also touches upon the concept of democracy and Presentist democracy, in particular. This, a contemporary understanding of democracy, explains an idea that democracy should take place materially and in the moment, in contrast to current political systems of, as for example, direct democracies. As the name indicates, this type of democracy is less bothered with defining a future agenda but is more about breaking free from past domination-type of programmes. This political idea, however, is not merely bound to a space at a given time in the form of public demonstrations by large crowds. It can also occur at as a way of long-term non-political living and as self-government of the not unified masses. She explains that the practice of unifying ourselves and others into homogenous groups based on race, gender etc. is a method of domination in the current democratic system as it forces us to accept discriminatory identities in order to be noticed. Presentist democracy builds on the idea that people arrange themselves in a heterogenic, non-identitarian manner to resist categorisation and to move towards a democratic system characterised by true equality (Lorey, 2014).

5. Conclusion and Discussion

The recent developments in information technology have increased the speed of capital flows internationally and certain cities which have managed to grow a niche in the global market have benefitted from huge influxes of capital; both of the financial and human kind. This has had certain effects on the spatial forms and several of the European global cities today have more in common with cities across other continents. In both San Francisco and London urban space has been redeveloped for the benefit of the international market; in order to host the Olympic games and to provide recreational facilities for corporation tech workers. These processes are often allowed or even initiated by the state. However, the increased attention from the international market has lead to increase property prices and thus also a growth in interest from developers and investors. Marginalised city residents with financial difficulties may be more inclined to give up their presence in the attractive urban spaces. Furthermore, the interventions from neolibertarian forces usually account for urban resistances as they appears in its current form. The urban activism, even when radical, is not able to break the current systems of power as it still exists within the institutionalised borders by adhering to the labels and groups assigned to them. Scholars in sociology and urban planning such as Swyngedouw and Lorey argue that democracy in its current form need to cease to exist as it is fails to provide social and economic equality. Taking a leftist approach they argue that the current foundations hold up and nurture the wealthy few. Presentist democracy is introduced and explained as a solution to the existing order of inequality. It encourages heterogeneity and as Lorey puts it; the becoming of “whatever many”. It is distinguished from the traditional representative democracy and the liberal thinking which generates tension between social inequality and political equality (Purcell, 2009). Current urban planning is largely characterised by communicative methods. Purcell means that its an attractive way for neoliberals to maintain domination but also political stability. It creates the appearance of meeting multiple interests, but in truth it only encourages capital and not people. An interesting aspect that he discusses is the coming together of people, not to claim rights to accumulation as per the neoliberal values, but to claim other rights such as to inhabit the urban space or to maximize use value, as opposed to exchange value. It is a valid point as current claims in urban activism are often defined within the capitalist structures. To establish new values would indeed mean to resist current hegemony, but it is my opinion that both need to be able to co-exist in order to achieve what is real democracy where all types of needs and interests are catered for.
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THE (SMALL SCALE) POLITICAL IN A GLOBALIZED CONTEXT.
TAKING A LOOK AT VIENNA’S DANUBE CANAL

Clara Rosa Rindler-Schantll

1. Introduction
"Conflict in the city, as it reveals the ‘absence’ of politics, points to the need - as Swyngedouw and Wilson (2015: 215) put it – for a ‘re-politicization in depoliticizing times.’" (Gualini et al., 2015)

This essay will look at tensions and problems of the entrepreneurial city concept impacting the everyday life of citizens. By bringing together two different unit topics, it attempts at developing an understandable roundup and cross-disciplinary views on current challenges of the European city, by combining Walter Siebel’s writings and further literature. On the following pages I will look at examples of smaller-scale political actions that face the bigger context of neoliberalization and examples which are directly associated with the concept of the entrepreneurial city. For this I will focus on the Vienna Danube Canal, which winds right through Viennas city centre, that only recently, in the last decade, gained importance for inhabitants and city planning departments. Overlooked for a long time, much like the adjacent second district, the canal today is a very diverse and highly contested space. As an 8km long strip of recreational public space waiting to be revived, the Danube Canal started to be contested by businesses, residents, clubs, graffiti makers and various other users. With its accessibility, its green spaces and the generous boardwalks on each side it presents itself as a perfect recreative spot for residents as well as tourists. Adding to the complexity of the space, the Danube Canal features a transnational connection point with the docking station of the twin city liner, connecting Bratislava and Vienna.

As globalized and local politics don’t meet expectations and needs of the communities, various conflicts arise and communities or smaller groups are becoming active. On the following pages I will attempt to show demands raised from politics, businesses and users on the everyday spaces of the Danube Canal. I’ll look at the concept of the entrepre-neurial city, neoliberal activism and how they interact, respectively antagonize, one another. This essay, rather than raising the claim to produce new thoughts and insights, merely is an attempt to further work with, understand and deepen my personal knowledge about some theoretical approaches discussed in the lecture “Strategies and intervention of the produc-tion of space: The European City: A Conceptual Framework in Crisis”. While Margaret Crawford writes about a new attitude towards urban design on the first pages of her book “Everyday Urbanism” (Crawford, 1999), which pays attention to the city rather than thinking about it in abstract and normative terms, this concept stands in opposition to the „new urban politics” Phil Hubbard and Tim Hall write about in the Introduction of “The entrepreneurial city”, which describes how cities are increasingly run like businesses, constantly looking for economic development (Hall, and Hubbard, 1989). The Danube Canal was in a critical state to being privatized step by step but through civic involvement and petitions as well as official measures of planning departments, consumption-free zones could be defended in the recent past. In her article „First world urban activism”, concerning the neoliberalization of urbanism, Margit Mayer addresses not only the entrepreneurial city but also new forms of movements performed frequently by the middle-class of privileged Western citizens in the global north. This article is a crossover of the two selected unit-topics while much of this essay relates to the situation in Vienna and the Danube Canal. After looking at the concept of the entrepreneurial city, neoliberalist forms of activism I will focus on the Danube Canal on different scales.

2. The entrepreneurial city
"During the 1980s and 1990s a number of writers have been sketching the contours of a new kind of Western city. This post-industrial, postmodern metropolis is depicted as being dramatically different from its predecessor, with its revitalized city centre of gleaming offices, high-tech transport nodes and secure, privatized (sic) shopping malls surrounded by a veritable archipelago of elite enclaves, fragmented neighborhoods and ‘edge’ cities (Soja, 1989; Knox, 1991; Zukin, 1991)." (Hall, and Hubbard, 1989)

According to Phil Hubbutt and Tim Hall, local governments show “... characteristics once distinctive for businesses - risk-taking, inventiveness, promotion and profit motivation ...”. In post-fordism, with growing globalization, a change from government to governance happened. Cities increasingly had to develop local potentials and needed to assert themselves special and unique characteristics. “Neat models of urban structure, many of which could be traced back to the pioneering work of the Chicago school of the 1930s, have thus come to appear as increasingly anachronistic within this
seemingly geographic city as spectacular new urban forms out-of-town retail parks, waterfront developments, heritage centres and so on - change the nature of urban spatiality” (Hall and Hubbard, 1989)

Hall and Hubbard argue that these changes of cities appear with a change on how cities are run. A shift to more outward-oriented policies, cooperations with the private sector and more and more being financed by new actors. As cities are increasingly run like enterprises, the macro scale gets important. Advertising cities and trying to climb various city rankings leads to festivalization of public spaces and a decrease in small-scale local politics, only to mention examples.

To achieve capital accumulation, cities need to find marketing strategies that make them attractive, get them high rankings in international comparisons and that attract businesses and tourists. When looking at Vienna, a rapidly growing trend of festivalization is recognizable as the dissertation of Gerhard Hofer, about the festivalization on cities using the example of the Viennese townhall square, shows in depth. As there’s a city-run advertisement company behind that strategy in Vienna, the trend doesn’t stop here. Also the Danube Canal is used for city marketing more frequently and appears in various rankings like best city beaches or tourist attractions. Just recently The Guardian ranked the Danube Canal number five for the best urban beaches in Europe.

3. Neoliberal urbanism

Every insurgent action, social and non-social movement and mobilization is unique in it’s cause, interests, contexts and needs to be looked at separately. “Since seminal work by Castells (1983) and Feinstein (Feinstein and Feinstein 1985) paved the way for understanding urban mobilizations as phenomena characterized by context-specific and particularistic features and as expression of defined by local political subjectivities and claims, several critical contributions have addressed the emergence of forms of mobilization in cities in connection with contradictions generated by the neoliberalization of urban policy and by the „urbanization of injustice”. (Gualini et al., 2015)

Further, as Gualini states, we need to be cautious and need to avoid a „romanticization” of resistance, as it frequently happens in research and everyday discussion. Of course resistance has always been part of urban society and Mitchell remarks: “The idea of public space has never been guaranteed. It has only been won through concerted struggle ... it is always in some sense in a state of emergence, never complete, always contested.” (Mitchell, 2003). “From the perspective of urban movements, the neoliberalization of first world cities presents a contradictory set of changes. On the one hand, it has led to intensifying social fragmentation: the upgrading of central areas has curtailed public space, and has exacerbated polarization and displacement, while the recent austerity cuts have been hitting not only the already disadvantaged, but increasingly youth, students and more segments of the middle class. On the other hand, it has allowed concessions and offerings to those movement groups that may usefully be absorbed into city marketing and the locational politics that municipalities everywhere are now tailoring to attract investors, creative professionals and tourists. The interplay of both of these tendencies is at the root of the disparate makeup of today’s urban activism, some of which—in European as well as North American cities—is trying to make this disparateness cohere under the label of „right to the city”. (Mayer, 2013)

In Margit Mayers „First world urbanism” she addresses an interesting aspect of contemporary urban movements, the movements performed in a neoliberal context mostly by the middle-class. The aims of those middle-class activists, artists, students etc. are heterogenous but share the force to „defend their accustomed quality of life” (Mayer, 2013). Yet these movements are rarely inclusive in terms of participating groups, marginalized groups are rarely represented in contemporary movements. Neoliberal urbanism, not really insurgent or rebellious actions, appeared and rather performs within the rules of politics of neoliberalism but at the same time fails to look at basic conflicts and the disparancy between themselves as privileged users and the growing advanced marginality of others. But not only the social milieu of movements should be of more interest, but also the political milieu the movement comes from.

This article, in response to architectural ”narratives of loss” lamenting the disappearance of public space, argues that urban residents are constantly remaking public space and redefining the public sphere through their lived experience. Following Nancy Fraser, this article questions the insistence on a unified public, the desire for fixed categories, and the rigid concepts of public and private space that characterize the bourgeois public sphere and proposes contestation, competing “counter-publics,” and the blurring of private and public as equally significant aspects of the public sphere. In Los Angeles, the struggles of two “counterpublics,” street vendors and the homeless, over use of the streets and public places reveal the emergence of another discourse of public space, suggesting new forms of „insurgent citizenship” and offering new political arenas.” (Crawford, 1999)
4. The Danube Canal

The discussion about the Danube Canal is very polarized, while some link the area to trendy beach bars and restaurants, there’s also the connotation of conflict. Often people get the picture about the canal as a space of fears, criminality and drugs. But of course there is a much higher complexity when looking at the canal as just a black and white categorization of different uses and perceptions. Being known for a music club and a the biggest legal spraying spot in the country the canal also hosts a growing number of bars and restaurants. But the canal is also a space for arts, street art, sports, communication and last but not least it is a very big non-comercial space which has no fixed usages assigned but is highly inclusive. Further it is also a space of arrival with the docking station of the Twincity liner. Therefore the space right and left from the water is highly contested and in the middle of multiple interests clashing. The developments on the canal are slow, every change seems like it has been discussed thoroughly and Viennese residents watch closely what the city plans for spots on the canal. Many different actors with even more different aims and interests clash on these kilometers. But, whose interests win, who are the actors involved and what are those interests and whose interests weigh more in the end?

In this chapter I will take a look at a recent petition "donaucanale für alle" that achieved to get in the way of a new beach bar opening at the canal as well as the official position of the city of Vienna towards the danube canal, including the "Donaukanal Partitur", which won a competition of the City of Vienna for further plans for the canal with the very central element of a non-development plan. With a social movement creating pressure on the local authorities, the petition "donaucanale für alle" achieved in exactly what Margit Mayer wrote on Post-Fordist City Policies: “Instead of hanging on to ‘old-fashioned’ large-scale, nationally oriented strategies, Instead of demanding unspecified third sector or community representation, social movements will need to use their own card within the structure of the new bargaining systems. Since urban governance has become based on the representation of functional interests active at the local level, and since the local authority has to respect to some degree the particular functional characteristics of the other actors involved in the new partnerships”, and since all the involved participants control resources that are necessary for the policies to be effective, even social movement groups have a real basis for negotiation. Bilt ‘negotiation’ may be a mild term for the struggle at hand. The emerging post-Fordist regime, with the new social modes of regulation including the new forms of urban governance described in this chapter, may function with some temporary stability, but it poses enormous long-term problems of social disintegration. The emphasis on economic innovation and competition, and the subordination of all social programmes (sic!) to these economic priorities, will tend to produce deep divisions in society and threaten the decay of civil society (which, of course, in the long run causes difficulty for economic stability). Given emerging increasingly polarized class relations and the fragmented local situations, social movements need to mobilize to create pressure on the local authority, first, to develop strategic plans that make every effort to avoid social segregation and marginalization, and, second, to use the resources of large private investors to meet local social and environmental needs. If they manage to seize the opportunities and spaces provided by the new, fragmented political arrangements, they may yet influence the concrete shape of the post-Fordist development path.” (Mayer, 1994)

Official guidelines and the petition „donaucanale für alle”

The master plan for the Danube Canal was published in 2010, it defines the necessary frame for a controlled development. In 2014, Gabu Heindl won the competition of the City of Vienna to create a design guideline for the Danube canal, the „Donaukanal Partitur”. After that, the City agreed to follow both the Master Plan and the „Donaukanal Partitur”. In studies previous to these guidelines, the urban sociologist Cornelia Ehmayer got clear results on wishes by residents regarding changes on the canal. The interviews showed that the residents wish for no to very small changes and developments on the canal but want a limit on gastronomy and want it to be mainly for recreational uses. One central element of interest in the Donaukanal Partitur is the non-development plan, which clearly defines the areas.

In May 2015 a petition called “donaucanale für alle” (Danube Canal for everybody) got submitted to the City of Vienna, concerning a big development project on the canal called „Sky and Sand”. The private investor was in the process of being admitted a large space, opposed to the music club Flex, to open yet another beach bar with 800 seats. The petition demanded: “Hands of the Danube Canal meadow”, it further demanded to stick to the plans the city agreed on as well as participation for big new developments on public and central spaces. As one of the last bigger green spaces on the canal, the area was meant to get privatized. In the master plan for the area, the specific area addressed by the petition is classified as a consumption-free zone (see figure 3 the biggest area marked in the middle). Another specified remark on the area in the master plan is that this side, the “sunbank”, is specifically meant for recreation. These controversial spatial politics started to be discussed, a political awareness by residents emerged.
The petition got a lot of publicity and raised awareness for these matters across the borders of the canal. The organization around the petition started to organize events in this area such as public lectures, discussions, open-air cinemas and much more. The bicycle movement “critical mass” officially expressed their solidarity. Finally, in January 2016, the city officially stated that the project “Sky and Sand” was rejected for multiple reasons.

“In the last decade, a variety of local mobilizations have emerged in response to controversial spatial policies, interventions and projects, both when determined by local decision-making and planning or supralocal initiatives.” (Gualini et al., 2015)

5. Conclusions / Questions
The mobilization at the danube canal is much like the phenomenon Margit Meyer addresses as First world urbanism. The contemporary urban movement was a movement by mostly middle-class participants. Meyer states quite harshly that these form of movements will remain meaningless when not addressing basic conflicts in society.

“Otherwise, even where urban struggles succeed in preventing or modifying crass neoliberal urban development projects (as was the case in Hamburg), they will remain meaningless as long as they do not address the basic conflict between privileged city users on the one side and growing ‘advanced marginality’ on the other, which has become so defining of cities of the global North.” (Mayer, 2013)

Nevertheless, the petition still shows a political action, possibly performed by people who haven’t so much participated in public politics. A network of more or less like-minded people arose which was soon used for more than just the petition, but for discussion rounds and other public gatherings. One further needs to look at the transformative potential this network holds. Like in the next quote by Martin in Gualinis article, place identities are created that enable collective action.

“In the process, place identities’ may be constructed as ‘place-specific frames’ for collective action: based on selective, but shared, experience-based understandings of collective interests which can stimulate collective organization and mobilization (Martin 2003).” (Gualini et al., 2015)

While many people, officials as well as residents, want the canal to be more representative, there seems to be a strong protective instinct by the Viennese inhabitants. Many different opinions concerning the space exist and also many of politicians, planners and residents that don’t want a sleazy danube canal. But what comes with beautifying and privatizing this very unique urban public space? And while movements like the petition „donaucanale für alle“ succeed in averting neoliberal development projects, the possibility to act political in these contexts are exclusive for many residents at the same time.

“Conflict in the city, as it reveals the „absence“ of politics, points to the need - as Swyngedouw and Wilson (2015: 215) put it - for a „re-politicization in depoliticizing times.” (Gualini et al., 2015)

The spaces of the danube canal are therefore, speaking of current challenges for european cities, right in the middle of public and private as well as they are torn apart inbetween being spaces of hope and fears. The actors interested in these spaces for various reasons, face each other both symbiotically and antagonistic. The danube canal finds itself right in-between globalized city marketing, neoliberal activism and the everyday.
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Introduction

Migration is seen as a main topic that was, is and will always be part of the world. People are moving from one place to another for different reasons. Settled at a new home they become citizens of this chosen/or not chosen place with everything that comes with it. All places have different traditions, cultures and a heritage which are all part of the whole arrangement the new citizens have to deal with.

The first example in this essay will show the dispute over heritage of Berlin’s African Quarter. This will lead to a discussion about questions like who is seen as a citizen, who is allowed to make claims about heritage and whose city is it? Further the heritage of the European City will be discussed as the decisions made in the past are influencing the current situation.

Migration or better said mobility of people is also a part of a globalized world. In addition this also includes factors of the daily life like time, money and space. There are even more factors like race and gender that are not very often considered when talking about globalisation. In this sense it is also an issue to take a look at the places where these factors are visible in the daily life routines of people and through this as Massey (1991) puts it have “a global sense of place”.

Zooming in at a local level people of the everyday life get visible, therefore this will be the focus in the third chapter. Ordinary people with their daily routines, struggles and concerns. In this context the Everyday Urbanism comes to the foreground, an urban design concept that investigates on these lived experiences that we all know very well and because they are being part of it, ordinary people can be seen as experts.

Also the so called “social nonmovements” are noticeable at a local level. These kind of nonmovemments are visible in the everyday life and as example for this migration to the global North will be given. This entails the “quiet encroachment of the ordinary” as this is seen as overcoming the struggles of new residents to achieve a better life in their host state.

The last chapter before the conclusion will be about ‘insurgent planning’ and its main aim being justice, which will be linked to all the other topics. In the conclusion, a short connection of all the given theories will be made, followed by a discussion.

1. Heritage

Heritage is visible in all spaces and shapes main parts of a city. Vienna is known for its old buildings in public places that can be divided in different categories like religion (Stephansdom), law (the houses of parliament), politics (townhall), amusement (opera and Burgtheater), etc. These buildings are all very well known in Vienna and one cannot imagine a Vienna without it. In addition to this, monuments and statues are chosen to remind different eras and are linked to positive or negative stories that form the basis of the history.

Besides, there are also street names that have the same effect of reminding on the happenings of the history. History shapes the city and also the people who are living there, as they are confronted with it in their everyday life and in public areas. The main point here is that for example not all of the street signs are linked to people with positive associations, which leads to a discussion that is not only about renaming streets, as the following text from Engler (2013) about the colonial past of Germany will show.

Dealing with Berlin’s African Quarter

The debate started with a proposal about renaming ‘Mohrenstraße’ that was proposed from Christoph Ziermann (local assemblyman) in 2004 in Berlin. This debate led to a discussion about renaming the streets in Berlin’s African Quarter. There, many signs read the names of former colonial regions and even colonial actors. Several groups of postcolonial, anti-racist, non-profit organizations and activists tried to make this consensus obvious to the public and wanted them to be renamed, while the opposition like the Christian Democratic Party and the citizens’ initiative ‘Pro African Quarter’ defended the street names. (cf. Engler 2013: 41) This discussion is also about the overall ‘history of Berlin’ and which and whose history is seen as being part of it, as well as “who has the right to make claims to change the representation of historical actors in the public space”. This “means discussing who belongs to the city, who has a right to the city (Harvey), and who counts as a citizen.” (Engler 2013: 42)

These questions show that there is more behind the renaming of street signs. The discussion itself and the made decisions influence people, their daily life and their acceptance as a citizen. There are also other examples of disputed monuments at public places that represent the history.
Like the monument in memory of the German occupation at Budapest’s Liberty Square which was positioned during a night in July 2014. It is highly discussed, if this monument is even a distortion of history as it can be interpreted to demonstrate Hungary’s role as a victim and at the same time covering Hungary’s co-responsibility for the Shoah. Therefore, there were several demonstrations against this monument from different sides like the political opposition or the Jewish community. (cf. Ritterband 2014)

In this case, the same questions arise, like who counts as a Hungarian citizen? Whose history is taken into account? Who is allowed to make claims? And whose claims are going to be heard? A monument like this shows how citizens get suppressed from their representatives at public places. Both cases are political and show examples of dealing with the history in public realms. A part of the citizens feel injustice about these representations and conclude an even deeper connection to the present and their role as citizens. The affected people may not identify with the street names or the monument and this could lead to an overall resentment with the city and the feeling of not belonging to it.

In this context memory plays also an important role, which can be defined as ‘the past made present’ and which is connected to the existence of the so called memory conflicts in public space. These conflicts are about the public representation of history. They are not about their own memories, but rather show a setting that is formed through dialogical interaction with one another (cf. Rothberg 2011 quoted from Engler 2013: 43). The importance of a memory conflict is about the self-formation of the actors and the analysis of “different significances, usages, and meanings of ethnic, racial, national, or other categories in this formation process” (Engler 2013: 43). In these arrangements the involved actors legitimize present claims, rights and belongings through various ways of referring to the past. In addition to this, they “determine, change, and challenge their relationship to one another and arrange each other, according to different modes of belonging.” (Engler 2013: 43)

This is why the main point of the discussion about the renaming is not “the confrontation of two divided, pre-given memories of the white colonizers and the black colonized, but rather about the negotiation of the question who belongs to the city and, therefore, is a citizen - has the right to change the city’s historicity and the representation of histories in the public” (Engler 2013: 44). These questions are also a part of the overall history of the city, its historical self-perception, and its self-representation [and] becomes increasingly important regarding the multi-ethnic, highly diverse population of the migration metropolis of Berlin.” (Engler 2013: 44)

These arguments are also seen in the example of the monument in Budapest about the German occupation. Here it is also not about the clashing of the two groups but rather about the effects of this monument on the citizens and their rights.

Dealing with history as shown is about social interactions in the public and how people place themselves in the social network. These discussions are relevant as they confront not only the history, but even more important the present and the everyday life of the citizens. The public place as venue and as a place where everybody in a city is part of it, plays a main role. In public places scenes of everyday life are visible and have a main impact on other people and their social interactions in both ways, conscious and unconscious.

The text from Engler (2013) shows an example for a ‘gap in European memory’ which is linked to the time of colonialism. The outcome is a main discussion and shaped the nowadays society and its citizens belongings. Häussermann (2005) instead (in following chapter) describes an example which influenced the core of the model of the European City. The model of the European City today would look different without the heritage of the opposition against the market-led urban development which started in the second half of the 19th century.

**Heritage and the European City**

This market-led urban development in Europe was seen as accountable for “the deep social contrasts and for the inhuman living conditions of the lower classes in the cities” (Häussermann 2005: 244).

The opposition was supported by the enlightened bourgeoisie as they were concerned about these social effects. A shift to a public administration on urban development can be seen in several outcomes like the increase of public land ownership, the public organization of water and energy supply, transport systems, the establishment of the welfare state, etc. (cf. Häussermann 2005: 244)

“As a consequence of these historical developments, even today the core of the model of a European city is the public influence on urban development, and the perception of the city as a collective identity.” (Häussermann, 2005: 245)

These three examples (Berlin’s African Quarter, Budapest and the European City) about heritage take place at a local level and at the same time have impact on a global level. The discussions and their outcomes have fundamental consequences that are not only in concern of the city itself, but also affects the global level. The following part will take a look at this connection between the global and local scale, which was also examined by Doreen Massey (1991) in her essay ‘A Global Sense Of Place’.

**2.Between Global and Local**

Time, mobility, money and place are four main factors that are part of the everyday life. These factors also correlate with each other on a global level. Everyday people are confronted with time
as something that shapes their life and that is very important to them as life is structured through time. Mobility is necessary to save time for example by getting money from A to B in one day without being there. Place is the one factor that brings it all together. While sitting in an office in Vienna and sending money to a partner in Chicago place plays an important role. Or maybe not? Because it does not depend where on the earth someone is, as long as the money is at the right place. On a global level time and mobility seem to be essential, but place, where the local functions are situated and people meet in reality, is left out. Is it like this, or are there other things to be mentioned when talking about place in a global sense?

The Time-Space-Compression
Massey writes in her article about the ‘time-space-compression’ a phenomenon of the current age, which is described by the terms ‘speed-up, global village, overcoming spatial barriers, the disruption of horizon, ... and it is built upon the concepts of capital flow, peoples mobility, transportation of commodity, etc. In addition, the “time-space-compression refers to movement and communication across space, to the geographical stretching-out of social relations, and to our experience of all this.” (Massey 1991: 24) In this global view the relation to the local place and the keeping of a sense of a local place is important. (cf. Massey 1991: 24)

There are different causes for the time-space-compression that are very common, like time, mobility, money and space, but there are also some that are not among the first mentioned. One example for these are race and gender. When talking about the restriction of women’s mobility not only money is seen as cause but also men (as being afraid on streets at night). (cf. Massey 1991: 24) Adding to this reason Massey (1991: 25) states that the “time-space-compression needs differentiating socially”.

Social aspects are very important and often left out or even overlooked on purpose. Social inequality is an often discussed topic, but still justice is not everywhere seen. For migrated people it is hard to settle down at a new place, get a job, address all the duties and integrate themselves. Another cause for difficulties with integration are the citizens with their traditions and beliefs that differ from place to place.

A main part of the time-space-compression mentioned by Massy (1991: 26) are the functions of the so called jet-setters. They have main tasks to do like sending/receiving faxes, holding the international conference calls, controlling the news, etc. “These are they groups who are really in a sense in charge of the time-space-compression” (Massy 1991: 26).

Beside this group there are also other groups who indeed play an important role in the time-space-compression, but are not in charge of the process. Massey (1991: 26) gives three examples. First the refugees, who are moving from one place to another for the chance of a better life, second the pensioners who are just at the receiving side as they are using various articles (TV, food, etc.) from all over the world, and third the people who are living in the favelas of Rio who contribute to the time-space-compression through football players and global music, but they are at the same time imprisoned in it. These examples show social differentiation, in terms of movement and communication and in the degree of control. (cf. Massy 1991: 26)

In this complicated construct of the time-space-compression the aspect of sociality plays a very important role. Through including sociality, politics of mobility and access could be possible. In this sense mobility and the control over mobility of some groups are a main part and have effects on other groups in the time-space-compression. To conclude: “The time-space-compression of some groups can undermine the power of others” (Massey 1991: 26).

An example for effects of an activity is given by Massey (1991: 26). Driving to an out-of-town shopping centre effects the rising prices and also accelerate the demise of the corner shops in the inner city. In this case it is the matter of local activities at one place that has effects on another place.

People are responsible for their acting and the effects of it on different groups. Most of the time the effects are not direct and at the same time visible for the people who trigger them. In some cases people simply do not want to see them. In this way it is easier to live one’s own life without taking care of others. One reason for this is the time-space-compression through which the effects move.

A Global Sense of Place
In this huddles of the time-space-compression and the different movements, places can be seen as something that gives fixity, security and is identity-establishing. People are longing for such things and for being able to kind of ‘escape to locality’ from the rest of the world. But is this even possible/ or necessary? And how does the definition of place look like?

The existence of boundaries is one way to describe a place. Another one is about identities, about the different links made by people between a particular place and the rest of the world. It is about the various people who live there, the diverse products they are able to buy, the movies that are shown in the cinema, the stories and news from other places, the planes that are coming from somewhere else and the full roads to get you out of the city. Projecting these different links to the places concludes that also places have many different identities which...
can have positive or/and negative effects on the place. These connections to the ‘outside’ leads to a global sense of place which makes it even more difficult to draw boundaries around a place. Adding to this, the social interactions that differ between economics, politics and culture do not make it easier. Through this, places “can be imagined as articulated moments in networks of social relations and understanding” (Massey 1991: 28). This concludes to a sense of place which is extroverted, has real relations to the wider world and integrates the global and the local. (cf. Massey 1991: 28) The structure of a place can therefore be described as the habitat of connections to the outside including different identities from all over the world and social interactions that foster and form new connections.

**Everyday Urbanism**

Thus far the essay is concerned with the heritage that shapes the city with its inhabitants and the connections between the local and the global context that define a place. This chapter will focus on the people who are living in these places and how they affect the shape of a city. It is about the ‘Everyday’ which is defined as “the lived experience shared by urban residents, the banal and ordinary routines we know all too well” (Crawford 1999: 6). The daily, weekly and yearly routines that are part of our life and which shape who we are. The existence of an everyday space is the physical part used for these repeated public activities and which can be found in between the realm home, workplace and institution. (cf. Crawford 1999: 6)

Henri Lefebvre, a Marxist philosopher and sociologist, describes the everyday as the basis of all social experiences and even difficult to decode as it is fundamental ambiguous. In addition, urbanism should be a human and social discourse, as the city itself is a social product. In this sense, the physical form of a city gets more in the background and the lived experience are in the middle of the investigation. (cf. Crawford 1999: 7)

Another important point in the discourse of the everyday is the role of differences that are part of who we are, for example the body, age, gender, ethnicities and class. Although these differences are negated in the design of abstract urban spaces, it is still the most notable fact of everyday life. These differences can also be seen in the people’s daily routine which leads to a divisions of urban lives in the space. Where these differences interact, hotspots of everyday urbanism develop. (cf. Crawford 1999: 8)

The Everyday, as simple as it may sound, is different from one person to another and may change during a lifetime several times. Being a student, getting/losing a job, care for children or other people, having an accident, etc. all these points change the daily routine and the everyday of a person. For this reason it is hard to investigate on it, but the people experience the everyday on their own and therefore know about it. Lefebvre mentioned immigrants, women, low-level employees and teenagers as victims of the everyday life (cf. Crawford 1999: 8). The reason for the immigrants may be almost the same as for women, as they are caught in their everyday endless routines between housework and shopping (cf. Crawford 1999: 8) (This is not seen as up to date). Taking a look at the immigrants (that are coming for the chance of a better life) they may have less money available and they have to struggle with social harassment. That is why their possibilities are restricted. They may not be allowed to work, for them it is not possible to travel, they cannot afford going to a restaurant, etc. That is why they are not so free in their daily routines and kind of caught in them. Homeless people are not mentioned in the text as victims of the everyday life, but their everyday routines are seen as even more restricted. The hotspots of the everyday, where the differences interact, can be seen in the public realm, on the streets, in the parks, on places, in front of the supermarket, etc. Their planners have the possibility to do research and at the same time become part of the everyday, get in touch with the people and through this get to know the needs and the wishes of the people and are able to make a contribution in the direction of a just city. Planners, like everyone else, can be seen as experts of everyday life, but they try to diverge and take a look at it as outsiders. Planners even use different techniques to distance themselves which can lead to a missing of real relations to the world.

“To avoid this breach with reality, everyday urbanism demands a radical repositioning of the designer, a shifting of power from the professional expert to the ordinary person” (Crawford 1999: 9). That is why in using Everyday Urbanism it is important to take a look at the lived experiences of different individuals and groups in the city through which the concerns and wishes of the people can get visible. Everyday Urbanism is seen as an alternative urban design concept in which the ordinary and social meanings merge with urban design and research. In this sense, Everyday Urbanism also has the purpose to reveal unexpected possibilities in ordinary places which requires invention and creativity. (cf. Crawford 1999: 10-15)

Everyday Urbanism may sound simple as the needs of the citizens just get visible through an observation in the public in which the people are seen as the experts, but it is a complex process. First, observation is a tool that has to be learned and the interpretation should be impartial to avoid misleading outcomes. Second, unforeseen possibilities not just pop up and instead invention and creativity is needed. These two things take time and patience as the process may not be linear and
instead circular in which going backwards is part of it and should not be seen as a failure.

**Social Nonmovements**

In this everyday life the so called social nonmovements are developing as being part of it. According to Bayat (2010: 14) social nonmovements are "collective actions of noncollective actors". This means that people are doing similar activities to trigger social change. Behind these actions there are usually no ideologies, leaderships or organizations. Bayat (2010: 15-19) gives three examples for this, which make the term social nonmovement identifiable.

The example about migrants entering a country without a legal permission shall be discussed here, a topic that is currently in the everyday news and was already mentioned several times in this essay. In the chapter heritage through the questions: Who is seen as a citizen and whose city is it? In the chapter about the global sense of place through people’s mobility and in the chapter of everyday urbanism, as immigrants are part and at the same time victims of the everyday life.

The migrants are moving from one place to another. They are travelling to the global North on high risk to lose one’s life on the different ways they have chosen. At their final locations they try to build communities and cultural collectives and get visible in public places. An anxiety among the Europeans elites is noticeable as they see the ‘invasion of foreigners’ overwhelming their social habitat and way of life. (cf. Bayat 2010: 15-16)

Social nonmovements are compared with social movements more action-orientated. The actors directly practice what they call for and their activities are part of the everyday life. All these points can be seen in the illegal migration as they are crossing borders to find new livelihoods. Moreover the actions of social nonmovements "are common practices of everyday life carried out by millions of people who albeit remain fragmented [...] that is why] the power of nonmovements rests on the power of big numbers" (Bayat 2010: 20).

This example show how the everyday life could look like and with this case the needs and concerns of people get easy visible. The action, evoked through the will to change something, is in the foreground. These actions not just shape the crossed places or their host states but even show affects at the global level as already mentioned in chapter 3 about the time-space-compression.

**Quiet Encroachment**

The migrants who have already arrived at their host state have to struggle with the provisions they are finding over there. To do so, Bayat (2010: 56) used the term "quiet encroachment". This means that people try in a quiet and interminable way to achieve a better life. It is not seen as a social movement or a survival strategy as they do not harm fellow poor people or themselves. Instead, they (as a collective action) do it at the costs of the state, the rich and the powerful. (cf. Bayat 2010: 56)

In Vienna an example can be seen at the 'Museumsquartier'. During the summer time, a lot of young people are hanging around and enjoying beverages there. Instead of getting up and buying expensive beer in a bar they are waiting for young migrated man or woman who are coming to the people and offering cheap and cold beer. This gets at the costs of the bar owners who are losing their customers. In this case the migrated men and women are doing this not through political intension but because of their ambition for a better life.

Like Bayat (2010: 59) said: "In short, theirs is not a politics of protest, but of redress, struggle for an immediate outcome through individual direct action." According to Bayat (cf. 2010: 59), there are two aims that quiet encroachment is longing for. First, the redistribution of social goods and opportunities for survival and acceptable standards of living. Second, attaining cultural and political autonomy for an informal life. This informal life should for example work without modern bureaucracy like fixed rules and contracts and should instead be based on trust, informal dispute resolution and self-employed activities.

"This is so not because these people are essentially non- or antimodern, but because the conditions of their existence compel them to seek an informal mode of life. Because modernity is a costly existence, not everyone can afford to be modern." (Bayat 2010: 59)

The last point made is about autonomy in a globalized world where integration is becoming more and more relevant and security plays an important role in times of modernity. Security for the vendors means being free of state’s security and at the same time the communities want to have schools and clinics, etc. which would led to integrate them in the system of power. That is why the urban poor range between autonomy and integration. (cf. Bayat 2010: 60)

The vendors at the ‘Museumsquartier’ may also want to be free of state’s security but at the same time be included in the system and get integrated. For them the informal way is the easier way to earn some money instead of being part of the system that is difficult to enter when money makes the barriers.

**Insurgent Planning**

This chapter is about Insurgent Planning, a type of planning where justice is seen as most important and which is therefore dealing with the concerns of marginalized and oppressed groups. Mirrftab (2009) describes the needs of insurgent planning through the example of the anti-colonial struggle of the South. In this case it is seen as very important to decolonize the planner’s imagination and that the modernity of the Western planning ideals are not
a must be. Beside this, also the informality of third world cities should be seen as something positive that succeeded the Western modernity. A new view on this subaltern cities is necessary to understand their rules and values - a historized consciousness. (cf. Miraftab 2009: 44f)

This leads to the first of three main principles of insurgent planning: ‘Insurgent planning is transgressive in time, place and action’. To transgress boundaries of time the historized consciousness is necessary as well as the historical memory should be part of the present. National boundaries get able to transgress through the “building of transnational solidarities of marginalized groups” (Miraftab 2009: 46). Through public actions, like generating formal/informal arenas of politics, false dichotomies are able to be transgressed. (cf. Miraftab 2009: 46)

The second principle ‘Insurgent planning is counter-hegemonic’. Like the name already says, insurgent planning is against hegemony and for the ‘citizens’ right to dissent, to rebel and to determine their own terms of engagement and participation.” It also not only takes a look at how the system of oppression works but also how it is disputed. (cf. Miraftab 2009: 46)

The last principle is ‘Insurgent planning is imaginative’. Imaginative in a way in which the idealism for a just society is recovering and the symbolic value of insurgent citizenship activities is seen in offering hope. From this point of view alternatives can be shown. (cf. Miraftab 2009: 46)

This three principals summarize the aims of insurgent planning. Taking a look back at the former chapters a connection to these principals is possible. The first principal is seen in the chapter about heritage, where it is assumed that history and the dealing with it is important and therefore it is necessary to get history in a deliberate way to the present. In the third chapter about the global sense of place the social connections between one place and the world are part of what a place defines.

The second and the third principal draw lines to the topics of ‘Everyday Urbanism’, ‘social non movements’ and ‘quiet encroachment’ where people are seen as experts, are put to the foreground and their needs are of main interest. It is also about actions made by individuals to achieve a better life and the overall longing for a just city.

5. Summary and Conclusion

This essay deals with a lot of different topics, where one is connected to the following and the overall topic migration is part of every one. The first chapter ‘Heritage’ is about dealing with history and its effects on the citizens as fundamental questions are addressed that confront others migrated people. From this local topic the connection to the second chapter about the global sense of place is made, as the effects are also visible in a global context. An example about the migration of people is given, as their mobility is seen as a main part of a globalized world. Further a definition of place is tried to be made. The next chapter is based on this local level and deals more precisely with the ordinary everyday life, which can be detected all over the world. In the last chapter, an explanation about the planning strategy ‘Insurgent Planning’ is given, which aims are linked to all the other sections. Like the Everyday Urbanism, it is a planning strategy which focus on different people, their actions and aims to participate to a just city. It can be concluded, that in all these topics people and their actions are in the centre of attention. People are a main part of the city, they are living there and moving in the city, away from the city and to the city.

Places in the city open possibilities to meet each other, to get in contact (it does not matter if per phone or through a direct contact) or just spend time there. The design, the site, the infrastructure, etc., depends on how a place is used and accepted. That is why the main subjects to address in planning are the people, their concerns and needs. The questions to answer are: For whom are we planning? Who are the experts? And who has the right to the city?

Another conclusion is about the ‘everyday life’, the ‘social nonmovements’, the ‘quiet encroachment’ and their connection to the heritage. As often mentioned these movements are visible in space. The migrated people are visible in the public and seen as part of the citizens. Right now, a lot of immigrants and among them a lot of refugees are coming to Western Europe. Will there be a heritage of these movements? It does not have to be a monument or a street name, but it could be something that is manifested in space. How could the heritage of the present look like? There are for example already existing monuments for the drowned refugees at Lesbos. But are there other ways to let history be present in public space? And who is allowed to decide about this?
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The exercise "Urban Ethnography and Explorative Mapping and Visualisation in Urban Studies" complemented the summer term's teaching with practical projects, aimed at trying out new methodology and combining ethnographic research with an approach to visual representation. Urban ethnography allows researchers to learn about and describe the lifeworlds of different groups of urban dwellers in a non-normative way. Primarily aimed at understanding how certain groups see and understand their lived experience of the city, understanding their lifeworlds in their own right, urban ethnography can enable us to also reflect our specific positionalities as researchers and urban professionals, as planners or architects. Explorative mapping and visualisation represent inventive methodologies, that are used both to produce and to communicate knowledge. Mapping observations of urban lifeworlds and bringing them onto a common presentational plane, we are able to trace linkages and trends that would otherwise go unnoticed. Explorative maps create new propositions about the urban realm that can express and communicate knowledge beyond academia to a wider public through their experimental, visual, and palpable character.

The kick-off of the exercise consisted of introductory lectures to the new methodology and with an exchange on previous experience of teachers and students alike in working with these methods. The first input introduced the method of ethnography from its beginnings, when it was used by anthropologists to study "foreign", non-Western ethnic groups and their culture from a Western perspective. From the 20th century on, anthropologists and sociologists alike used ethnography in cities to study their "own", Western culture, that had become more urban, dense, heterogeneous and "foreign" itself. Urban ethnography takes place "in the field" of the group of interest and requires the researcher to be open and adaptive of the social reality as it is lived out by a group and the relevancies that come up in the field.

The second input discussed maps and visualisations of data from a theoretical point of view as well as from a practical perspective. How can maps contribute to our understanding of the city and what are their limitations? How can we understand maps and mapmaking in their history and general application? How did the map as an artifact achieve its significance and ubiquity? How do maps work? And last but not least, how do we want to work with maps?

A field trip to Praterstern in Vienna exemplified the methodological approaches and their application "on the ground". From there, students were asked to develop their own field trips, where they would introduce the others to their research project and jointly conduct field work on a specific theme. From mapping election campaign posters, to studying different teenagers’ perspectives on their district and their appropriation of public vs. private spaces: The diverse set of research projects, that were the result of that exercise, represents the students’ various fields of interest in urban studies. The projects show their ability to apply theoretical knowledge to the realities of urban dwellers and urban sites and to translate their findings into visual representations and maps. The students’ field trip guides don’t just communicate knowledge of the social world of the city of Vienna in an explorative way, but also offer an insight into the research process, the limits and difficulties everyone encountered in their work, and a reflection on the positionality of urban researchers and professionals vis-à-vis the people they observed, interviewed, and worked with in their projects.

**Literature**


With our project "The Power of Bodies & Gender" we wanted to investigate how (sitting) bodies form space and atmosphere and what role gender performance plays in this process. Following Martina Löw’s relational space concept (2003) we looked at three analytical layers: the place, the body and the interaction. For this we used three different methods: mappings, field notes as well as quick gestural sketches, to later on analyze posture and body language.

Analyzing the sketches, we found out that the chosen place, the taken posture and the related activities are used (independent of gender) to create privacy in public space. But women and men use different territorial strategies when sitting in public space. As a consequence sitting women and men are perceived in other ways and create a different atmosphere.

Women tend to create a more introverted atmosphere. Due to their curved body axis and looking down most of the time (because of justification activities like reading) they seem more passive in engaging with a place or other people and seemingly using bodily extensions like bags, bikes, prams, jackets etc. to fortify their private space. This tendency is also visible by the chosen sitting place (middle of the bench) and obvious as it leaves less space for other people to sit down without disturbing their private spheres.

Men might create a more extroverted atmosphere. They show their presence more bodily (straight body axis, eye contact with the surrounding). A key point of men’s creation of atmosphere is the observation as it serves two functions. Firstly it could be interpreted as a way to reinforce their personal space as they can send out signals to not come too close and second it might allow them to react more quickly to the environment. In addition to that male bodies show their demand of space. They spread out with their bodies to again demonstrate a certain degree of dominance as well as openness to interaction. Such atmosphere tends to be less inviting as you get a feeling of being watched. Such bodily expressions can appear deterrent to other people when seeking places in public space that allow them privacy and to feel undisturbed.
Based on the assumption that the daily routines and meeting points of refugees differ from the natives, the survey started with a go-along together with three refugees to get a first insight of their lives in Vienna. During the walk they decided what they wanted to show us. With this method we wanted to learn about their perceptions of their lifeworld and about important places for the refugees. We mapped all relevant information of the walk and the interviews. These places often constituted meeting places, where they can connect with their social networks and their parts of the ‘syrian/arab community’.

Soon these so called 3rd places became our main interest of the study, as public life takes place there: They serve as places of conversation (cf. Oldenburg 1999: 26), social interactions are created and integration processes start. To deepen the survey, two places, the Brunnenmarkt and the mosque (Islamic Center Vienna), which were part of the go-along, were chosen for observations and interviews. At this point the subject of investigation was broadened to people with migration background form the Near East as it isn’t possible to differ between these groups during an observation.

The concept of a public character as a person, who’s always present, public and talks a lot to various people (cf. Jacobs 1961: 68), played a special role in our investigation. At both places we observed how the social interactions shaped spatial relevance in dividing space in a crossover from public to private. Especially the semi-public places, which are constituted through public characters, seemed to be important for the activity of the community. Their role as standing in between public and private to connect people and bring them in contact. As a result, the public characters play an important role by building and maintaining social networks. The social interactions between different public places across Vienna are mapped in the network figure. On the photo the density of social interactions at one meeting spot at Brunnenmarkt is mapped. As a public character the garbage bin is marked to symbolize the garbage man, who isn’t visible on this photo.


The tramline 49 crosses three very different districts of Vienna along its route. According to the available statistical data the tramline starts in the 7th district, a relatively "rich" district, inhabited by younger people coming from higher social classes and probably having European background. The 7th district is followed by the 15th district, which is one of the poorest districts of the city and has one of the highest shares of non-Austrian citizens in Vienna. The 14th district, where the tramline 49 ends, is inhabited by many older people from higher classes and is characterized by a lower number of people coming from foreign countries.

Against this background we wanted to examine, whether the differences between the three districts are reflected in the composition and behaviour of the passengers on the tramline 49.

Our next step was to examine whether we could see these differences inside the tramway, therefore we chose the method 'empirical observation'.

We applied this method by riding on the tram from the first to the last station at several times on during six weeks and tried to spot differences by observing passengers and their social interactions. Then we compared our results from observation with our statistical findings. Differences did not show up exactly at the district borders, but as we travelled further into the districts. The observation results also strongly depended on what time of the day we took the tram. So, to get clearer results, we are convinced that a longer observation period (at least half a year) would be better.
Methods - The methods we used are literature research, with the focus of meaning of home and being homeless. As well as observation and mapping techniques. Threw the literature research and the conversations with roofless people we discovered the importance of the terms we use (homeless, roofless).

Findings - We went on two walking tours through Vienna with a roofless guy named Stefan. He is travelling through Europe the last few years, staying only for a few months in a city then he goes to the next city. He was kind enough to do with us two Tours through Vienna, he showed us his favourite spots in Vienna as well as places roofless people go to get food, help, clothing or shelter. Stefan sees himself as a free European and likes the way he is living. He always walk around with his backpack, where he keeps all his belongings. We also met with Dimitri. Another roofless guy who lives and begs next to Karlsplatz. He is a foreigner who makes ends meet with begging. He found a temporary home and even some kind of a family at one of the central squares in Vienna. Another roofless person we got introduce to is Jelena. She lives as well at Karlsplatz, she occupies a bench and turns public space into her own private space. What we learned through the evaluation is, that no one wants to be called “homeless” because everybody has some place, they to call home. People tend to find themselves temporary homes and even families if they stay for a longer time at a place.

Conclusion - The qualities of home, like being well located, clean and most of all the social environment are important for the temporary home of Roofless people. People who are described as roofless are not automatically homeless. Because everybody tends to find a home at some place. Roofless people don’t identify themselves as homeless. In Vienna different ethnic groups of roofless people occupied different places in the City.
In the weeks before the elections public space gets politicized in many ways, with the election posters as the most visible representatives, omnipresent 24/7 on squares and streets. Put in public space, a poster draws the attention towards its controlled content, but is at the same time open to all forms of responses. As people are rarely writing on the posters in front of others, one has to refer to the texts, stickers, drawings or damages that are being left behind when analyzing election posters.

This research project gives an insight into the dimension and quality of this phenomenon in the presidential elections 2016 in Vienna, answering the following research questions:
1. Where are the candidates advertising their contents through election posters?
2. Which kind of reactions do people leave on which election posters?

As a starting point of the project we did a quantitative mapping survey in order to find the locations and distribution of both unmodified and modified posters. On the basis of the collected data, a qualitative analysis and categorization of the different types of interventions on the posters was done, including a photo documentation and interpretation.

In the 15 km²-reasearch area for the quantitative analysis, more than 1,200 posters could be found in the two rounds of elections. The differences in distribution and number tell a story about target group and aspirations of each candidate. The city centre clearly is the primary political battleground, combining half of the total number of posters and a clear above-average share of modifications. The dimension of modifications rose significantly from the first to the second round of votes, going up from 20% to 30% of all posters. This indicates a strong polarization carried to the streets and the election posters, as the two political antagonists Van der Bellen (supported by the Green party) and Hofer (The Freedom Party of Austria) were confronting in the run-off vote.

Five categories of modifications were developed – express political opinion, insult, make invisible, make fun of and the small rest-category different use. The overall most frequently encountered categories to modify election posters were express opinion and making invisible. From the first round on it became clear that front runners in the polls were reacted on with much harsher methods. The small and insignificant candidates were to a much higher scale made fun of. As the election has to be repeated in autumn 2016, the research we want to continue the research project and present its results end of 2016.
Schwedenplatz is a square with many usages which are more or less well coordinated. As the city of Vienna sees many aspects that offer room for improvement, they decided to redesign the place. The city tried to include the public at many different stages. Although the government has collected a range of opinions, the qualitative research focused on experts and the inhabitants of the 1st district. We believe that the users of the Schwedenplatz are far more diverse. We want to show this variety. We want to ask ourselves the question: How do people perceive the current situation of Schwedenplatz and does the new plan of renovation address the needs of the public?

We decided to do research on our own and give people the chance to tell us their opinion of the project in a qualitative interview. The question was not only what they like and dislike about the current situation. We wanted to get to know more about their needs and wishes, if they feel comfortable in the different areas and what kind of experiences they had at Schwedenplatz. Based on the methodology of ethnography, six deep interviews were conducted with people of different age, gender, occupation and cultural background. Talking with the people, we got to know many different stories about their personal experiences they had at Schwedenplatz. By asking them just a few questions and letting them speak freely, they told us not only about what they like or dislike, but gave us a deeper insight in their views.

The records of the interviews show that there are several questions that need to be addressed in the redesign of Schwedenplatz:
- Are drunken people welcome or not? Do we need restrictions or do they have the right to stay?
- Is gentrification and domestication the best way to improve Schwedenplatz?
- Is the Schwedenplatz really unsafe or do we only feel unsafe?
- Shall we exclude, separate or include marginalised groups?

For detailed information take a look at our blog: https://letsaskthepeople.wordpress.com/
In this sociological and ethnographic research project we attempted to put the focus on a part of the city that is rarely looked at - Döbling is populated by the rich and consists as well of many social housing blocks. Contrasting building structures, school types and social groups are neighboring each other. By using an alterable methodology, containing various elements, we were able to gain a reasonable overview of the social circumstances and found some answers to our research question: “How do teenagers perceive the spatial/structural/social circumstances of their neighborhood and what were/are the central influences for their perceptual process?”

The central method to answer this question were narrative interviews we conducted with teenagers. The presented stories and findings give an insight on how the contrasts in Döbling are perceived by teenagers and how the social mix in the district impacts everyday life. Further we had go-alongs, observations and conversations with experts and people on the street to reflect the content of the interviews and to further complete these insights into Döbling.

The most prominent finding is that a social divide amongst teenagers definitely exists. Further there’s a repeating issue of unwillingness to build up contact and to overcome prejudices by the teenagers from private schools. The reason for this could be the safety concerns mentioned by the private school attendees. Adding to that there is a different use of public space, we found that teenagers attending private schools are mostly spending their time in private spaces and use public space only for mobility, not for diverse activities. The kids from the social housing blocks on the other hand are using public space much more extensively, for meeting and spending time there. Noticeable is that there appear to be less cultural conflicts in-between different migrated ethnicities of teenagers in Döbling, according to the youth workers, there is a higher interconnection compared to other districts. Another finding that repeatedly came up was a very strong „district patriotism“ which expressed itself by everyone being very proud of their district.

With these findings we were able to gain first insights that now can be a building ground for further scientific investigation.
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