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Looking back on the academic year 2015, the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space (http://skuor.tuwien.ac.at) has compiled the various teaching and lecture contents contributed under the annual theme “Urban Culture, Public Space and the Past – Urban Peace and National Welfare” in this comprehensive reader. The courses offered at the Interdisciplinary Centre are aimed at Master and PhD students as part of the curriculum of spatial planning at the Faculty of Architecture and Planning, TU Wien. In the summer term, lectures, a seminar, as well as practical exercises as part of Module “Urban culture and public space – Welfare farewell? Exploring the past(s)” sought to conceive the close link between modern urban planning and the welfare state as well as to explore materializations of welfare in city streets and squares, and in urban life. Against the backdrop of the global and European “refugee crisis” the winter term 2015/16 courses aimed at providing a space to discuss and develop constructive perspectives on the role of urban planners, architects and researchers as “human rights performers” in understanding and working towards urban peace through theoretical insights but more so through interdisciplinary, intercultural and intergenerational research and practice. In collaboration with the Institute for Art and Design (http://www.kunst.tuwien.ac.at/), Faculty for Architecture and Planning, TU Wien, and the Non-governmental-organization PROSA (Projekt Schule für Alle!, http://www.prosa-schule.org/) this space was opened as part of the Urbanize! Festival 2015 “Do it together”, representing a head start for an intensive semester project. Furthermore, an interactive Masters and PhD seminar has been offered to provide participants from the fields of architecture, spatial planning, and more widely from social sciences, humanities and the arts a scholarly context to discuss their research on urban issues. In fall 2015 we had the chance to take part in the masterclass Bridges in the city of Brussels, aiming at overcoming the both infrastructurally and socially fractured spaces of the city with interventions in public space and designs addressing an integrated transformation of spaces of exclusion.

The academic year 2015 gave us the opportunity to unravel the complexities of public spaces in face of new societal challenges. In her work “The human condition” (1958) Hannah Arendt outlined a political theory concept of public space which delineated it as the in-between, both separating and bringing together those who share it. Thus, one facet of public space –i.e. its political dimension – emerges in moments of collective action, in political moments. An important characteristic of public space is the political, only possible when nothing is predetermined and the future unknown. At the same time public space is used to determine certain conditions, to stabilize and emplace societies. During the academic year of 2015 the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space’s teaching reflected on both the unstable and the stable aspects of public space as outlined by Arendt. The theme of the summer term 2015 “Welfare farewell?” explored the history of planning and architecture by tracing a genealogy of planning as a discipline that has attempted to sustain societies with a rather clear concept of the planning professionals as stewards and guards of public order. Understanding planning practices however as a form or art of governmentality following a Foucauldian analytics of these forms 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 (e.g. public order, public interest, public space), to open up ways of thinking differently (Huxley 2002, 145-6). The project invited the participating students to think planning differently, and to develop a new awareness of ‘common-sense’ for planning practices shaping the actions of others.
The arrival of a large number of refugees to Central and Northern Europe opened up public spaces again for an unknown future. The self-organization of volunteers to support and take care of the newly-arrived questioned the order of urban public spaces and also questioned the political order of the state. The events also brought about the revision of different actors’ roles in handling the new societal challenge. In these re-appropriations and re-imaginings of public spaces respect and care for the other were practiced, and social spaces were created based on collaboration instead of competition. Building on Vienna’s continued history of welcoming refugees these new urban practices represent sparks of utopia, sparks of an inclusionary public.

For the Interdisciplinary Centre of Urban Culture and Public Space these events represented the context in which the positionality of planners, architects and researchers could be again questioned, rethought and reframed. The once clear construct of the planner as a technocratic administrator or the researcher as an objective observer and a critic at distance has been set in motion. Where though can we place the expertise of planners and where do planners learn about the city? The experiences of refugees and the workings of NGO’s are crucial learning spaces that planners and architects should not be afraid to join.

The 2015 Reader comprises theoretical analyses and essays from the Centre’s teaching staff and collaboration partners as summaries to lectures, seminars and various events. Booklet I presents the contents of the summer term module as well as an international perspective on “Urban culture, public space and the future – Urban equity and the global agenda” with the inputs from the candidates for the Vienna Visiting Professorship 2017. Booklet II contains a review of the winter term project “Refugees and the City”, from its beginnings at the Urbanize! Festival to the final student projects.

We received contributions from Prof. Dr. Nikolai Roskamm, Vienna Visiting Professor of 2015, guest lecturer Dr. Amila Širbegović, Office for Gentle Urban Renewal Vienna, and Dr. Karin Harather, affiliated with the Institute for Art and Design at TU Wien, as well as Ass. Prof. Dr. Sabine Knierbein, DI Tihomir Viderman Msc and MSc Elina Kränzle from The Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space. Furthermore Prof. Dr. Jaime Hernandez Garcia, Academic Leader Ed Wall and Prof. Dr. Kathrin Wildner as candidates for the Vienna Visiting Professorship 2017 contributed with texts based on their public lectures to this volume. We thank our various partners for the inspiring collaboration, especially the students and volunteers from PROSA and the Urbanize! Festival Organization by Dérive. In particular, we would like to thank our motivated students in the summer term’s module, Eshan Bazafkan, Aglaja Bitzinger, Grazia Bonvissuto, Mio Choki, Helena Götsch, Lena Junger, Nina Moser, Ina Paschinger, Isolde Plakolm, Tim Van Puyenbroeck, Andrea Stickler and Winfried Ucik; as well as the students in the winter term course, Bernhard Angerer, Michael Berger, Victor Bukovszki, Olivia Christopher, Theresa Edlauer, Bernhard Gugg, Helena Götsch, Jozef Hurban and Ilgin Kurum for their ambitious projects and engaged contributions to the topics. Thanks to all lecturers from the courses and especially to the candidates for the Vienna Visiting Professorship 2017 for contributing with international perspectives and their respective insights into urban cultures and public space. We want to thank the Gebietsbetreuung *9/17/18 for hosting the winter term’s final presentation in their office in the 9th district. Finally, we would like to express our gratitude to the City of Vienna as well as the Faculty of Architecture and Planning at TU Wien for their continuous support of the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space. Without them another year of intensive teaching and knowledge exchange within and beyond academia would not have been possible.
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PREFACE
Sabine Knierbein, Elina Kränzle

LECTURES
Introduction to Module. Urban Culture and Public Space: Exploring Urban Past(s)
Sabine Knierbein

Welfare, Polizey, and Public Health or: What is Genealogy?
Nikolai Roskamm

Framing Public Space as Lived Space
Sabine Knierbein

Cities as Places of Difference, Tolerance, and Conflict
Sabine Knierbein

Public Space and European Cities in Transition
Sabine Knierbein

Houses for the Masses, Masses for the Housing
Nikolai Roskamm

Relational Public Space Perspectives. Challenges for Architecture and Planning
Sabine Knierbein

Relational Thinking, Embodied Space and Performative Planning
Sabine Knierbein

Hannah Arendt’s Notion of “Public Space” and the Theory of the “Educating City”
Nikolai Roskamm

VIENNA VISITING PROFESSORSHIP 2017 HEARINGS

Everyday Extraordinary: Practices of Making Public Space
Ed Wall

Informal Public Space
Jaime Hernández-García

Inventive Methodology for Urban Research in Public Space
Kathrin Wildner

STUDENT PROJECTS

Imagining a Lived Street. A Reflection on the Project-based Course
“Turning a Street Upside Down”
Tihomir Viderman

7-Well(-Being)-Square - Turning Upside Down a Place
Lena Junger, Nina Moser, Andrea Stickler, Winfried Ucik

Public Life in Lerchenfelder Straße - Turning Upside Down a Street
Ehsan Bazañak, Aglaja Bitzinger, Grazia Bonvissuto, Isolde Plakolm

...a Lost Space? An Intervention Behind Secession, Vienna
Mio Choki, Helena Götsch, Ina Paschinger, Tim Van Puyenbroeck
The lecture “Exploring urban past(s)” focuses on the past of modern urbanism. The thesis is that it is necessary to look behind how pasts are constructed for getting an access to the meaning of urban culture and public space. This relates to the resources and relations and links to the conditionality and presence of a social materiality. It is the main topic of the course to explore what has happened in the pasts of urbanism and what kind of ‘truth’ is reversed in the historical events of such pasts.

Theme 1 – Genealogy of public space and urban culture

For approaching public space and urban culture, it is advisable to undertake a history of ideas concerning some of its crucial concepts. One of these concepts is the concept of welfare. The invention of modern urban planning and the concept of welfare are strongly connected. Urban planning as an institution with its own narratives, organizations, laws, techniques and discourses (and as a distinct form of knowledge, too) arises in the second half of the 19th century. On the brink, the concept of the welfare state emerges. As one might say, the result of thinking-the-welfare-state is the reality of modern urban planning. From that point of view the object of welfare is the bridge to analyze the urban planning past – understanding one is helpful (or even necessary) for understanding the other, and vice versa.

Lecture units offered by Nikolai Roskamm comprise the following topics: The seminar “Welfare, Polizey and public health or: what is genealogy?” (lecture 2) will comprise a introduction to the 19th Century discourse about the welfare state and the emerging of urban planning. The lecture “Density: a spatial modus and its varied history” (lecture 6) focuses on a genealogical analysis of the concept of density. In the evening lecture “Housing for the masses, masses for the housing” (lecture 9) reports about the urban masses and the public housing concept as the attempt of materialized welfare. Lecture unit 11 is about the “Case (1): The Tempelhofer Feld Berlin: welfare and well-being” and takes a glance at the recent history of one of the most interesting developments in Berlin. In “Case (2): Görlitzer Park, Berlin Kreuzberg: Reflecting on Realities and the Real” (lecture 12) a second story from Berlin will be told; the actual conflicts of use of central green areas are issue of the unit.

Theme 2 – Public space design and planning. Present past(s)

Public space design and planning is usually very much discussed along the presence of different types of appropriations (civil society) and commodification strategies (market sphere), or in relation to an ideal-type conception of public space for inclusive, democratic and just cities (projected into the future). The second part of the lecture offers an introduction to the history of relational and embodied approaches to public spaces, and thus seeks to connect to post-disciplinary ethics of positionality. While seeking to grasp the positionality of current urban planners, designers, and researchers, the basic idea is to enhance as well a historic understanding of wider processes of the production of space in the city, before a planner starts to create a plan, or an architect makes her or his first sketch on paper. While at first glance, this reflects the more recent history of particular professional and project-based processes, it can also be transferred to a wider understanding of the city as a socio-historic urbanization process.

Lecture units offered by Sabine Knierbein comprise six topics: The seminar “Introduction to Public Space” (lecture 3) will comprise a comprehensive introduction to
the field of public space and urban cultures research in urban studies. In the “Introduction to urban cultures” (lecture 7), the notion of ‘urban cultures’ as it is used in central urban development documents (case Vienna) will be deconstructed as a stretched concept with an overload of imprecise meanings, and then reconstructed with a look at different theoretical strands relating to urban cultures. “Public space and European cities in transition” (lecture 8) offers a critical debate on the previous historical relation between the national state and urban policies for public spaces, and a current reorientation to European politics affecting urban politics of public space in many cities in Europe. Finally, the lecture addresses “Embodied space, urban resistance and human emancipation” (lecture 11) and “Public space and relational perspectives: New challenges for architecture and planning” (lecture 13).

The lecture series included two guest lectures in the course of the City of Vienna Visiting Professorship for Urban Culture and Public Space selection process for the annual theme 2016 “Urban culture, public space and the present – Urban solidarity and European crisis”:

Solidary Urban Democracies (Lecture Unit 4, Dr. C. Schröder)

Solidarity and democracy are fundamental basics of today’s European societies. Both are normative concepts that evolved in specific socio-cultural contexts. In consequence, they manifest in various forms: We can observe representative, direct or liquid democracies and non-democratic structures. In addition, different notions of solidarity coin debates regarding the Eurozone crisis and global climate protection networks among families and friends, co-operatives, national welfare systems, European laws and manifestos, and others. And they all provide different options and limitations for individual and collective action, and both solidarity and democracy might be conceived here as something either inclusive or exclusive.

Based on the assumption that different forms of solidarity and democracy can be found at the same time, this contribution is dedicated to exploring their relations in the urban context from a practical, cross-disciplinary perspective: What actually happens if they “meet” in practice? Provided that different forms of solidarity and democracy co-exist, overlap, reinforce, and restrict each other: Which direct or indirect effects on cities, urban societies and urban spaces can be perceived? And how and to what extent do these patterns change in times of multiple crises and societal transformations that European societies and cities face today?

Neighborhoods in the tourist trap? New urban tourism and public space (Prof. Dr. S. Frank)

For several months now, a debate has raged in numerous international metropolises about the so-called ‘touristification’ of inner-city residential areas. It is true that residential space has increasingly been turned into hostels and vacation homes in many urban neighborhoods over the past years. While the real estate and tourism industries are reaping the profits of ‘new urban tourism,’ the rapid changes in some quarters have triggered objections, protests and even open xenophobia on the part of residents. Drastic rent increases in ‘trendy’ urban districts and the ‘tourist-friendly’ reconstruction of public space are symptoms of a social upheaval which raises questions about life in the 21st-century city. How must the ideal of ‘mixed neighborhoods’ be reinterpreted in spatial planning and design in an age of diverse mobilities? How can the interests of residents be reconciled with those of the tourism and real estate industries when it comes to shaping public spaces? And what are the fundamental assumptions underlying present, often dismissive, public discourses on tourism and tourists? This lecture will try to find some answers to these questions.

The intensive teaching blocks (ITBs) in March, May and June are structured along the following themes: ITB 1: Framework History of urban planning; History of the concept of welfare state. ITB 2: II Cases Theories, Planning laws, narratives. ITB 3: Tools Analytical access to the past(s). This lecture series offers both specific and introductory insights into international public space research in the field of critical urban studies. A specific focus is on a genealogical analysis of urban planning as revealing the production of truth, and its implicit relation to the construction of the welfare state during modernist urbanism. Within the general approach, public space is framed as place of public life and encounter, as embodied space and as realm of everyday learning about the city as a socio-historic urbanization process. Students have been asked to present their particular interests in this lecture and to propose how the lecture should be ideally run. Particularly the how and why of the looking into the past(s) as an approach to understand current present(s) will be explained.
WELFARE, POLIZEY AND PUBLIC HEALTH OR: WHAT IS GENEALOGY?

Vienna Visiting Professor Dr. phil. Nikolai Roskamm
Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space, Faculty of Architecture & Planning, TU Wien

In most study programs with the issues architecture, urban planning or urban sociology there are lectures and seminars about urban history, about the history of cities, about the antique city, about cities in the Middle ages, about the industrial cities and so on. Less common is a lecture series about the history of urban planning, about the history of urbanism as a field of knowledge and as a field of ideas. This is what I am doing in my research: Which means, for the main part, that I am not so interested in the date of founding-acts, getting the certificate for being an official city, in the moment at which they get their first million inhabitants. My concern is the history of ideas, the history of the concept of the city, the history of concepts and theories and practices.

The second issue is to give you a tutorial in a specific kind of philosophy. The concept of genealogy is strongly connected with Friedrich Nietzsche and Michel Foucault. For looking into the past and for understanding, why we do not have only one past but many, both thinkers are extremely important. Moreover, the international discourses about urbanism, urbanity and the city are in many cases based on the thoughts of Nietzsche and Foucault. Of course, it will hardly be possible to make you familiar with the very spirit of such a theory. What I will try is to give you the first insight into the realm of this thoughts and its links to urbanism and urban theory.

***

Genealogy is on the one hand concerned with researching the history of people, particularly the history of families, the genealogy of the ancestors and forefathers. On the other hand, and this is what I am interested in, genealogy is a specific form of regarding the past. Of approaching the past in a specific way, within a specific way of thinking. This understanding of genealogy refers to Friedrich Nietzsche. For exploring the concept of genealogy we have to go into its past. We have to undertake a genealogy of genealogy. And we have to start with Nietzsche.

Nietzsche’s radical questioning of the value and objectivity of truth has been the focus of extensive commentary, and his influence remains substantial, particularly in the continental philosophical schools of existentialism, postmodernism, and post-structuralism. His ideas of individual overcoming and transcendence beyond structure and context have had a profound impact on late-twentieth and early-twenty-first century thinkers, who have used these concepts as points of departure in the development of their philosophies.

However, let us take a glance into Nietzsche’s book genealogy of morality. This book is the bottom of understanding genealogy as a critical concept. We can find here a philosophical and psychological critique of the concept of morality in his times (which means at the end of the 19. Century). The subtitle of the book is “A Polemic” (Eine Streitschrift). It consists of a preface and three interrelated Abhandlungen (“essays”), which trace episodes in the evolution of moral concepts with a view to undermining “moral prejudices”, and specifically the morality of Christianity and Judaism. The book is considered by Nietzsche scholars to be a work of sustained brilliance and power as well as his masterpiece. Since its publication, it has influenced many authors and philosophers.

In the genealogy of morality Nietzsche deconstructs not least the common concept of history in general. History was regarded in those times (and maybe until today) as a more or less logical progress, as a linear sequence of time. History proceeds. For Nietzsche this is not the truth. For Nietzsche the progress of history is chaotic, accidental, is the result of unpredictable events, of actions and counteractions. Nietzsche argues against every construction of determining causes.
concerning social and historical processes. At the end of the 19. Century, particularly in the emerging field of sociology, the idea of causes was very popular. For example Auguste Comte represented a concept of the necessary and positive progress of society; Karl Marx represented the concept of class struggle and the necessary progress to socialism; Emile Durkheim identified density as the cause for the development of society to a new level. Nietzsche refused all these concepts and put by contrast the idea of unpredictable contingency. Nietzsche is the master of uncertainty. Nothing is sure. Nothing is given as such. Nothing falls from the sky. Because everything is the result of becoming (not of being), Nietzsche brings the plural in the matter of the past. There is not only one past, they are infinite pasts. Nietzsche rejects the idea of the one and only truth and brings a multi-dimensional perspective on stage: "On this earthly stage there was never to be any lack of really new things, really unheard of suspense, complications, and catastrophes. A world conceived of as perfectly deterministic would have been predictable to the gods and therefore also soon boring for them—reason enough for these friends of the gods, the philosophers, not to ascribe such a deterministic world to their gods!" (Nietzsche 1987, II §7) The main point in Nietzsche’s genealogy is to destroy a common place, the classical narrative, the truth of the day. This is crucial: Nietzsche’s concern is not only to destroy the given morality but every discursive routine as fundament of the bourgeois society and its truth. Nietzsche did not like things such as democracy, emancipation, solidarity or charity. This is important for the question of welfare. Nietzsche was an anti-welfare protagonist par excellence, but this is another story.

I would like to leave at this point Nietzsche and to follow the trace of the concept of genealogy. For this reason, Michel Foucault enters the stage. Michel Foucault promotes the concept of genealogy, referring to Nietzsche and elaborating it to a methodological and instrumental tool. In his essay Nietzsche, Genealogy, History from 1971 he transforms the term genealogy to a specific form of critical theory. Foucault explains that the objects of genealogy are events. The event is a philosophical concept, which breaks the concept of a linear history. Events are interruptions, events show that the future is unpredictable, that things are not fix and certain. Events change the order of history as output of divine providence or natural causalities. Foucault explains the distinction between genealogy and history with the German words Ursprung and Herkunft. Traditional history is searching for the Ursprung. If you are searching for Ursprung, your aim is, to find a singular past and a form of identity. Orthodox history believes that a final point exists; this belief is the foundation of the very approach. Such a history is looking back from the end of the world. Classical history believes that history is an objective science containing an absolute truth. The traditional historian invokes the accuracy of facts and the invariability of the past. Events, unexpected things and ruses are only disturbing coincidences. Traditional history believes that Ursprung is the place of truth. The belief of genealogy is different. Genealogy is the opposite; it is the search for the impossibility of one Ursprung. Genealogy is turning upside down history and its task is to unmask the truth. At the origin of history there is no identity but a general discrepancy, disagreement, dissent.

Foucault speaks and paraphrases Nietzsche: "Behind the always recent, avaricious, and measured truth, it posits the ancient proliferation of errors. It is now impossible to believe that "in the rending of the veil, truth remains truthful; we have lived long enough not to be taken. Truth is undoubtedly the sort of error that cannot be refuted because it was hardened into an unalterable form in the long baking process of history" (Foucault 1971). And again Foucault: "However, if the genealogist refuses to extend his faith in metaphysics, if, in his eye to history, he finds that there is "something altogether different" behind things: not a timeless and essential secret, but that secret that they have no essence ..." (Foucault 1971). Things do not have their own substantial essence - this claim is the base for genealogy. The object of genealogy is, therefore, to explore the divergences and differences of history. Genealogy travels the hard-to-reach details of the beginnings and eyes the barbarous and shamefull confusion (das unaussprechliche, barbarische Gewimmel). The object of genealogy is our heritage, our legacy. Heritage is a difficult thing, too. To come into one’s inheritance mostly does not means to get any prosperities or wealth but to get old things, problems, and difficulties. Heritage threatens the heir. Finally, genealogy has to do with the body. Because the body is the place of provenance, of birth. We all come from a body and every genealogical approach is interested in the connection between body and history.
Once again: what is genealogy? Foucault shows three forms of genealogy. The reality destroying parody, the identity destroying subversion and the truth destroying sacrifice of the subject. Every form of genealogy has the task to destroy something. The aim is to smash everything what pretends continuity in pieces, even the own fundamentals. The knowledge of genealogy is not so much for understanding than for the destruction of the existing understanding. Genealogy is the systematical instruction of demolition. Nietzsche and Foucault are the demolition men.

However, the next part of my travel should bring us from genealogy to the city and to urban planning. This step can be made with Foucault as well. Foucault speaks about the traditional forms of continuity and he includes: the soil, language, and the city. The city is bearing continuity and identity. The city is, therefore, a possible target for genealogy: genealogy as attack to continuity and identity attacks the city. This is the first link between genealogy and the city.

The second link is his concept of governmentality, which brings us to the origins of modern urban planning. In the years 1977 to 1979 Foucault held his lecture series about the history of governmentality. The lectures are published both in English and in German. In my eyes it is worth reading! The ugly word of governmentality is a combination from government and mentality and creates a common field between both areas. The issue of Foucault’s lectures is the art and practice of government and power from ancient times until today. Foucault reports from different phases of governmentality in the long-term run, from absolutist concepts of monarchy, about the Prussian police state, the arising liberalism in politics and economics and about neoliberal conceptions of the present. The core of Foucault’s analysis are the systems of truth underlying the different forms of governmentality, of the state apparatus as well as of the social institutions and conventions, the forms and practices of knowledge. Foucault retraces the ways of knowledge and power. Foucault, this is important, does not tell the story about what is true and what is not but about the production of truth.

For our topic it is important to notice that Foucault tells in his governmentality-studies the story of the genesis of urbanism. The provenance of urbanism is, following Foucault, the field of the police. The police in the absolutist state was the direct expression of the kings will and was responsible for the everyday-concerns of the state. The police was the connecting element between the people and the king. In 16th and 17th Century the word police was much more comprehensive than today. Police and everydayness was one and the same concept. The concept of police started as a positive link between the monarch and his subjects. First at the end of 17 Century the meaning of the word police was translated towards an institution for ordering the ordinary affairs. The police transforms in these times to the grounding-cell of modern administration. The common thing of the police affairs was, this is the point from Foucault, the city. The objects of the police were urban objects, the task of the police becomes the urbanization of the territory. Important is that the police happens in the city. The problems with which the police is concerned are urban problems, problems of the city, which arise because of the concentration of people in the city. The task of the police is to order the dense living-together of the city. Exactly this is the description of urban planning. This is the point. What we can find with Foucault is a description of the genesis of urbanism and urban planning as forms of the police. Urbanism is police science. Foucault brings us the concept of genealogy. With his genealogical analysis of governmentality, he shows us that urbanism is coming from the concept of Polizey.

In the second part of my lecture, I will take a glance into the annals of modern urban planning for proving if Foucault’s thesis is reasonable. Where are the annals of urbanism? What is the origin of urban planning? This is, however, not an easy question, is it? Of course, you can say, every city is a product of planning and in so far urban planning starts with the building of the first city. In this case, we are some thousand years before Christ. As a second choice, we could start with the Greek polis, and there are some good reasons for doing so. The polis is the origin of politke as well. If you think about the city as a political project (and this is my way of thinking), the polis is a good starting point.

However, I pick a third possible beginning. My issue is the invention of modern urban planning, of urban planning as one of the main projects of modernity. How does it starts? And when? I think a good date is the 1870s. In 1875 the Prussian Fluchtliniengesetz was constituted, what is one of the first
the task of the municipality. According to von Mohl, particularly prevention should be administered by municipalities. On the other hand, the encroaching repressive acts of police, on the other hand, the preventive and promoting act of an emerging state of law was to diminish the absolutist power of the king and the police. The main differentiation of von Mohl’s approach was the distinction in negative and positive acting of the state. The reorganization of the municipalities, was of course a political and civic intervention. However, von Mohl was not a revolutionary and part of a rather conservative discourse. Von Mohl’s main work is a book titled ‘Die Polizeiwissenschaft’. Von Mohl creates in his book a new term and a new theory of prevention. The thinking of prevention is crucial. Up to here it was not only necessary to combat a disease (as crime or revolution) but the aim became to ensure the health of the state, of society, of the city. Von Stein proclaims a change from the era of police into the era of public health care. In von Stein’s model, the state is a working and active unit and this is at least the image of the modern social state.

This debate is the ground for the concept of welfare and the welfare state. The new role of the state enabled the emergence of new concepts as the social reforms of Otto von Bismarck, who created the first welfare state in the modern world. I will quote Bismarck from a parliament speech in 1884: “The real grievance of the worker is the insecurity of his existence; he is not sure that he will always have work, he is not sure that he will always be healthy, and he foresees that he will one day be old and unfit to work. If he falls into poverty, even if only through a prolonged illness, he is then completely helpless, left to his own devices, and society does not currently recognize any real obligation towards him beyond the usual help for the poor, even if he has been working all the time ever so faithfully and diligently. The usual help for the poor, however, leaves a lot to be desired, especially in large cities, where it is very much worse than in the country.” The first bill from Bismarck that had success was the Sickness Insurance Bill, which was passed in 1883. Bismarck considered the program the least important and the least politically troublesome. The program was established to provide sickness insurance for German industrial laborers. The health service was established on a local basis, with the cost divided between employers and the employed. The employers contributed 1/3, while the workers contributed 2/3s. The minimum payments for medical treatment and sick pay for up to 13 weeks were legally fixed. The individual local health bureaus were administered by a committee elected by the members of each bureau, and this move had the unintended effect of establishing a majority representation for the workers on account of their large financial contribution. The other Bismarck bills were the “accident Insurance Law” in 1884 and the “The Old Age Pension program of 1889, an insurance equally financed by employers and workers,
was designed to provide a pension annuity for workers who reached age 70 years. Unlike the Accident Insurance and Sickness Insurance programs, this program covered all categories of workers—industrial, agrarian, artisans and servants from the start.

The reforms of Bismarck are one part of the welfare state. The other part is modern urbanism as such. We can identify at least two fields of welfare in the further history of urban planning: first the planning law (1) and second public housing (2). The first one, the planning law, brings us back to the case of Prussian [Praschen] Fluchtliniengesetz from 1875. I will give you a short insight into this first general planning law and will quote the beginning of the law. The king is speaking: “We, Wilhelm, King of Prussia by the grace of God, enact, with agreement of both parliaments, for all the territory of monarchy, what follows”. This is the preamble. As we can see, it is the King of Prussia, who is enacting; we are still in monarchy. The point is that within the act the king suspends a part of his power. There is a shift from the King’s sphere to the municipal sphere. The intrinsic meaning of the first planning law (not only in Prussia) was the extension of the municipal realm of accountability and the translation from absolutist police power towards municipal urban planning. This is virtually the initial “democratic moment” of planning law. And it is linked with a specific concept of welfare. The idea behind it is that the state rules in a better way with a greater benefit for its population if the smaller units in the state (as the cities) have a greater responsibility.

By the way, for the concept of public space – and public space is one of the frameworks for our seminar – it is interesting to look into the regulatory content of the Fluchtliniengesetz. I quote the first article: “the parish council decides about the building lines in the case of the construction of streets and places in cities and villages in accordance with the municipality and with agreement of the local police administration.” The building lines distinguish between a building and a non-building zone, between a private building sphere on the one hand side and a public street/place on the other side. The first article of the first planning law is not about how to build buildings but how to produce free spaces, spaces for the public. The content of the Fluchtliniengesetz, this is important for our context, was above all to constitute public spaces, public spaces for streets, public spaces for public places.

A second specific object of urban planning welfare is the housing question. The housing question appears in the emerging urban planning debate. The housing question was primarily an issue for new regulations concerning the social and hygienic standards in the buildings of the industrial cities. By degrees, the concept of public housing comes out on the horizon. We can find the first attempts for a concept of public and social housing at the end of 19th century. These attempts have been expanded in the following years. According to my view on the link between the concept of welfare and the concept of urban planning, it is obvious that public housing is the materialization of the welfare state. This is crucial: the materiality of the discourse, the materialized welfare state. Social housing is such a materiality. And it challenges, by the way, the concept of public space. Social housing provides another version of public space: public housing is built from the public for the public, but the result, the housing itself, is a private realm. This tension of public/non-public challenges the concept of public space. I will tell you more about it in my lecture in May about the “housing for the masses”.

The concept of the welfare state left marks in the emerging urban planning idea. In a book from the 1870s about the police-administration of the Prussian state the author proclaims: “The theory of welfare requires from the police not only the performance of a bellman but impose the state the care for the public good”. This care for the public good (Gemeinbedarf) became the main task for urban planning.

In 1873 some of the leading actors in the emerging field of urban planning like Reinhard Baumeister, Josef Stübben and James Hobrecht – founded the Deutsche Verein für öffentliche Gesundheitspflege (German Society of Public Health Care). In this context arises a biological conceptualization of the city as an organic corpus, which can be healthy or even not. Consequently, public health care and the concept of welfare/wellbeing are the very foundation of urbanism and urban planning in 19th century. To stress the relevance of their project the urban planners relentlessly constructed the city as a lively but sick entity. Urban planning designates the city as its patient and one of the main concerns of urbanism analysis was producing urban pathologies. However, both, the concepts of welfare state and of urban planning are strongly linked with the conception of the state and the city as organic entities, as biological beings affected with...
joy and sorrow of an organic body. In other words: both are fruits of something which can be named as biopolitics.

Biopolitics is an important theoretical sector in recent political philosophy, based on the analysis how medicine and politics are integrated into one concept. Welfare state and urban planning are classic examples for exactly this amalgamation. The proposed link to the past and to the concept of welfare state is the key for understanding urban planning as a main configuration of the biopolitical essence of modernity.

Concluding we can say that the birth of urban planning is embedded in the birth of the welfare state. Modern urban planning is the welfare state. The object of welfare is the bridge to analyzing the urban planning past. My proposal is, in one sentence, to analyze the planning regulations as practice of creating public spaces and the urban planning practice of producing materialized welfare as public housing.

***

At this point we have reached the preliminary end of our travel from genealogy to urbanism, polizey, welfare and public health. An end that will be a beginning: the beginning of having a seminar about different pasts of urban planning. I would like to resume very shortly some of the main points of my lecture: (1) The concept of genealogy is related with Friedrich Nietzsche (2) The concept of genealogy is elaborated by Michel Foucault. (3) The concept of genealogy refutes the traditional concept of history as a linear progress. (4) The concept of genealogy based on the claim that there is nothing that we could call as the last truth. (5) The genealogical analysis of urbanism shows that urban planning emerges as part of the Polizey. (6) It shows as well, that urban planning is materialized welfare and (7) that it is embedded in the idea of public health. These points are the base for the idea of our seminar, the idea to study the production of public spaces and urban culture through a genealogical lens. I hope you got a first impression about what it could be.
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Baumeister, Reinhard (1876): Stadt-Erweiterungen in technischer baupolizeilicher und wirtschaftlicher Beziehung. Ernst. Berlin
It is the aim of this lecture unit to acquaint students with different approaches to understand public space and to sensitize their conceptual repertoire regarding public space as a contemporary object of planning, a policy field demanded in a manifold way and a challenging design task. A general reflection of our spatial understanding shall be stimulated by linking the Lefebvrian account of the “social production of space” to a deeper understanding of public spaces in the city as lived spaces. In other disciplines mainly agitating in the fields of social science such as urban sociology, anthropology, ethnography, arts history or law, public space is dealt with as self-confidently as in planning, design practice, and in urban politics. But one discrepancy is manifest: All these actors talk differently about public spaces. Consensus on the particular meaning of public spaces is reached only occasionally. Some understand public spaces as built places, as urban morphologies whereas others deny any material of social life in the city. But how can we imagine social spaces and built, sometimes even highly-designed spaces, as two sides of the same coin? The existing diversity of theoretical approaches from different disciplinary backgrounds shows that there are basic disquietudes regarding theories on space, the role of institutions, their mechanisms and resources as well as regarding the players involved to be found behind debates on “public space”.

The lived spaces in the cities are rapidly changing: we are witnessing a new generation of global social protest (e.g. Arab Spring, Occupy movement, Indignados Square Movements), new privatisations of public space (e.g. the sale of streets, square and parks to private companies and developers), the rise of ubiquitous surveillance and control techniques (e.g. CCTV), but also embryonic forms of reclaiming the commons (e.g. through community gardening and insurgent and solidary practices). This shows that a number of social practices are constantly transforming the nature, manifestation and meanings of public space. Are these new phenomena? Is public space changing more radically and more quickly than ever? Or are we rather looking at it more closely and more sharply than before?

In the last 60 years, architects, geographers, planners, sociologists and urban designers interested in public space have been very busy compiling detailed overviews of the ways these places change. From accounts on the transformation of publicness and public life (Arendt, 1958, Sennett, 1991), public opinion and the public sphere (Habermas, 1989), to observations on dystopic landscapes and the privatisation of public space (Whyte, 1980; Sorkin, 1992; Christopherson, 1994; Low and Smith, 2006; Minton, 2012). Students starting to deal with public space in architecture and planning often start reading literature on the “public sphere” (as distinct from “public space”) which increases the level of abstraction and does not directly offer possibilities of transfer to the field of public space. To put it short, the main distinction is that debates on the public sphere basically tackle “public opinion” and “public reason” in the city, whereas debates on public space basically deal with “public life”. Low and Smith (2006) have therefore pointed to the disjunctures between socio-philosophical approaches to the public sphere and urban morphologies considered as being public spaces in the spatial arts disciplines. As a solution, she proposes to consider public space as the geography of the public sphere, thus linking theoretical abstraction again with empirical research. It is exactly at this interface that international public space research emerges which concentrates on an analysis, interpretation and further development of those places in the city where public life might eventually gain momentum.

This major body of literature exists alongside less mainstream (although very relevant) accounts on insurgent, interstitial, yet persistent forms of appropriation or re-creation of collective spaces (Watson,
While acknowledging the importance of these analyses, the complexity and richness of which cannot be addressed here in full, the lecture contends that new (relational) approaches in urban studies have allowed the emergence of new ways of seeing change and paths for acting change, which can be important tools for overcoming the limits of a dualistic approach.

Post-structuralist theories in geography, partially informed by the work of Henri Lefebvre and cultural studies, and other accounts of understanding the production of space have brought forth a range of theories revolutionising the way we conceptualise the link between space and people. These approaches, elaborating on the relations between society (and in particular cultural, political and economic change) and how (urban) space is actively produced by social agents, have been very influential across disciplines, and above all in planning (although less so in design), where they have inspired new relational approaches. The migration of these approaches to the cross-disciplinary field of public space is one of the main focuses of this lecture, and this task entails reconceptualising the importance of public life and the nature of publicness. Ultimately, the conceptual challenges brought forward by relational perspectives on public space are related to rethinking public space’s ontology and epistemology within the wider context of critical urban studies.

The works of feminist geographers, in particular, have been very powerful in creating new tools for thinking and seeing the relation between people and space and, through their dedication to participatory and action research, have also encouraged new action. bell hooks, for example, while reflecting on the socio-spatial marginality associated with race and gender, and the relationality of black identities, has chosen marginality as a position from which to speak as a place that offers “the possibility of radical perspectives from which to see and imagine alternatives and new worlds” (Hooks, 1990, p. 149). In so doing she is redefining her identity and inverting what it is to be marginal (Smith, 2005).

Gibson and Graham (2008) have also looked at empowerment both by engaging with community development and by choosing a post-structuralist perspective focused on giving visibility to a multitude of emerging alternatives (i.e. economies of solidarity), rather than on analytical descriptions of supposed dominant economic models (i.e. neoliberal capitalism). Contributions like these have encouraged a number of practices to emerge, to become vocal and gain visibility, as well as inspiring researchers to reflect on their positionality and empowering role while taking grassroots practices into account. Societies and social change have always been intertwined with space, yet action-oriented theory and research have fed and nurtured new ways of asserting and enacting alternative identities, ways of life and social practices.

There are two lessons to be learned here. The first is that social practices change in space and through space, and in so doing they change processes of space production. This understanding radically challenges and contests ‘flat’ ontologies of space, which see space as a container and geometric form, and related epistemologies. In this lecture, an engagement with the challenge of discussing and framing relational ontologies and epistemologies of public space is fostered, and their implications for innovative pedagogical models will be sketched. The second lesson is that a much greater trans-disciplinary dialogue is needed to enhance methodological and conceptual tools. Sciences of the built environment and the spatial arts, such as architecture and planning, in dialogue with innovative approaches, carry the potential to develop tools for reading these on-going processes, and incorporate them into innovative professional practices in a number of ways. This requires appropriate ways of doing research and the development of pedagogical models that bridge relational theory and practice.

Yet despite an often claimed interest in cross-disciplinary approaches to the study of public spaces and the patterns of emerging urban cultures, neither architecture nor planning has sufficiently investigated public spaces as sites of learning about the changing spatial patterns of social change. The overall relevance of such a critical analysis to inform, challenge and change planners’ and designers’ professional work is considerably underestimated. A possible explanation is the lack of sensitive knowledge about how to approach people in the city in ethically appropriate ways during the process of planning and designing material patterns of change; another is the restriction of debates on public spaces to consideration of mere themes, ignoring the challenge of understanding and explaining historic,
contemporary and future urban change phenomena via public space research. There seem to be epistemological qualities of public space which need to be uncovered, as well as ethical considerations of how to deal with the growing complexity of social change and place-making practices at the local scale which need to be reconsidered.

To achieve this we shift from a static conception of public space as a material surface towards a dynamic idea of ever changing public life and materialized lived spaces in the city. Then the lecture will offer systematic insights into these theoretical dimensions of public space. By doing so, a range of conceptual challenges will be addressed that are posed by lived spaces to pedagogical practice in particular, and to the production of academic insights in general.

In terms of production and consumption processes in the city, these have long been influencing patterns of everyday life in the city, and the dilemmas of changing macro-modes of regional and global production circuits become palpable on the micro-scale of those places where people “rub along” with particular rhythms and repetitions (Watson 2006, Lefebvre 1974). Through this everyday social interaction and the encounter of individuals and groups forming very different types of social relations, meaning is produced and changes the focus from abstract spaces of building regulations and architectural conceptions towards the lived places of everyday culture in the cities. However, as Watson (2006) has highlighted, public spaces are vitally characterized by forms of disenchancing and enchanting encounters: in urban realities, they are as inclusive as exclusive, and can be considered as being one of the most contested urban realms.

In addition, traditional approaches to understand space tend to view public space mainly as a shell or container, focussing on its morphological structures and functional uses. That way, its ever-changing meanings, contested or challenged uses have been largely ignored, as well as the contextual and on-going dynamics between social actors, their cultures, and struggles. The key role of space in enabling spatial opportunities for social action, the fluidity of its social meaning and the changing degree of „publicness“ of a space remain unexplored fields of academic inquiry and professional practice, especially in the fields of landscape architecture, urban design and city planning.

To unravel the theory building potentials of relational public space based on spatial practice as a key driver, an epistemological bridge is established between abstract relational space theory and concrete approaches in urban education, and four learning fields will be further identified as transversal educational pillars in teaching public space matters. By promoting and qualifying a relational epistemology of public space as a core field in urban studies, the aim of this lecture has been to reconnect academic education in architecture and planning to a people-centred understanding of public space, considering the city as a lived space. Teaching about public space in planning and architecture resembles a reformist pedagogical approach in educational studies, as it is action-oriented; it focuses on the self-organizing and empowering aspects of learning about space, and considers each student’s individual capacities in a collectively organized learning group as an important resource.
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CITIES AS PLACES OF DIFFERENCE, TOLERANCE AND CONFLICT

Ass. Prof. Dr. phil. Sabine Knierbein
Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space, Faculty of Architecture & Planning, TU Wien

Approaches and Structure
Following the idea of fetching architects and planners from a context that is familiar to them and orient them towards a discovery of the concept of ‘urban cultures’ this lecture combines an analytical reading of the former Urban Development Plan 2005. We will first ask: In which ways does this urban development document involve notions of urban culture? A second step will be to explain the different and partly ambiguous ways in which culture is used, and detect different biases in the perception of culture in the city. After having deconstructed the everyday and sometimes rather unreflected use of the concept of urban culture in planning and urban policies, different scientific approaches to urban and city cultures will be introduced in order to re-construct a wider and more reflected conception of urban cultures, and discuss aspects of difference, tolerance and conflict in relation to these conceptions. The lecture is therefore divided into four parts:
(1) Construction of urban culture: the content-analytical/discourse-analytical construction of ‘culture’ in urban development programs
(2) Deconstruction of urban culture: scientific counter-positions, attempts to enlighten, and successes
(3) Reconstruction of urban culture: the exploration of difference in urban society in terms of everyday aesthetics and lifeworlds (e.g., in public space)
(4) Co-construction of urban culture: awareness of discriminatory practices and discourses, empowering the spatial identity construction of individuals and groups who are disadvantaged or discriminated against

Construction of Urban Culture
In the Vienna Urban Development Plan for 2005, the term ‘culture’ is used by employing the following connotations: culture as historical heritage, culture as cohabitation of different and diverse cultures, culture as regional identity/regional connectedness, and culture as economic sector. Based on the “Public Space Score” (for the district of Aspern), a culturalization of landscape architecture and urban planning is evident: according to this strategic-symbolic urban development approach, theme-based urban development (cultural theming) is intended to serve “to set values” for a new city developed and marketed from scratch. Based on the cultural planning in the Vienna Museum Quarter, two further modes of interpretation of culture that have a strong relation to public space are represented in the city: (high) culture is used here, firstly, as a catalyst for urban development in order to boost consumption; secondly, a feature of post-Fordist urban development can clearly be seen here: culture serves as a central instrument of the experience economy (city of spectacle). This is about individualized consumption patterns that go beyond meeting the basic physical needs of the urban population. The crux of many of these developments is that often, in the course of the development of spatial symbolism, urban publics are no longer characterized by the necessary breadth or diversity of society, but are divided into selective and often exclusive consumption-specific target groups (cultural theming is accompanied by symbolic exclusion). Target groups cannot be equated with urban publics, as the term of urban publics is much more inclusive.

What can be analysed from these different uses of ‘culture’ and ‘urban culture’ is that there are different biases underlying the political discourse relating to urban culture in Vienna, and other cities:

Creative Bias
Culture is understood in the narrow sense of the cultural sector, creative industries, and thus refers to intellectual and artistic practices that, in addition to material products, especially generate services with symbolic value. Creativity in everyday life and beyond the creative milieu is often neglected here,
which fuels criticism of the selectiveness of discourses of creativity and culture in urban development.

Ethnic Bias
If culture-related debates are linked to discourses on migration, integration, and diversity, the concept of culture is quickly narrowed to refer to the ethnic origin or nationality of different migrants, in short, to their "otherness." As a political solution to overcome this "otherness", supremacist approaches (frequently) prevail, according to which immigrant cultures should adapt to what is considered familiar to or characteristic of the receiving society or state. These approaches are problematic, as they do not view the self-sufficiency of certain values and cultural practices as potentially valuable, and they dictate how people must deal with their past before they migrated. This can be understood as a (partial) invalidation of their identities produced by lack of recognition and by discrimination through 'othering'.

Economic Bias
In the course of economic considerations relating to urban development, 'culture' demarcates a very narrow economic field. Within this field, culture is seen as a factor in the creation of urban value. Everything that is of little or no commercial value, such as everyday cultural practices in public spaces, will be excluded in this approach to culture. As part of the change of the Fordist city to the post-Fordist and post-industrial city, a new meaning is attributed to the symbolic economies in terms of the marketing of land, houses, and apartments. This process is known as the commodification of culture, as symbolic space itself becomes a commodity (Zukin 1995). Media economy has developed similar path of turning public space and public life in cities into a commodity (commodification): These approaches are coined as attention economy (Knierbein 2010).

High Culture Bias
In the course of city marketing and tourism, works and services of avant-garde cultural production in particular are subsumed under the notion of 'culture': performances in the opera, theatre, ballet, contemporary dance, composition, visual arts, etc. This traditional notion of works of high culture is now more likely to include popular and avant-garde forms contained within the cultural mainstream, fuelled by provocative and controversial ideas that generally relate to alternative, artistic, and activist practices and countercultural approaches. However, the contributions of these countercultural actors are often far less valued or recognized.

Deconstruction of urban culture
Regarding the use of the term ‘culture,’ Johnson et. al. (2004: 35) state: “The idea of culture was caught in an interplay of social and intellectual movements. It became a kind of holding term, summing up tradition, only used perhaps “where imprecision matters.” Culture is a sufficiently ambivalent concept that can address diverse, sometimes contradictory requirements, tensions, or challenges simultaneously. Due to its relatively uncontroversial rhetorical character, ‘culture’ is often used to implement discursive and material interventions with different, sometimes incompatible goals.”

The use of the term ‘culture’ opens up interpretive spaces of play, reveals the overstretching of the concept, and, above all, lends positive connotations. So, must we reject the concept of (urban) culture? No. After all, ‘culture’ and ‘urban culture’ are still two key terms when it comes to bringing the dimensions of everyday culture and the lifeworlds of urban social spaces back into the teaching and research agendas of universities, especially in architecture and planning. In urban planning, urban research, and urban design, the concept of culture must be used with special care if clarity and depth of content are intended: the awareness of at least four dimensions of indistinctness that we often encounter in the use of "culture" and "urban culture", is therefore to be connected to the study of (emergent) urban cultures.

Reconstruction of urban culture
Against the backdrop of this criticism of the use of ‘culture’ and ‘urban culture’ in urban development discourses, a reconstruction of urban culture is appropriate for an in-depth discussion of the everyday-life dimensions and lifeworldly aspects of city and space. This will be in two steps: first, in the discussion of societal and spatial differences and, secondly, the systematic inclusion of symbolism, emotion, and experience in urban research, planning, and design.

I. Heterogeneity and difference
The sciences that deal with the city are empirically and theoretically heterogeneous in nature and deal with scientific subjects that are also characterized by difference (e.g. social groups or urban societies). It is obvious how the particular characteristics of a city (as a heterogeneous process of global urbanization) or public space (as public life in flux that is characterized by difference) diffuse
into the character of the working method. The following conclusions emerge from these considerations:

(1) If urban societies are characterized by difference and heterogeneity per se, then this must also be reflected in the way we analytically work with urban space.

(2) Urban culture serves as a valuable working concept to acknowledge, criticize, and bridge urban differences, or to reframe the analysis of these differences.

II. Symbolism, emotion, and experience in the city

In addition to the examination of differences in urban society and urban space, urban cultural research also includes approaches, that deal with symbolic inscriptions in the materiality of the city; that emphasize the role of emotions, traditions, customs, and value systems based on people’s own experience; that point to the particular patterns of belonging of certain groups (processes of collective and individual identification); that recognize, thematize, analyze, and seek to overcome practices of ‘othering’ (the prejudiced interaction with ‘others’, ‘foreigners’ or ‘people who are different’).

Co-construction of urban culture

For the study of urban culture in the fields of architecture and planning, the following passages will be read, analyzed, and interpreted:

Rolf Lindner. *Walks on the wild side.*

“The anecdotes show that the discovery of urban culture implies developing a sensorium, a ‘sense’ for urban culture (e.g. to understand the ‘strange’ (das Fremde) as ‘different’ (das Andere) and not as ‘being in deficit’ (das Defizitäre)). To develop a sensorium for urban culture means to see behind the curtain of preset opinions as well as public sceneries and private facades. "Lifting the veil", den Schleier zu lüften, (…)" (Lindner 2004, S. 116, own translation)

Michel de Certeau. *The practice of everyday life*

“For what I really wish to work out is a science of singularity; that is to say a science of the relationship that links everyday pursuits to particular circumstances. And only in the local network of labour and recreation can one grasp how, within a grid of socio-economic constraints, these pursuits unfailingly establish relational tactics (a struggle for life), artistic creations (an aesthetic), and autonomous initiatives (an ethic). The characteristically subtle logic of these “ordinary” activities comes to light only in the details. And hence it seems to me that this analysis, as its bond to another culture is rendered more explicit, will only be assisted in leading readers to uncover for themselves, in their own situation, their own tactics, their own creations, and their own initiatives.” (de Certeau, 1984, ix)


“It is in the movement of these bodies - differentiated by gender, age, class, ethnic and national identity - and their everyday activities: conversations, purchases, leisure time spent listening to Latino music, eating homemade food - that these vendors and their clients make the market space what it is. And it is also through the embodied space of their relationships that the market is transformed into a translocal/transnational space. Moore Street Market for most of its users is both a cultural home in Brooklyn and a native homeland located in the same space/time continuum.” (Setha Low 2011, p. 473)

The text by R. Lindner suggests that there has already been a call for the development of a sensorium in the history of urban research. This sensorium allows researchers to respond in an analytically unbiased way to new things and changes in the city. Based on the text by M. de Certeau, firstly the relevance of everyday life for the researched understanding of the city is referred to. Secondly, the biography of the researcher, including their urban experiences and influences, will be foregrounded. Thirdly, it is not just about large proclamations and strategies dictated ‘from above’, but rather it is about practices and tactics of everyday life, and the importance of more subtle socio-spatial changes. Lastly, by means of the text by S. Low, the question of the spatial dimensions of culture will be posed, understood to be embodied space. In every social action, there exist physical qualities that are of central importance for the anthropological and sociological analysis of space. On the one hand, inferences can be made about a person’s social position based on facial expressions, gestures, and movements; on the other hand, the example of street markets shows that a practice in public space that appears to be local can simultaneously be a reference for translocal identity.

To bring these perspectives together, co-construction of urban culture means that we can build on existing scientific contributions to work to overcome
discriminatory practices in urban research, urban design, and urban planning. It becomes clear, that difference in the city is often associated with unequal chances of emancipation and refers to existing power structures or conflicts that are manifested primarily where majority and minority society come together. The following questions are important here to take into account when debates in planning and architecture unfold around notions of ‘culture’: What do others emphasize when they speak of ‘urban culture’? How can we bring together as many relevant perspectives as possible to address this topic? How specifically do minorities or individuals or groups who are often stigmatized or discriminated against in the city identify with the city, and its cultures? What are their positions on the discourses and practices through which they more often experience negative effects than positive effects?
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Parts of the paragraph “Approaches and Structure” have already been published in:

European cities are changing rapidly in partial response to the processes of de-industrialization, European integration, international migration, economic globalization and climate change. Public spaces of these cities, as essential ingredients of the urban image and experience, are increasingly playing an important part in this transition. A key question concerns the role that public spaces are expected to play in political, economic and cultural transformation of cities, and the impact of these transformations on the nature of public space as a shared resource. How are public authorities addressing the challenges of provision and maintenance of public space both as a catalyst for change and as a common good?

Public space is a subject with a rising significance, beginning to receive the attention that it deserves in urban research and practice. There is an increasing number of academic books on public spaces, which reflects this development (e.g., Carmona et al. 2008, 2010; De Souza & Frith, 2012; Delaney, 2011; Eckardt & Wildner, 2008; Fessler Vaz et al. 2006; Jonker & Amiraux, 2006; Lehtovuori, 2010; Orum & Zachary, 2010; Shaftoe, 2008; Stevens, 2007, Watson, 2006). The recent civic unrest and struggles in many European cities and beyond show the everyday political and social relevance of the topic in professional and cultural practice (Iveson, 2007; Drache, 2008; Knierbein, 2015). Public spaces are broadly defined as crossroads, where different paths and trajectories meet, sometimes overlapping and at other times colliding; they are the meeting place of politics and culture, social and individual territories, instrumental and expressive concerns (Madanipour, 2003a). This lecture presents an investigation (Madanipour, Knierbein and Degros 2015) regarding the multiple roles that public space play in European cities in transition:

- How do European urban authorities understand and deal with public spaces?
- How does this interact with market forces, historic legacies, social norms and cultural expectations?
- Whether and how do interventions into public spaces relate to the needs and experiences of their citizens, exploring new strategies and innovative practices for strengthening public spaces and urban culture? The authors draw on case studies from Antwerp, Belfast, Berlin, Budapest, Dresden, Istanbul, London, Milan, Naples, Paris, Vienna, Warsaw, and six Swiss cities of Basel, Lucerne, Schaffhausen, St. Gallen, Winterthur, and Zurich, which were conducted by authors from anthropology, sociology, geography, architecture, landscape architecture, urban planning and design, urban policy, and urban studies (the full texts of these case studies have been published in Madanipour, A., Knierbein, S. and Degros, A. (2014) Public space and the challenges of urban transformation in Europe. London: Routledge). These cases investigate different moments of urban transformation in European cities with a particular focus on the public space and the challenges that face cities in this process.

**Public space and economic revival**

Cities are engines of economic development, places where most economic activities of production, exchange and consumption take place. Basing the future growth of the economy on knowledge and innovation demonstrated the transition from labour-intensive to knowledge-intensive activities, from manufacturing industries to services and higher levels of added value activities (Madanipour 2011a). The transition involved expanding the information and communication technologies, supporting the development of science and technology, enabling innovation, and encouraging the development of knowledge and skills through research and education (EC, 2010a). Innovation is considered to be the beating heart of economic development and transformation; in its different forms in science and technology as well as in
creative and cultural industries, innovation draws on the encounters between different stakeholders, the meeting of minds, which is partly facilitated by the urban environment.

Many cities around Europe have developed policies and projects for public spaces, paying attention to their urban environment as a necessary component of urban competitiveness. It is a vision based on competition between cities, in which cities behave like private corporations in search of new investment, new workforce and new markets, and expanding their productive capacities as a prerequisite for this competition. This entrepreneurial approach has been widely adopted by public authorities, but it has caused alarm over its social, political and environmental consequences. The challenge that this entrepreneurial turn has put forward concerns the nature of urban transformation: an emerging orthodoxy about the necessity of market-based thinking and continuous controversy over the social and environmental consequences of this approach. So rather than hollowing out the need for critical reflection on public spaces that are under pressure, especially during phases of rapid transition, how can we emphasize their potentials as bearers of this change? Do they serve as interfaces between local needs and global pressures? Is gentrification an unavoidable outcome of economic revitalization, or can we find ways that are not necessarily dichotomous and can illustrate the challenges cities face when dealing proactively with manifold paths of transformation?

**Public space and social inclusion**

Since its beginning, the EU has emphasized the need for social cohesion to coincide with economic development. However, research has shown a rise in income inequalities within most member states, similar to the trends elsewhere in the United States, China and India. Indeed, for most European countries, socio-economic inequalities were higher in 2007 than in 1980, explained by the growing imbalance between pay increases and productivity increases, resulting in a decline in labour’s share of added value. The low paid workers, therefore, have not been able to benefit from upturns in productivity (EC, 2010b, p. 18). In this period of economic growth, fuelled by economic modernization and labour market deregulation, employment has polarized and earning inequality widened without being offset by social transfers and other policies (EC, 2010b, p. 44). Research, however, shows that less unequal societies benefit from more social and economic advantages, which is why it is argued that a new model of development is required that reduces, rather than intensifies, socio-economic inequalities. However, ‘socio-economic inequalities are not an automatic consequence of modernity, they can be reduced and kept at bay’ (EC, 2010b, p. 3).

In the context of social challenges such as ageing, inequality and cultural diversity, what roles can be envisaged for city authorities? The provision and maintenance of public space is part of the delivery of public services, which in turn is one of the central ways with which social challenges can be addressed. It is part of the quality of urban environment, which is a social asset for all. Building and maintaining accessible and high quality public spaces in all urban neighbourhoods is one of the ways of making a city fairer and more democratic, in which all parts are given equal treatment, and investment in public space is not a pathway to displacement and gentrification.

**Public space and cultural difference**

Cultural difference is a primary feature of the contemporary urban experience, caused by the breakdown of some mass routines associated with manufacturing industries, the struggles for more freedom by different social groups, the diversification of lifestyles, the opening of national labour and education markets, and migration within and between continents and countries: European cities are pulled in different directions. Cities are the historic creations of European civilization, their buildings and public spaces symbolizing the identity of cities and nations, icons around which proud narratives are echoed down the ages. Yet the cultural difference and diversity of the modern city demands adjustment and transformation to a new social reality. How can the contemporary public spaces signify the increasingly diverse cultural mix?

The choice, however, is not merely limited to looking to the past or the future; it also involves a selection from the different periods of the past, deciding how far back to go, which layer of the palimpsest to adopt as the more authentic. Each of these past layers, meanwhile, is loaded with historic significance, with wars and struggles that may still be alive in people’s memories. The question may be formulated as a dilemma between the eclectic diversity of the present and the authentic purity of a past.
Another way that the distinction between a modern eclectic identity and an authentic historic identity may be formulated is in the distinction between the centre and periphery. The centre may display a seemingly easy coexistence of historic layers as part of its identity, but how can the periphery make a more positive contribution to this multi-layered identity? There is a need for systematically connecting research on public space to an investigation of particular European cities in various regions of Europe in order to ask for their differing roles as important ingredients in democracy (constructed on egalitarian difference) and as local vehicles for change.

**Public space and environmental care**

The provision of public space is directly linked to the quality of life in compact urban environments. Urban sprawl is driven by individual search for better quality of domestic space, but with adverse consequences for the society as a whole through higher rates of energy and land consumption, higher levels of traffic, air and noise pollution, heat waves and climate change (EEA, 2009). To address these problems, it is essential to restrain urban expansion, which can reduce transport and energy use, protect the countryside for agriculture, recreation and wildlife. The compact city, however, needs to offer a high quality and healthy urban environment. Provision of public space plays a significant role in persuading citizens to adopt a sustainable way of life inside the city, rather than leaving the city in search of open space.

The environmental, social, and cultural challenges come together when dealing with the legacy of the modernist road infrastructure and mass produced buildings and their impact on cities. Wide roads had been cut through cities to open them up to the fast movement of cars. Now with the awareness of environmental problems, the tide is turning against the motor car, taming it rather than seeing it as the engine of urban transformation. In this context, public space plays a key role in reintegrating the fragmented pieces left by these gigantic transport projects, reshaping the city for the benefit of pedestrians and cyclists.

**Public space and urban governance**

In many cities in Europe and beyond, public space has been reconsidered as a cross-cutting policy field. Many European cities have scented the advent of a new paradigmatic shift in public urban development. Sometimes, this new emphasis on public spaces is used as a model for other cities, for example in the cases of Barcelona and New York, where a certain politics of public space is shaped and then promoted as a model for application in other cities (e.g. in Buenos Aires, Lima or Rio de Janeiro (Barcelona case) or in Mexico City (New York case)) (Fessler Vaz et. al., 2006).

Public space, we argue, offers the potential to make a valuable contribution in addressing the economic, social, cultural, environmental and political challenges facing European cities. The question, however, is whether the local authorities are able and willing to use it in that capacity. Although the politics of public space has been subject to considerable analysis (Sadeh 2010, Low and Smith 2006, Tonkiss 2006, Fessler Vaz et al. 2006), there is a need to explicitly address the multifarious and partly ambivalent roles of ‘the state’ as a social sphere and of state actors as influential stakeholders actively shaping the processes of public space production. How do state actors deal with manifold interests of citizens and market players in order to create a balance of interests? How is public interest cast in steel and carved in stone via public policies? How do planners try to ‘translate’ political programmes into everyday material reality within European cities? In the context of European integration and globalization, might public spaces serve as a framework for theorizing justice (Fraser 2008) beyond the nation-state and the Westphalian principle of national sovereignty?

The various challenges that cities face place a high burden of expectation on their governance. The processes of economic liberalization, privatization and deregulation, and the recent economic crisis have reduced the scope and the capacities of the public authorities for action. The number and range of new stakeholders in urban transformation has increased to include many non-state actors. Taking action would require coordination among these stakeholders, putting in place effective governance for urban change while protecting the common good. The public authorities, in ensuring the delivery of public services, which includes public space, and in maintaining the social and environmental requirements of urban living, are still playing a central role in urban development.

Beyond the different social models that have characterized Europe, from the Nordic to Anglo-Saxon, Continental and Mediterranean models (Esping Andersen, 1999), some have argued in favour of a new, combined European social model, which can be an asset in responding to the economic crisis.
The elements of this model would include employment pacts, social dialogue and the redistribution of the fruits of growth. In this context, public space, in its various forms, would be an essential ingredient in the public infrastructure that can facilitate social dialogue.
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In a previous lecture I discussed my genealogical approach to the concept of the welfare state. I tried to bring to you the concept of genealogy with introducing Friedrich Nietzsche and Michel Foucault. The aim of these efforts was to outline the concept of welfare. I talked about the link between the concept of welfare and urban planning, and I told you as well that obvious public housing is a kind of materialization of the welfare state. Of course, we are in Vienna, and you all know the famous examples of such materialized public housing welfare state.

Today I will follow another trace from exactly this point of departure. My intention is to take a glance on public housing while exploring a different name for the same thing. I have already mentioned that naming and signifying are specific and interesting kinds of action. A crucial part of the nature of the signified thing is embedded in the very procedure of naming or signification. My suggested operation, therefore, is, to change the term ‘public housing’ into another term, namely into the wording „housing for the masses“, in German: Massenwohnungsbau. Housing for the masses is a common term in the social housing discourse. Social housing, affordable housing, housing for the masses: these are different names for more or less the same thing. The result of this operation is to identify a new signifier as my new object of study. This signifier is the concept of the masses. My idea is, in short, to understand what could be “housing for the masses” by focusing on the idea of the masses. My thesis is that for understanding the welfare-state-concept of housing for the masses it is necessary to ask: what are the masses?

However, what I would like to do in this talk is to give you an introduction into the discourse of the masses, particularly in the late 19th Century. In other words, I will tell you the story about inventing the masses. In my mind this is particularly important because of the new discourses in our times. Again the view into the past could be a key for getting a better understanding of recent happenings. However, housing for the masses has different manifestations, different characteristics, different sides. My access to the phenomena is to figure out the masses, the idea of the masses and the history of the idea of the masses. My questions are: who has introduced and for what reason the object „The masses“? Which idea is underlying such a welfare-state- manifestation?

***

I will start with a closer view on a somewhat strange field of knowledge called mass psychology. What is mass psychology? Crowding studies emanates from the late-nineteenth-century discourse on mass psychology. In this context, it is also useful to discuss density. ‘Density’ and ‘mass’ have several things in common here. Much like the word ‘density’, the term ‘mass’ is rooted in physics, though it also has an interpretative dimension on the social (non-physical) level. Much like density, ’mass’ suggests a number of people, but it is (likewise) also deployed as a significant concept in political, philosophical, social-scientific and literary discourse. The main connotation of the term ‘mass’, however, is not a spatial one (unlike density, to which space is intrinsic), nor can it be reduced to a number quite as easily as density can.

The provenance of the discourse about the masses is the field of criminal anthropology, which was tasked with the mission of studying the criminal. In one of the first tractates of mass psychology you can read: „Criminal anthropology studies the delinquent in his natural place, that is to say, in the field of biology and pathology“. The Italian Cesare Lombroso, professor of forensic medicine and hygiene in Turin, advanced the agenda of criminal anthropology in 1878, when he
published L’uomo delinquente, a highly influential book which went through five editions. The book, published in English in 1900 under the title „Criminal Man“, solidified the links between social evolutionary theories and the fear of crowds with its concept of the „born“ criminal as the savage in the midst of civilized society. The book influenced both European and American legal experts interested in assigning responsibility to individuals in dubious behavior while engaged within a crowd. Another main object of interest in those times was the issue of hypnosis. The First International Congress for Experimental and Therapeutic Hypnotism was held in Paris, France, on August 1889. One of the attendees was Sigmund Freud, by the way. In general, mass psychology was interested in how this it works for the individual and in the question what is contagious in case of masses.

However, I will give you more details about some of the main thinkers of mass psychology. And I will start with Gabriel Tarde. Tarde (1843 – 13 May 1904) was a French sociologist, criminologist and social psychologist who conceived sociology as based on small psychological interactions among individuals. Tarde was born in Sarlat in the province of Dordogne, and he studied law in Toulouse and Paris. In the 1880s he corresponded with representatives of criminal anthropology. Along-side Lombroso, Tarde came to be the leading representative for a „French school“ in criminology. In 1900 he was appointed professor in modern philosophy at the Collège de France. As such he was the most prominent contemporary critic of Durkheim’s sociology, who will be the focus of my density lecture on Wednesday.

Gabriel Tarde’s Les lois de l’imitation of 1890 is often cited as a first point of reference in mass psychology. Tarde’s Laws of Imitation, to give it its English title, is not a study on psychopathology or criminology but an exposition of a distinctly sociological theory in which the author stakes out his position within the emerging discipline of sociology. Tarde elaborates a “pure sociology” focused on the “purely social side of human phenomena” (Tarde 1903, ix). In this respect Tarde’s theory stands clearly opposed to a naturalistic, social-Darwinian approach, against the “biological” or “mechanical air” that sociology had always previously been given. Tarde derives his approach from the thesis that historical progress essentially rests on “resemblances and repetitions” (ibid., 14). Imitation, in Tarde’s often repeated credo, “is always the point to which we must return” (ibid., 60). Even history, he says, can be explained in this way. Indeed, imitation is supposedly “the only thing” that is “of in-terest to history”. And as a “collection of those things that have been the most successful,” history is a collection of “those initiatives that have been the most imitated” (ibid., 139). Tarde’s core thesis, then, is that imitation is of central significance to all social processes. Imitations, says Tarde, can oc-cur in various manifestations, whether “conscious or unconscious, deliberate or spontaneous, volun-tary or involuntary” (ibid., 192). The object of imitation might be an idea, a volition, a judgement or an intent in which a certain amount of “belief and desire” is expressed. ‘Belief and desire’ for Tarde are the two “psychological quantities” one finds “at the bottom of all the sensational qualities” and they constitute “the very soul of words, of religious prayers, of state administration, of the articles of a code” (ibid., 145). As for what constitutes the core of imitation, Tarde says the sociologist “should yield to the psychologist” (ibid., 74). The effect of one brain upon the next is comparable to “hypnotic suggestion”, an unconscious transfer that is both the source and the cause of imitation (ibid., 199 note 1). Tarde refers to imitation as a kind of somnambulism, a form of human interaction that cannot be rationally understood (in its constituent parts). Even “the simplest and most superficial kind of sociology” is thus rooted in “the depths of the most inward and hidden parts of psychology” (ibid., 87).

Tarde attracts enourmous interest in recent social philosophy. Particulary Gille Deleuze and Bruno Latour refering to Gabriel Tarde and his focus on the relations and its theory. For my object it is crucial that Tarde stages the masses. He stages the masses with considering the city. The mental state of the metropolitan, says Tarde, is that of the ”somnambulist“. He then uses this psychologically-in-flected strain of urban sociology to explain the ‘dark side’ of the city, which was a much discussed issue at the time. Statistics on crime, suicide and mental illness are cited as evidence of the negative excrescences of city life. And this thesis brings Tarde to the idea of the ‘crowd’ and the masses. Tarde puts in the year 1890 the object of the masses on the agenda and therefore he counts today as starting point of mass psychology. Tarde’s Laws of Imitation can be regarded as foundational for the discourse of ‘mass psychology’. Tarde distinguishes between a pathological and a social variant of ‘imitation’. In the social variant the crowd causes the social behaviour.
of a single individual. In the pathological variant, imitation (in a crowd) leads to feverish mutual contagion among individuals. The latter became the basic assumption of crowd psychology.

Let us take another glance at another founding father of mass psychology, Scipio Sighele. Sighele (1868-1913) was an Italian criminal anthropologist and pioneer of mass psychology, teaching at the Universities of Brussels, Rome and Pisa. Sighele supplied with La Folla delinquente the foundational text of crowd psychology (1897 [1891]). Sighele’s text was written as a contribution to a debate on reforms within the Italian justice system centring on the question of individual culpability (whether an offender can be regarded as individually accountable when acting as part of a crowd). Sighele’s book assembles observations on collective behaviour from various disciplines (criminal anthropology, ethnology and historiography, for instance) and, with a clear nod to Tarde, develops the thesis that imitative acts are reinforced and accelerated within the crowd and that this effect is due to the bodily proximity of those involved. Everyone, according to Sighele, is prone to the urge to imitate what they see, observe and experience (1897, 48). Just as “wasps and birds” can be “worked up into an irresistible panic by a gentle beat of the wing”, people react in a similar way when “driven together into a crowd”. All it takes for commotion to spread through a crowd is that “its effects be seen and heard” – the actual cause of the commotion need not be known (ibid., 73). And when a crowd is formed “the powers of intellect and empathy both diminish.” In support of his theses Sighele cites another analogies with experiments on animal behaviour. For instance, he mentions one experiment by an ant specialist who had isolated several “individuals” from two fiercely antagonistic armies of ants and had then placed them in one container, at which point their belligerence had subsided and was suddenly supplanted by interaction of an “extremely amicable” kind. Sighele takes this experiment as evidence that “the ferocious and aggressive impulses of the crowd are caused by its large number” (ibid., 106).

The pathological effect of the crowd upon the individual is clearly one of his central theses, whereas he has nothing further to say on the socialising effect of the crowd (one of Tarde’s assertions). With “arguments based on association than logical causality”, Sighele concludes by describing the crowd as an impulsive, demented and instinctive animal (Gamper 2007, 418f.). In doing so he drives a wedge between formerly shared perspectives (sociology and social psychology) and instead chooses to regard things in terms of individual behaviour, thus consolidating the view of the crowd as a negative phenomenon.

Gustave Le Bon (1841-1931), another main thinker of mass psychology, studied medicine in Paris before becoming a general practitioner and an author. His main work Psychologie des Foules (The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind) is characterised by a language more drastic and populist than that of Sighele and Tarde, though his arguments do rely on the theoretical scaffolding of these two forebears. Like them, Le Bon is especially interested in the psychology of the crowd, that fleeting, transitory phenomenon consisting “of parts of the permanent social masses” and occurring in crowds and spontaneous demonstrations (Le Bon 1950 [1895], xvi). Le Bon conceives his analysis of the crowd as a continuation of his research on the “Rassenseele” (“genius of race”) (ibid., xxviii), thus setting crowd psychology within the same context as the racial discourse of the anthropology of his day. Le Bon’s “essential law” is that the “inferior characteristics of crowds” are less pronounced “in proportion as the spirit of the race is strong” (Le Bon 1896, 168). He attributes a number of gen-eraL characteristics to the crowd: compulsiveness, mobility, excitability, suggestibility, credulity, impatience and imperiousness. And according to Le Bon the crowd entails not only a loss of individuality but also a lowering of the cultural level of mankind. His ideas come to a head with the assertion that an individual in a crowd becomes “a barbarian” (ibid., 13).

As a result of Le Bon’s work a great deal of attention was paid to the subject of the crowd in social and political discourse at the turn of the century. His crowd psychology established the phenomenon of the crowd as the matrix of a scientific discipline whose epistemological status was still a matter of dispute. Le Bon managed to treat almost all the relevant social phenomena of his time in terms of the crowd, even if his argumentation was based on a “very one-dimensional conception of society” (Gamper 2007, 432). His clear, simple terminology did nothing to diminish the popularity of his theory and catapulted the concept of the crowd right into the heart of many “pessimistic diagnoses of the contemporary situation” (ibid.). Le Bon encapsulated the results of crowd psychology’s “manipulative analogies” (Friedrich 1999, 309) in a potent contribution
to contemporary discourse: an empirical study that was at once ideologically slanted, rhetorically loaded and heavily tinged with resentment (Gamper 2007, 431f.). This bias gave crowd psychology the reputation of being contemptuous of the masses. Crowd psychology regarded the crowd as an "emphatically reprehensible phenomenon" and an "instable, petulant social entity" that "is led by its impulses and completely subjugates the individual," thereby effecting a "removal of inhibitions" (Bernauer 1990, 61).

In this terrible vision the industrialised masses are depicted as a threat to civil society, ganging together and taking to the streets to demonstrate or revolt (Günzel 2002, 125).

Another important point in Le Bon’s book is the crowd’s susceptibility to control by a leader figure. As soon as a certain number of living creatures are brought together ("whether they be animals or men"), they instinctively place themselves "under the authority of a chief" (Le Bon 1896, 118). The crowd, according to Le Bon, exists in a permanent state of susceptibility to hypnosis and can therefore be steered by a hypnotist or ‘leader’ (see Bernauer 1990, 61). Le Bon identifies with reference to Nietzsche's "mediocrity for society as a whole (see Gamper 2007, 398f.)."

Le Bon stands for the climax in mass psychology and for the state of the art on how people think about the masses, for the state of defining the masses. Now, we turn to the further development of the field of knowledge, let’s say to the first period of post mass psychology, a time, in which the narrative of the masses has changed. In the 1920s, the discursive mass criticism – in the tradition of the mass psychology of the late 19th century – changed to a reflexive involvement with the crowd. Milestones in this transformation were Sigmund Freud’s Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse (1921), Siegfried Kracauer’s Das Ornament der Masse (1927) and José Ortega y Gasset’s La rebelión de las masas (1929). Particularly Freud’s approach moves the sociological focus of mass psychology to-wards a more individual point of view.

Freud (1856–1939) studied medicine at the University of Vienna, completed his doctorate there in 1881 and was appointed professor of neuropathology in 1902. Alongside his medical practice, Freud published a great deal of work on neurology and psychology (on sexual theory and the interpretation of dreams, for instance) and went on to become the founder of psycho-analysis. After 1933 he was subjected to numerous acts of repression by the National Socialists. He emigrated to London in 1938 where he died one year later.

In Sigmund Freud’s Massenpsychologie und Ich-Analyse (Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego, Freud 2001 [1921]) one critique of Le Bon’s The Crowd is to be found – and a very different take on much the same subject. His argument is that the key to understanding the masses is inside the individuals. The crowd exists only because the individuals identify with their selves, because they internalize an ego ideal. Being in a crowd enables the individual to slough off the repression of his unconscious instincts. The apparently new features of the individual in the crowd are utterances of this unconsciousness. The disappearance of responsibility or conscience, according to Freud, is the same as suppressing social fear. Freud’s second argument is to change the evaluation of the crowd. In mass psychology, the negative view on the phenomenon of the masses was dominant. Freud reveals positive aspects of the masses. It could be, he claims, that only society -in the form of the crowd - is able to set norms of morality for the individuals. However, Freud approaches ‘the crowd’ from the perspective of individual psychology rather than that of sociology, though he justifies this with the contention that individual psychology can never entirely ignore an individual’s interactions with other individuals and that individual psychology is therefore always also social psychology as well (Freud 2001 [1921], 69). At the same time, the actual work of ‘group psychology’ would never arrive at any results without addressing the individual – the one topic needs the other one.

For Freud, crowds form because individuals identify with one another, because they have in-ternalised an identical ego ideal: the leader. But Freud goes on to say that contrary “manifestations of group formation” can also be discerned. In certain circumstances, for instance, “the morals of the group” may stand at a higher level than those of the “individuals that compose it” (Freud 2001, 82). It is quite possible, Freud suggests, that it is only society that prescribes any "ethical
standards” at all, whereas the individual “as a rule fails in one way or another to come up to its high demands” (Freud 2001, 82–3). A positive account such as this may at first appear “completely contradictory” alongside the usually negative connotations of the crowd (ibid., 83) but a second look shows that the (negative) effects of the crowd described by Tarde, Sighele and Le Bon relate to “groups of a short-lived character”, whereas the contrary opinions owe their origin to “the consideration of those stable groups or associations” in which “mankind pass their lives” (ibid., 83).

Freud picks up on a distinction from Tarde’s theory of imitation, differentiating between the effects of a spontaneously formed crowd and those of the stable, permanent mass. Freud’s consideration of the ‘stable masses’ draws the focus away from the temporary crowd event and instead directs it towards the implications of more permanent (structural) concentrations of people. This brings Freud’s permanent or structural group formation – conceived as a counterweight to the spontaneous crowd – very close to the ‘high density’ of the metropolis. Here the above-mentioned distinction be-tween spontaneous and permanent masses again comes into play. Freud connects the potentially positive character of the masses with the permanent and stable mass in which humans spend their lifetime.

The machinations of crowd behaviour – to sum up this short survey of mass psychology – became a very popular subject in the scholarly discourse of social psychology. Crowds of people (uprisings, strikes, demonstrations) and the danger they posed served as “discourse motors that consolidated what was known and drove the state of knowledge forward” (Gamper 2007, 408f.). ‘Mass psychology’ was established as an independent area of scholarly research, one that paved the way for a negative account of the crowd in the fields of sociology and social psychology. But bourgeois anxieties about the possibility of uprisings and revolutions were stoked as much by the permanent masses of the proletarian and lower-class districts as they were by the more spontaneous manifestations of the crowd. The crowds that tended to gather in the big cities were perceived as ‘masses’ that followed their own rules and it was these that aroused anxiety and insecurity among conservative politicians and academics. And while combatting ‘temporary crowds’ was generally seen as a police matter, the combatting of ‘structural crowds’ was the remit of other administrative and political authorities.

Meanwhile, discussion of the crowd gained in currency for those with conservative and ethno-nationalist sympathies and would also become an important idea for the National Socialists. Beyond this it should also be acknowledged that ‘crowd psychology’ contributed to a well-established anti-urban mentality with a long tradition in literary, political and scholarly debate (par-ticularly in Germany). We can adhere that the masses were established in the field of mass psychology as an object of anxiety that revolved around the bourgeois fear of the vagabond or revolutionary crowds. However, the construct of the ‘stable masses’ reveals a possible way of dealing with this anxiety: the stabilization of the masses became goal no. one. This stabilization leads us back to the materialized welfare state and the houses for the masses. It is no coincident that the first plans and concepts of public housing emerge in the 1920ies. The idea to materialize the welfare state with the concept of housing for the masses is part of the fear of crowds, a fear, which has its discursive provenance in 19th Century mass psychology.

In the last chapter of my lecture I will consider the further histories of different mass dis-courses. In the 1920s, things were changing in the realm of urban planning. After the First World War, the prevailing mood was a mixture of expressionistic enthusiasm, socialistic utopias, völkische ideas and hostility towards big cities. Architecture and urban planning sounded the charge towards the new city, the new habitation and the new human being. In the Weimar republic, the first welfare state in Germany, a systematic housing policy emerged, the ‘housing question’ became an urgent topic at all state levels. The requirement of a healthy apartment was introduced into the constitution of the republic and was the base for extensive state interventions. A new tax established the capacities for the state promotion of communal housing. The conceptual architectural framework of this development was the garden city concept on the one hand and the ‘Neues Bauen’ on the other. The aim of the first modernity in architecture and its representatives such as ‘Deutscher Werkbund’ and Bauhaus was to use new materials and building techniques that had become available to develop a new form of architecture and urban design. However, even in the international debate the signs of the times in architecture and urban planning were similar. The Congrès Internationaux d’Architecture Moderne (CIAM)
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founded in 1929 postulated a ‘revolutionary new housing for the new human being’. This new housing, based on new materials and new technologies (pre-fabrication), was the ‘housing for the masses’.

Times changed again in the 1930s. And here another side of the masses enters the stage, the masses of the NS state and the masses of war dead. Of course, the NS dictatorship was a break in mass discourse. But there is a difference. Because these were not the spontaneous mass, nor the rabble of the city. This was a very organized mass, a mass with a leader. The object had changed. Mass psychology is concerned with this happening and for example Gustave le Bon was charged with its, not in rare cases racist motivated, arguments. But, this is not my story today.

Mass psychology disappeared from the screen after the war, the object of the masses did not. The notion of ‘mass society’ – in conjunction with concepts of ‘mass culture’ and ‘mass communication’ – became a key concept of postwar sociology in its attempt to understand the complexity of social processes. One of the strategies for capturing the masses was to define them in statistics and data collections and in ostensibly objective notions such as ‘population’ (cf. Roskamm 2013a). Equipped with echoes (ghosts and residues) from former mass psychology and mass condemnation, the mass perspective, particularly in the 1960s, stressed the relation to forms of power, and in some deliberations the masses (again) became independent actors in modern democracy.

In the 1960s and 1970s the main production area of the housing for the masses started. There was a massive production of social housing of postwar modernity (cf. Roskamm 2011a). Especially in the big European cities, housing for the masses was realized on a grand scale. In the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, the Grand Ensembles of Paris, big social housing projects in London and huge estates of pre-fabricated housing in East Berlin – to name but a few – emerged. Housing for the masses is the central product of architectural European postwar modernity and the realization of the concept of ‘Neues Bauen’. The production of such housing is based on both the discursive constitution of the masses and the economic parameters of the Fordist era. The relatively stable economic development, the implementation of mass production in the building sector and mass consumption (enabled by the economic upgrading of the masses) are the conditions for realizing the urban planning concept of housing for the masses.

Interestingly this period of social housing is, in my impression, rarely – at least from an urban studies perspective – the object of scientific studies. For this reason I appreciate the initiative here in Weimar to focus on the issue of affordable housing. Probably not least because conservatives, as well as critical intellectuals, criticized the aesthetics and social reality of postwar public housing, the very stories beyond the big buildings have often not been narrated. In my eyes a lot of research is possible and desirable in this field.

To end my lecture I would like to take into account – very shortly – the perception of the housing for the masses itself. A critical and often hostile view was already dominant in the reception of social housing reality when the first habitation had hardly been built. The critics qualified the big building complexes as grey, monotonous and socially isolating, if not ‘inhuman’. Such a rejection and criticism came from very different origins: from activists like Jane Jacobs, from intellectuals like the Marxian urban philosopher Henry Lefebvre and the psychoanalyst Alexander Mitscherlich, and from anti-modernist representatives. Especially because of such different origins, it is a rewarding task to invest in a closer study of these negative perceptions. Some questions arise: what is the cohesion between all this repudiation? What unites the critics against an intrinsically social project like housing for the masses? Moreover, is there any correlation to the old criticism of the masses itself? Has the ‘contempt for the masses’ transformed into a ‘condemnation of housing for the masses’? Did the criticism become materialized?

Another point for closer consideration is – from my point of view – the everyday life of the public housing inhabitants. This everyday life is the product of the everyday practice of the inhabitants and not in rare cases opposed to the ideas of the housing for the masses. The everyday practice of the inhabitants is also a form of criticism but less noisy and virtually more productive. My assumption is that some of everyday life practice manifests a form of Foucault’s concept of ‘anti-conduct’ (2004, 292) and this could be the starting-point for further analysis. The urban plan as an instrument of (re)ordering is the one side of the coin, while everyday life as an instance of disorder is the other side. The everyday practice pollutes the urban planning theory; the former is the contaminant of the latter. For a mass-housing-research-agenda such contaminants are crucial points, not least because they are central to an understanding
of the materiality of discourse.

The whole story of the masses – becoming an idea, becoming a concept, becoming a built reality, becoming a social reality – is a story of increasing contamination. However, my suggestion is to consider the complex of houses for the masses from a historical-critical perspective, referring to current approaches in urban studies, political theory, science and technical studies, and ethnography. My proposal is, and I will come to a conclusion with this point, to regard at the same time and on the same level the material and the discursive production of ‘housing for the masses’. I guess that the object ‘social housing’ is suitable for this aim because the discursive and the material elements are immediately evident (and therefore accessible): housing for the masses is of course a concept/an idea; it is also a built substantiality of stone and cement; and it is a social reality.
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This lecture discusses relational perspectives on public space in order to present a way forward in dealing with new challenges in architecture and planning education. Developing a pedagogical approach based on urban life, urban cultures and difference in public space is a crucial and a much needed challenge in an increasingly complex and accelerated urbanized world. Considering the ramifications of spatial practice and strategic interventions on urban everyday life, this is a key task for the field of urban professionals’ education. Alternative (relational) ways of envisioning space are particularly needed in architecture and planning schools in order to reflect critically on the crucial role of academics, and to amend historical patterns in the production of space. These relational enquiries into public space have the potential to address ethical and knowledge-related concerns in those disciplines that are particularly oriented towards shaping the material urban environment. These are called “conceptual challenges” as they bring new ways of framing public space and how to research it. The lecture will show that theory can be informed by embodied social practice. Urban collectives, in gaining spatial momentum, start to form critical counter publics; this might lead to a continuous reconfiguration of what can be considered as public space. The changing nature of social relations and political claims can be revealed and analysed in public space if they are understood as socio-historical processes.

While urban collectives and urban movements might not always reach the point of becoming ‘critical counter publics’ (Fraser 1990), there are many ways in which theory and practice can be informed by the effervescence of daily life, and by the way people both engage with and signify space. These are coined as “practical challenges”: we have engaged with a number of media instruments and interactive tools, which can best reach people – e.g. pupils, adolescents or the elderly. These have great potential for the training of future professionals and enhancing technology-based design and planning. But change can also be instigated by influencing the institutions that mediate and frame public space design and planning processes. Transforming institutional action can be achieved by provoking change in the training of young professionals who are likely to hold relevant positions in those institutions that will frame and shape public space and related policy instruments. In this respect, studies from within academia, which are situated at the interface of theory, practice and policy, raise as well new “research challenges”.

A perspective transversing these three angles – conceptual, practical and research challenges – is the educational mission which lies at the heart of the book that this lecture is thematizing. Its core message is that there is the need and potential to further develop educational approaches, which will enable a reading of public space as lived space and facilitate a nuanced understanding of the micro-scale of everyday life, with its rhythms and fluidity of meanings, as a fertile base for a deeper theoretical abstraction and generation of knowledge in and about cities. The lecture thus invites students to develop specific relational perspectives on public space which are of relevance to those scientists and practitioners who base their educational work on cross- and trans-disciplinary principles, at the crossroads between theory and practice, know how and know why, (re)thinking and (re)making space. Relational perspectives on public space enable links to be created between the dynamics of civil society (including conflicts between individuals, groups and different social spheres), political decision-making, and planning and
design practice. An explicit trans-disciplinary approach is adopted, reflecting a dialogue between academics and practitioners, with the aim of: (1) Elaborating on the ontological, ethical and epistemological dimensions of relational public space; (2) Providing playful approaches that foster innovative education and practice in and for public space; (3) Addressing opportunities for learning about difference in, about and from public space.

This trans-disciplinary perspective (connecting theory and practice) is embedded in a cross-disciplinary framework (involving various knowledge fields). Starting from the premise that public space can be considered as an epistemic arena where different fields of knowledge and expertise can equally meet, this lecture presents eight educational challenges in architecture and planning triggered by cross-pollination from other disciplines, including digital arts and media, social sciences, educational planning, political science, ethnography (and others):

1. **Learning and Designing. Creating spatial conditions for meaningful change**

   The first educational challenge is to establish educational contexts, conditions and situations characterized by trust and respect and to start from the experiences which students bring into the learning process. That way, students are being made aware of the need to create spatial situations where they are able to respect people’s local beliefs, routines and experiences, develop professional empathy and acknowledge the potential resources that urban dwellers might bring along. The emotional and practical aspects of the manifold relations implicated in these learning processes in public space need to be considered. The shift from co-learning to jointly changing the material arrangements of public space with urban dwellers requires the ability to acknowledge ethical, ontological and epistemic considerations and constraints implied in these forms of dialogic learning.

2. **Emerging and embedding. Acknowledging spaces of emergence and spontaneity**

   The second educational challenge is to engage with intuitive ways of learning based on the encounter with the unexpected and to acknowledge the patterns of social emergence as a core characteristic of public life. Appropriate tools and procedures that can capture the situated, context-specific and idiosyncratic nature of collective places and their social dynamics need to be developed. These tools both emerge from, and address the context, problem and given situation, and ideally explore public space as relational space. Students will learn to link these dynamics back to the material dimension of public space, specifically to its emerging materialities, while they are encouraged to deal with the unpredictability and spontaneity of material claims and spatial appropriations.

3. **Opening and sharing. Learning about new forms of inclusiveness from the open source movement.**

   The third educational challenge is to encourage a general openness to sharing different perspectives and ways of working within the daily life of the students. Public space, in this respect, can serve as an experimental arena where alternative ways of pooling resources for urban change can be envisioned, developed and practised as if real. Enabling alternative spatial appropriations that use public space as a common good beyond private fragmentations needs to start from the resources that lived space already offers. Welcoming attitudes to new perspectives (e.g. introducing public feedback loops) need to be cultivated as they offer a good opportunity for integrating new forms of inclusiveness.

4. **Activating and appropriating. Developing positionality while learning about (politics) of public space and time**

   The fourth educational challenge is to encourage students to take an informed stance and to develop a professional positionality towards their socio-political role as urban professionals by developing their own, ethically informed position. That way the politics of space and time of public space will be acknowledged as given ground for any professional action. Planning and design studios need to radically incorporate a new, cronopolitical thinking and its translations into practical project rationales, to enable the plethora of everyday life rhythms of space appropriations and re-appropriations to fully unfold. Both politics of space and politics of time are therefore central to relationally thinking of public space as lived space.

5. **Overcoming Othering and Nesting. Reflecting and overcoming own biases and accepting difference in public space**

   The fifth educational challenge is to train the ability to overcome individual, intimate and private comfort zones, in order to develop professional skills of acknowledging, integrating and respecting social and cultural difference in urban space. This concerns the ethics of intervention in lived space as
well as the ethics of the seminar room. A core educational aspect here is to focus on experiential learning in non-discriminatory situations where teachers include and appreciate as many different perspectives, languages and disciplinary frames as possible. Group formation for studio work can be organized along aspects of difference in order to stimulate self-experience and dialogue. On a theoretical level, postcolonial accounts of (public) space can help in revisiting current approaches, unravelling and opposing practices of othering.

6. Acting and Reflecting. Collectively learning from the ethics of transdisciplinary exchange

The sixth educational challenge is to combine argumentative debates linked to the public sphere (reflection) to the embodied interventions and public address in public space (action) in all pedagogic formats. On a practical level, this helps to develop experiential and experimental ways of public intervention and tools to induce processes of co-shaping public spaces. For students, in these self-developed formats, the analysis of the realized interventions is one core aspect: for this reason it is important that sufficient time is allocated for reflection before, during and after the participatory intervention in public space. Particular emphasis needs to be put on the de-briefing phase, when the ethical and epistemic implications of practical action can be unravelled, discussed and challenged, and the political character of any intervention in public space can be jointly exemplified.

7. Collaborating and Countering. Dealing with heterogeneous interests and resulting conflicts

The seventh educational challenge is to start from a study of and collaboration with collective claims, counter publics and their acts of resistance and contestations when developing an idea about their role as urban professionals intervening in public space. This way, students learn to develop their own politics of action in contested areas of social interaction, as well as to recognize already existing activist tools, knowledge and practices. Consideration of conflicts as normal opportunities to learn about socio-political aspects of public space rather than as exceptional risks to the formal and often canonized (party) politics of public space, can be a key component for socially just decision making, where the involvement of civil society actors is not considered as a risk to urban development processes, but as an enriching precondition.

8. Theorizing and Changing. Learning from the everyday and reinterpreting education as inclusion, participation and action*

A good way to start dealing with this eighth and concluding challenge, is to declare universities as public spaces where not only rational discourses are framed and perpetuated, but also professional practice is reinterpreted in its original and embodied sense: re-rooting the notion of educational politics to ‘the collective’, the public in its earliest connotation. This means, addressing public space not merely as a theme, but rather as a vehicle for gaining knowledge based on epistemologies and ontologies of the everyday. It implies considering research and teaching not just as ways of generating data and conveying information, but as politically informed processes to embed inclusion, participation and action into the life of the scholar with the aim of generating socially innovative insights and relevant knowledge on public space as lived space. This means nothing less than shifting the focus of urban professionals back to the shaping of everyday places of public and collective concern.

Above and beyond such disciplinary attainments, public space facilitates the inter-weaving of many different bodies of knowledge, from the everyday to practical expertise, bureaucratic proficiency, inter-generational knowledge and professional insights –to name but a few. However, as social difference and cultural heterogeneity are both displayed, and lived, in public space, we also claim that learning from such space requires reflection upon the structures of learning themselves: In addition to academic approaches advocating a relational praxis, a plethora of grassroots and activist practices have emerged in the form of insurgent planning spheres, which implicitly involve relational approaches to space, without their potential being necessarily recognized by institutionalised planners and designers and their institutions. By learning from these emerging, spontaneous, critical and insurgent practices, and by experimenting with innovative pedagogical tools inspired by them, this lecture seeks to address and bridge the gap between relational approaches to space and relational spatial practices.
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RELATIONAL THINKING, EMBODIED SPACE AND PERFORMATIVE PLANNING
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The architect, the planner, the sociologist, the economist, the philosopher or the politician cannot out of nothingness create new forms and relations. More precisely, the architect is no more a miracle-worker than the sociologist. Neither can create social relations...” (Lefebvre 1968 [1968]: 151, cited in Tonkiss 2014, 1).

Relational thinking

Based on an understanding of public space as relational counter space provided in the previous unit, this unit seeks to ask for successive steps for action in public space, in combination with their unexplored potential as a multifarious knowledge field. Freire (1973) has proposed to combine action and reflection in order to come to an education of enabling and emancipatory character. In this sense, it is important to realize that there is 1. active knowledge in public space and 2. reflexive knowledge, and that it is because of this richness of different knowledge types we can access in public space that bridges between separated knowledge fields can be made and planning can be reconected to everyday life realities of people through the combination of action-theory accounts to space (in connection with action knowledge) and more reflexive contributions to the theory of space (in connection to reflexive knowledge). This huge potential is currently not seen or it is underestimated in planning. The turn towards relational and performative planning, however, suggests, that there is a growing academic, extra-academic and everyday interest in this type of intersections between ways of living and ways of knowing. Which ways of learning can we foster in public space and how is this learning related to the situated qualities of urban neighbourhoods and different social niches? How does this relate to the changing global learning landscapes (Banerjee 2015)?

In order to explore these questions, the lecture offers a systematic overview regarding the two knowledge categories at first hand and connects these to current forms of planning in a second step. As with all forms of categorizing knowledge, the following scheme does not provide an intent to separate forms of creating insights and knowing but rather points to the fact that many of these categories are mutually interlinked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Knowledge</th>
<th>Reflexive Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formally produced through bodily and face-to-face encounters or through the presence of others in public space</td>
<td>Forms of knowledge that can be connected to the experience of social encounters in public space, but might be produced elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential knowledge everyday knowledge that is produced through the urban experiences of a person, a group or through a city public</td>
<td>Academic knowledge forms of knowing produced in the academia, often &quot;about&quot; or &quot;on&quot; public space, space theories, social groups, inclusion/exclusion, etc., not necessarily with other social partners beyond academia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded knowledge produced through bodily encounters in space, e.g. through acts of peaceful occupation, sit-ins, etc.</td>
<td>Local professional knowledge about the urban development history, project and plans for the area, methodological knowledge about tools of participation, planning and inclusion, can also leave the realm of planning and urban development and can be produced in other professional fields relating to public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendered knowledge achieved through perceiving oneself in gender specific situation, the preconditions for this have been set e.g. through family or social group values and thus through socially constructed gender categories</td>
<td>Knowledge about the local context all knowledge contributions that people (with or without professional education) can make and the history, the specific traditions and cultural patterns (e.g. solidarity) of a place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded knowledge knowledge that is generated in a local context, in exchange with local dwellers, NGOs, organizations, firms, etc., and that is circulated back into this local context</td>
<td>Practical knowledge forms of urban knowledge that is generated through (spatial) practice, through practical wisdom and experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational knowledge this is active knowledge on how to approach/not to approach other people, keeping a healthy distance (Simmel) and establishing new social relations</td>
<td>Cultural knowledge knowledge on one’s own social position and cultural values in comparison to other ways of living that get visible in public space (e.g. ethnic knowledge, religious knowledge, knowledge about your own and other social milieus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 embodiment space.

This part of the lecture links the previous units on public space and public life to theories that include the body as an integral
part of spatial analysis. As mentioned in the table and already in lecture unit 7, anthropological perspectives to urban culture highlight the role of the body in space, as a precious analytical entry dimension for sociospatial research. The particular focus is set on the creation of place through spatial orientation, movement and language, and in particular, through non-discursive spatial practices (e.g. gestures). Setha Low, an urban anthropologist based at the City University of New York, USA, states that “many researchers need theoretical formulations that provide an everyday, material grounding and an experiential, cognitive, and/or emotional understanding of the intersection (...) of body, space, and culture” (ibid, 2003, p. 10). She seeks to position anthropological theories in a space and place discourse often dominated by geographical and sociological contributions and thus points to the need “to theorize and imagine the body as a moving, speaking cultural space in and of itself” (2014, p.41).

A second aspect of this unit is the introduction of Pierre Bourdieu’s and Erwin Goffman’s earlier studies on “body gloss” and “Habitus”, which are essential for an understanding of social spaces and public spaces. In this respect, Bridge and Watson (2011, p. 377ff) have dedicated a whole section on city affect relating as well to city publics and cultures in their recent compendium on “the city”. Pierre Bourdieu (1977, 1984) uses the term ‘habitus’ to characterize the way the body, mind, and emotions are simultaneously trained, and thereby offers a perspective to understand how social status and class position become embodied in everyday life. Goffman uses the term “body gloss” to describe the ways that individuals use their bodies to make otherwise unavailable things visible to others, and he identifies various subtypes of this body idiom. One such subtype is “orientation gloss,” designating the behaviours that signal to others that we are engaged in normal and harmless everyday actions (Goffman, 1971, pp. 128-129, cited by Jacobsen and Kristiansen, 2015, 78).

The term “body” refers to its biological and social characteristics and “embodied” space is the location where human experience and consciousness takes on material and spatial form (cf. Low 2014, p. 20). Ali Madanipour (2013:378) and Gary Bridge have been pointing to the relevance of “embodied knowledge” (Bridge, 2014: 1646) generated through everyday (non-discursive) interactions. Feminists take this further by exploring the epistemological implications of knowledge as embodied, engendered and embedded in place (Duncan, 1996). Haraway (1991) for example offers an emphasis on location, “a position in a web of social connections that eliminates passivity of the female (and human) body and replaces it with a site of action and agency”. Yet “it is not biology/psychology that produces gendered body spaces and their representations but the inscription of sociopolitical and cultural relations on the body” (Low 2003, 11f).

It is the aim of this lecture unit to understand that the concept of embodied space is a crucial interstice between public space, planning and design and action-based theories of space, and a valuable analytical and interpretative link to reconnect urban theory and urban practice in the field. Embodied space offers a valuable connecting frame between critical (feminist, queer) theory, human geography, history of the arts, arts and activism, cultural studies and relational planning.

**Performative planning**

This part of the lecture is dedicated to understanding the links between public space, forms of urban knowledge and performative planning through action-based formats and bodily encounters.

In classic, positivist accounts to the spatial arts and during times of prevailing urban modernity, emphasis was given on reflexive knowledge. In the course of the postmodern turn and in post-positivist accounts to planning, design and urban research, a new emphasis is put on active knowledge. Performative planning approaches combine both modes of generating knowledge with a strong focus on public space. Performative planning approaches (Huning/Altrock 2014), performative urbanity (Helbrecht/Dirksmeier 2008) can be understood as examples for the performative, social or relational turn in urban research, planning and design (Tornaghi/Knierbein 2015). As Altrock and Huning (2015, 161) frame it: “From a relational perspective, public spaces are central to urban planning in two ways: 1) as socio spatial settings for representation, use and appropriation (‘object’ of planning and ‘stage’ for urban life; and 2) as sites of urban integration and conflict (‘media’ of planning and urban life)”, and conclude: “...performative action may offer a solution whenever planning capacities and resources are limited and/or no ‘easy’, clear cut solutions are at hand.” (ibid.)
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The "educating city" and "public space" are two things that have something in common. It could be called a connection, since the transforming city exists in public space. The relationship may possibly go beyond that, however. Perhaps the idea of the "educative city" may be interpreted as meaning that urban design shapes public space. This "shaping" may be interpreted in two ways. One of them, generally understood in planning, is that urban design shapes public space in the sense of "forming" it: urban design forms public space. Planners typically presume this, and this view is also served by the concept "educating city" (In German language "bildend" is both `educating´ and `forming´). But this premise also appears to assert something else, namely, that urban design forms public space in the sense of "informing" it, so that it also instructs; it educates and empowers. In my view, this argument merits a more thorough study and an investigation of how the relationship between urban design and public space is configured. In order to get at this relationship, however, a further question must be tackled, and that is the question of what actually constitutes public space. From an urban planning perspective, discourse on public space is mainly focused on an accessible, contained spatial situation, i.e., a public square in a city. In other disciplines, political theory for example, the meaning of public space is slightly different and more broadly defined. For this reason, I would like to take a look at the grounding of this concept in the history of ideas. From that vantage point, I will then again question what public space has to do with the educating city, and also who actually forms whom in this particular place.

Hannah Arendt, whose thinking occupies the intersection of political philosophy and urban studies, conducted a well-known study of public space. Arendt's works are extremely influential in political theory and to some degree in social sciences as well, while the notion of public space that is at the core of her work is also a key concept in urbanism. Arendt developed her theory of public space in The Human Condition (1958). For Arendt, public space is primarily the space in-between. Arendt describes it using the image of a table: the space in-between occupies the interstitial space "as a table is located between those who sit around it; the world, like every in-between, relates and separates men at the same time." Like a table, public space gathers people "and yet prevents our falling over each other" (1958, 52). People meet in public space, and at the same time, it generates the power that initially brings them together. This power is by no means something built or spatial, but rather the public itself. The public, and this is decisive, is for Arendt a substance that is produced by common action, in doing and in speaking, in sharing and developing ideas. The essence of public space is situated in the moment of initiation and beginning, in the moment in which collective action originates. This moment is difficult to grasp; it is by nature something fleeting, difficult to situate, and even harder to hold onto.

This idea forms the premise that inextricably connects the event to public space (see Arendt 1961). Only at the moment of the event does the specific space of the public open up, a momentary and temporary space, a space that is thought from the event, a space that breathes the "spirit of revolution" (Marchart 2005, 148). This opening provides access to a private zone, a private sphere; the sphere of the political, in fact. To fathom the political
is actually the goal of Arendt’s thinking. Her notion of public space, one might say, is always embedded in her reflections on the political. This political – always closely tied to the concept of “public” – is for Arendt the content of public space, that which happens within it. And the political is predicated on the fact that the course of history is not linear, foreseeable, or necessary. The political requires the option of deciding in favor of one or the other. Without this possibility, there is no political; without this possibility, public space loses its content. The essence of public space is the political, and both – the political as much as public space – are only possible if everything is not defined and predetermined. A public space is only conceivable if Arendt if the political resides within it, and this political relies on the existence of different possible decisions. Public space is present only when alternatives are possible, when nothing absolute is predetermined or preordained.

Public space, that is, the other side of the coin, has yet another attribute in Arendt’s political theory, a sedimenting and stabilizing side (see also Butler 2011 and Jaegi 2008). This is where public space, in its constructed and reconstructed, or spatial, manifestation, comes into its own. In built public space, there is an attempt to create permanence and strength, one that originates in the aim of protecting the political. Arendt emphasizes this quality in her analysis of the public space of antiquity. The polis and its public spaces were, writes Arendt, a stage for shared and free exchange among equals – a concept that led to hefty accusations that Arendt forgot about the unequals (others), all those excluded by the Greek city-state (see Benhabib 1996). At this point, however, I would like to pursue something else, namely the idea of spatiality. According to Arendt’s analysis, for the Greeks (exactly like the res publica of the Romans), public space was primarily a guarantee “the futility of individual life”; it was the space that protects “this futility and reserved for the relative permanence, if not immortality, of mortals” (1958, 56), a space which “could not survive” without the “stabilizing protection” of the “wall of the polis” (1958, 198). Arendt’s theory therefore assigns the spatiality of public space the task of perpetuating the ephemeral, of capturing the fleeting, but not in order to battle this inconstant (to ossify the fleeting); rather, to keep it alive (as something inconstant). Spatiality – containment within walls, just like the containment of institutions and laws – becomes for Arendt a factor that prevents public and political momentum from dissipating.

Taken together, in Arendt, public space is constituted twice: first, it arises from common performative and fleeting action, and contains the political. Secondly, it can be constituted permanently only through a spatiality that causes the political and the public to receive the chance to last longer than the moment. Arendt identifies two fundamentally opposing driving forces that act in public space: one ephemeral and performative, the other, stabilizing and solidifying. Public space is at once the outcome of negotiations, and (potentially at least) protecing of these negotiations through spatiality. In ancient Greece, Arendt argues, the moment of action and speech could only survive (at least for a time) by means of the stabilizing protection of the walls and the laws of the polis. The fleeting political is actually opposed to solidified spatiality, but it needs the latter in order to be able to exist for longer than just one moment. Arendt’s public space thus virtually connects the spatial aspect with a notion of the political and the theoretical. Public space is also structurally and physically determined by it, though not so much internally (not intrinsically), as externally, in support of the stabilization of its contents.

In terms of exploring the relationship between urban design and public space as announced at the outset of this essay, and also regarding the question of who actually forms whom in the educating city, Arendt’s conception is not without effect. From this perspective, the walls of the polis are not at all what really constructs public space. At the same time, the urban doesn’t appear particularly suited to forming the substance of public space (also in the sense of the “activate” or “initiate”) – the public and the political. On the contrary, urban activity always runs the risk of closing public space (to fill the constitutive void), to the degree that it blocks it off. However, if one follows Hannah Arendt, public space must be an autonomous in-between open space, simply in order to allow the possibility of taking action. What urban design can try to do is therefore not so much create a new public space as endeavor to distinguish and protect the public nature of the space.

Perhaps urban design doesn’t create public space at all, in neither of the two meanings of the term “to form” (bilden); first, it appears urban design does not make public space – public space comes into being at the moment of action (the public and the political), and
not through spatial configurations. Secondly, it may be that urban design cannot teach public space anything – rather (at best) the reverse is true. Urban design is shaped much more by public space (the public realm), and this happens in two respects: urban design is actually itself – at least if it is not imposed from above or designed behind closed doors – a form of action. Urban design first originates from a collective and democratic design process only in and through the public domain (out of it); public space shapes urban design into a potentially emancipatory project. On the other hand, public space shapes urban design to the extent that it (potentially) teaches it something. The goal of urban design is to intervene in the urban realm and form an urban reality, to change it for the better. But this requires knowledge about the site of intervention. And this knowledge is located in public space. When urban design grasps public space as its own space of learning, only then will it be able to find a way to approach the site of intervention: through practical experience and the reality of the city. Therefore, urban design doesn’t instruct public space as much as it learns in it.

What actually becomes evident when examining the political theory of Hannah Arendt and her notion of public space is a reversal of direction in the course of the development of the theory of the educating city: urban design does not form public space, but rather is formed in it and by it. Only when urban design has educated itself in this way, when it has discovered what constitutes the public in public space, only then can try to fulfill its true purpose: to pro-TECT that public, to keep the space open, and to allow for and illuminate alternatives.
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EVERYDAY EXTRAORDINARY: PRACTICES OF MAKING PUBLIC SPACE

Academic Leader Landscape Ed Wall, University of Greenwich
City of Vienna Visiting Professorship 2017

“Mapping human relations at every scale, the city stands as both an incredibly succinct representation and a monumentally complex and efficient facilitator of contact“ (Sorkin 2009:21)

“We might address the question of the social relations which could construct any new, and better, notion of public space” (Massey 2005:153)

The formation of public spaces occurs through contrasting and often conflicting practices. Extraordinary urban public spaces are continually being made, remade and unmade, through process which range from political strategies to design drawings and from everyday activities to spontaneous gatherings. These practices of making public space can be understood from and read through a range of academic and professional frames. This lecture/paper examines some of these practices for the creation of new public spaces. Beginning with design, it explores conflicts which occur between public spaces produced architecturally and those emerging through more participatory processes and democratic actions. The lecture/paper asks what is lost and gained through these interconnected processes of making and it speculates on alternative methodologies for research and practice of public space. The lecture/paper is structured around different ways of making public space, ranging from the architectural production of public spaces through urban design practice to the social formation of public spaces. It is punctuated by reference to key literature – and in particular, texts which focus on the process of making public spaces. In this context the lecture/paper seeks to accept public space as a process, as Massey (2005) proposes for space, which is always under construction.

The Valley Section drawings by Patrick Geddes (from 1888) provide a point of departure for these discussions. Geddes’ drawings explore the relations between social activities of work and the spaces in which they occur. The drawings frame an interest in the relations between social processes and spatial forms which originated in Geddes’ work as a botanist and investigated further as he worked as a planner and academic. Early drawings mapped the progression from the mountains to the sea while alter urban drawings represented the section of a high street. The Valley Section drawings are frequently read vertically, exploring the interactions between activities of work, the tools employed and the spaces transformed. But while some drawings present the fisher, his nets and the sea or the woodsman, his axe and the forest, they also suggest horizontal relations between the various individuals and between the spaces of a regional scale territory. Through reading the drawings horizontally and diagonally further relations between individuals, tools and spaces are revealed. This lecture/paper proposes that through translating the nineteenth century Valley Section drawings to contemporary urban landscapes we can discuss new potentials in public space research and practice, overlapping relations between professions and the adoption of alternative tools in our work. The approach by Geddes allows us to simultaneously understand the plurality of practices (from disciplines to activities), tools (from research frames to physical forms) and geographies of making public space.

Design has a role in the definition of public spaces. The creative development of spatial forms is the focus of urban design processes, from the design of entire cities to the siting of street furniture on sidewalks. Public spaces are created, as Carr et al define, as ‘the stage upon which the drama of life unfolds’ (1992:3). Their description of architectural public spaces as common ground on which
people ‘carry out’ activities (1992:xii) closely reflects de Certeau’s description of tactics which are limited to ‘play on and with a terrain imposed on it’ by strategies (1984:36).

Long-established architectural typologies of public space dominate cities, such as streets, squares, plazas, parks, amphitheatres, terraces, sidewalks and footpaths. Public spaces are the physical manifestation of political and economic strategies rendered and made spatial by architects, landscape architects and urban designers. These architectural forms and spaces provide for a diversity of activities, rhythms and events. At different times of the day these public spaces accommodate contrasting scales of events and varying degrees of publicness. These are public spaces on which activities are performed; they are sites to be visited, used and occupied; they are entered into, passed through and temporarily appropriated. The activities which unfold within them contribute to the definition of these geographies as public spaces. The existence of physical public spaces also allows individuals without such opportunity to find presence in the city. As Staeheli and Mitchell write, ‘being present in public space – making claims to and becoming visible in the streets, sidewalks, squares, and parks of the city – is a vital, necessary step in making claims on the public and as part of the public’ (2008:xiv)

Spatial forms on their own are insufficient to define what can occur within public spaces. As public spaces are remade, what Smith and Low term ‘rules of access’ (2006:3) are rewritten and new codes of engagement are formed. As such, public spaces are defined by spatial and social rules. Architectural forms and regulatory prescriptions have the potential to define exacting terms: in proposing design code for public spaces in New York City, Whyte states, ‘what you do not prescribe explicitly, you do not get’ (1980:30). These exacting approaches need not restrict but can also open up the possibilities of public spaces. In Local Code (1992), Sorkin’s utopian manifesto for a city, he sets out an urban code which ‘seeks, in its limits, not to restrain associations but to free them’ (Sorkin 1992:127). The code which is presented without drawings or images defines a possible city in a specific North American geography. Design code has the potential to prioritise issues of public concern over frequently aesthetic issues of design. Following Sorkin’s Local Code, Department of Public Space, an initiative to explore public space code using the micro-blogging website Twitter, write an open-source manifesto for public space in London. Authors using the hashtag #PublicSpaceCode co-author a code which sets out and questions the nature of future public spaces. Proposed code explores both ephemeral and spatial qualities, such as ‘Public space is where people do their own private things’ and ‘All public spaces should be BBQ-friendly’ (www.twitter.com/DeptPublicSpace, 2016). How the possibilities of public space can be realised becomes the ambition of these ‘rules’.

But frequently design code and guidelines are employed to narrow the terms of use of public spaces and to restrict activities which may or may not occur within them. Public spaces with limited possibilities selectively exclude certain activities through defining what is outside of the formal terms of use. What spatial design is unable to determine, the regulations which accompany these urban transformation seeks to achieve. As a result people are excluded from public spaces and denied opportunities and presence in the city. Mitchell describes in the Annihilation Valley Section (© Geddes, P. 2099)
of Public Space by Law (1997), how events
which are intended to unfold on these stages
are expected to be ‘unsullied by images of
work, poverty, or social strife’ (1997:323).
Restrictions on skateboarding, sleeping
equipment, fishing, political gatherings,
vending and performances are some of the
activities which impact on the young, the
homeless, the political, street vendors and
performers, who are denied opportunities
to find presence in these public spaces.
These restrictions are witnessed in the highly
publicised disputes over the rights of Occupy
(see New York and London) as well as daily
incursions in public spaces in cities around
the world.

Public spaces formed through the presence
of people can contradict the intended image of
architectural public spaces. Mitchell highlights
this contestation by asking ‘Landscape or
Public Space?’ (1997:322). He states that
“landscape” implies a particular way of seeing
the world, one in which order and control
over surroundings takes precedence over the
Transforming public spaces as landscape
denies the everyday interactions in public
spaces or the possibility to reconfigure them.
Visual images do not merely represent but are
also appropriated to reinforce spatial claims.
Zukin states that ‘the power to impose a
coherent vision of a space enables a group to
claim that space’ (1995:279) allowing people
and uses to be excluded: ‘The look and feel
of cities reflect decisions about what — and
who — should be visible and what should
not, on concepts of order and disorder, and
on uses of aesthetic power’ (Zukin, 1995:7).
These claims to public space are expressed
strongly by individuals and groups with
power. Policy makers, masterplanners, owners
and managers have the means to transform
how a space looks, decide who is afforded
access and define what they are permitted
to do once inside. Through appropriating
landscape techniques for making public space
‘propriety classes express “possession” of
the land, and their control over the social
relations within it’ (Mitchell 1997:323).

We could argue that the potential for social
interactions to redefine public spaces can
expand definitions of public space beyond
narrow architectural terms. The spatial form
of the city is actively reinvigorated through
the presence of gatherings and crowds.
Referring to historic notions of public space,
Mitchell (2003) states: ‘then as now public
spaces were only public to the degree that
they were taken and made public’ (Mitchell
2003:142). The presence of political protests
and demonstrations in public spaces provide
extraordinary images of the public. But
the public is also found in the small-scale
textures of everyday routines and individual
appropriations of public space. But rather
than merely the access to physical spaces,
the access to which individuals and groups
have to social and spatial processes that
contribute to the redefinition of public spaces
and publics could open up possibilities of
their publicness. In addition to keeping under
scrutiny the public nature of space a stronger
spatial understanding of the relations which
form public space is suggested by Massey
(2005): ‘For instituting democratic public
spaces (and indeed the spaces of places
more generally) necessitates operating
with a concept of spatiality which keeps
always under scrutiny the play of the social
relations which construct them’ (2005:153).
Studying the relations, between politicians,
planners, urban designers, developers,
community groups, businesses, commuters,
residents, researchers and visitors, highlights
opportunities for these institutions, groups
and individuals to participate, contribute
and be part of public spaces. In addition to
access to spaces formed through more or
less controlled architectural processes the
opportunity to be involved in contributing to
and potentially reconfiguring these sites as
public spaces could contribute to degrees of
publicness.

To consider the spaces and relations of
how public spaces are made and remade
exposes what is at stake for those involved.
As Madanipour describes ‘urban space will
inevitably reflect the values and aspirations
individuals exert their presence in planning
discourses, how developers assert their rights
of property through redevelopment or how
groups maintain their rituals of meeting in
public spaces expose what can be lost and
gained as these sites are transformed. That
power is mediated and made evident through
physical spaces is described by de Certeau,
He states: ‘Power is made visible in the city
through struggles both in and over space’
(1984:61). In the definition of his conceptions
of strategies and tactics de Certeau writes
that ‘a tactic is determined by the absence
of power just as a strategy is organized by
the postulation of power’ (1984:38). But
we can understand that these structures
of power are neither binary nor static, and
that they are continually challenged and
disrupted. Rather than limiting tactics to
negotiate on imposed terrains (1984:36) there remain opportunities for hierarchies of scale and power to be challenged. Massey is critical of de Certeau’s argument, which she claims ‘overestimates the coherence of ‘the powerful’ and the seamlessness with which ‘order’ is produced’ (2005:45). She claims that de Certeau reduces ‘the potential power of ‘the weak’ and obscures the implication of ‘the weak’ in ‘power’ (2005:45). Without denying the dominance of some institutions and organisations in the process of making public space, moments of opportunity can be witnessed through individual appropriations of spaces and tactics of resistance to and reinvention of masterplanning processes.

From design to research this lecture/paper advocates open and creative practices of public space. How site-specific conditions of urban geographies are studied can provide the foundations for creative public space proposals, installations and engagements. Fieldwork is the point of departure for many ethnographers and anthropologists as it is in disciplines of landscape architecture and urban design. But allowing this research to inform inventive responses should not be limited to design professions. As Geddes presented the spaces, tools and people which interact in the Valley Section, this lecture/paper seeks to explore the relations which form and define public spaces. This lecture/paper argues for practices of public space which overlap and opportunities for individuals to adopt additional tools which can create new forms and generate new ideas of public space.
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INFORMAL PUBLIC SPACE
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Associate Professor of the School of Architecture and Design at the Pontificia Universidad Javeriana in Bogotá, Colombia

Introduction
Public space in informal settlements, the same as housing, is largely produced by the people themselves. Similarly, these spaces are mainly used by the people who live around, with particular ways of interacting, appropriating and giving meaning to them. The product observed is the result of people’s needs, interactions and symbolic constructions. From an empirical perspective of working and researching Bogotá’s barrios for more than 20 years, this paper explores the production of public space in informal settlements, identifying key themes, actors, conflicts and advantages of this form of socio-spatial production.

Informal Settlements and Informality
In Latin America more than 75% of the population lived in cities in 2001 and over 30% (128 million people) of the continent’s urban population were estimated to be living in conditions defined by United Nations Human Settlements as slums (UNCHS 2003: 14). The UNCHS report (2003: 9) recognises there is not a universal characterisation of these settlements and ‘today, the catch-all term “slum” is loose and depreciatory’. One of the first tasks, therefore, is to find an appropriate term to identify these settlements. In literature several can be found besides slums; e.g. shanty, squat, irregular, marginal, spontaneous, un-planned, informal and so on (see more in Payne 1989 and; Gilbert 2007). Most of them are defined by the negative; however, the term ‘informal’ may also recognise the positive input of people’s involvement in their production and transformation, by means of understanding informal as alternative: ‘Informal settlements are by definition unfinished projects in which the agency and creativity of the occupant-builders is central, in contrast to architect-produced architecture which emphasises the physical form of the buildings often at the expense of users.’ (Kellett 2008: 11).

Informal settlement processes are now the dominant form of housing and urban spaces production in the rapidly expanding cities of Latin America. These cities are the sum of the continuing actions of low-income households each attempting to construct in physical terms their vision of the life and values to which they aspire. Informal settlements not only make up a large portion of Latin American cities, but are also a dynamic part of them in physical, social and cultural terms. Fiori and Brandao (2010: 188) argue that ‘Urban informality is inexorably interwoven with the city as a whole – at all scales and levels – and has to be seen as another way of being in the city and constructing it.’ Informal settlements are also seen as innovative and creative: ‘Today we recognize the innovative genius of the urban poor in taking advantage of the specific cultural opportunities to survive and improve their living conditions.’ (AlSayyad 1993: 5)

Informality is not equal to poverty, marginality and deprivation; it is increasingly accepted as an alternative way of doing things. ‘Lo popular’ (the popular, the informal) is acknowledged as a strategy that informal settlers use to face their everyday economic realities, but is also referred to in relation to social and cultural aspects. Informality is not taken necessarily as a transitional step into formality, among other things because the border line between one and the other is increasingly becoming blurred. In economic terms, formal and informal activities are highly interconnected; and in urban aspects well consolidated popular settlements can eventually become indistinguishable from formal settlements, especially when upgrading programmes have taken place and land tenure regularisation has been implemented (Kellett 2005). For some, urban informality ‘emerges under a paradigm of liberalization,’ and can not be understood outside the context of globalization as an alternative way of thinking and performing: ‘... urban informality not only as a political economy but also as a way of life.’ (AlSayyad 2004: 26-27).
In a similar respect Robinson (2006), in her call to postcolonialise urban studies, argues that we should get away from developmentalist approaches to understanding cities in the global south which imply a sort of catching-up notion with cities in the north.

‘Lo popular’ also comprises organization and culture; for Palma (1988) ‘lo popular’ and poverty are not necessarily the same, therefore it is not defined by what it lacks, it is defined by the proposals, initiatives and contributions of the people. ‘These [informal economic practices] have passed from being observed as transitional to a formalisation, to be seen as a valid and necessary alternative for the survival of many in the continent. It (this alternative) does not only comprise an economic type, but is seen as a means of organization which includes also social and cultural dimensions’ (Ruiperez Palmero 2006: 105).

Informality in Latin America is related to more than to settlements: for many it is a type of economic development of the region. But informal also applies to social and cultural practices, qualifying expressions and manifestations which differ from the mainstream.

Informal is usually defined as the opposite of formal; in economic terms the formal is the capitalistic, neoliberal and global economy; in urban matters the formal is the planned, institutional and legal city; in cultural aspects the formal is arguably the established modern tradition.

The Production of Informal Public Space

In this sense, it can be argued that the production of space in informal settlements follows informal patterns as a way to find new alternatives for the spatial and the social. Firstly, is a permanent transformation process; and secondly, the involvement of local people is crucial in this production (Hernandez-Garcia, 2013). The production of informal space is largely steered by the people. Lefebvre (1991: 286) argues that ‘space is permeated with social relations; it is not only supported by social relations but it is also producing and produced by social relations.’ Therefore ‘social space “incorporates” social actions, the actions of subjects both individual and collective who are born and who die, who suffer and who act’ (ibid.: 3), this is the case of informal settlements.

Public spaces in the barrios are often associated with a pedestrian scale (Segovia & Oviedo, 2000). The main open public space is the pavement and the street (Nino & Chaparro, 1997), with pavements in the barrios not always clearly defined and sometimes even non-existent. Urban stairs can be seen as types of street, owing to the fact that steep topography is a characteristic in many settlements. The most significant public space is the ‘parque del barrio’ (neighbourhood park), also called ‘la cancha’ (the sports field), recalling the plaza or the main square of colonial cities, and wherever possible, located in a central area of the barrio. The parque del barrio accommodates ‘traditional’ public square activities such as strolling, meeting people and resting, alongside other activities such as football. These ‘parques’ often have more in common with sports pitches and children’s playgrounds, than green or paved areas for resting. Active recreation activities characterise these areas and distinguish them from other open spaces of the city (Beardsley & Werthmann, 2008; Riaño, 1990).

Initial actions for the creation of public space in the barrios can be ‘inspired’ by difficulties and may be promoted by individuals and later by groups. Initial stages of public spaces in the barrios are marked by struggle and the agency of individuals who manage to mobilise the community. Once the place for the parque has been established, either because it has been given, decided or ‘created, the improvement process begins. It usually starts with an empty space - nothing more than a green area and eventually a playground contributed by the developers. In the improvement stages new themes and new actors become involved. The agency of individuals gradually gives way to the agency of groups, and a hesitant community organization in the initial stages becomes stronger, though not necessarily involving the whole community. The JACs (Juntas de Acción Comunal - community action groups), which have existed since the beginning of the settlements, take on a greater role, and with them the municipality, which also played a relatively small role in the past. Participation and conflict are now more evident in the dynamics of production, in the way that Carmona, et al. (2003) suggest when actors come up against each other with their own objectives, motivations, resources and constraints. But the particularities of this production process also produce an ‘own space’ as Lefebvre (1991) argues, which will be a permanent process through space transformation and consumption practices.

Alongside the leading role of the people of the barrio in the transformation of the public spaces, the municipality starts to play...
an important role in the improvement stages. This opens up a number of issues. The dialectic with broader structural forces is one of them, as Carmona, et al. (2003) suggest when referring to the institutional model of the production of urban space. The community interacts with public institutions and politicians to get what they need. In this sense, power relations are developed. In this regard, the JAC which provide a formal channel for community organisation in the barrios, have learnt that if they can put together a project, there is a possibility that the municipality will provide the resources to develop it. These two actors, the municipality and the JAC, on behalf of the state and the community respectively, to a large extent define the public spaces of the barrio. In this dialectic, power relations are created and transformed. But not only between them, but also within the groups they claim to represent.

In the improvement stages, new actors and new themes appear, which directly influence the design, construction and management processes. The municipality and a more organised community are crucial in these phases; however, other actors continue to play their role, such as politicians and NGOs. In addition to the themes of collective action, community participation, community organisation and the role of the JACs, other important issues can be identified, including: economic resources, participatory design and participation in the construction.

Romero, et al. (2004) argue that the production of the urban environment comprises four main parts: planning and management; construction; distribution; and use; and in the production of informal space these four phases are oriented (self-started and self-managed) and sometimes physically undertaken (self-built) by the people themselves. Design, construction and maintenance activities of public spaces in the barrios confirm these claims. In this sense, the dialectical relationship between people and place is observed from the production of the urban environment, and the leading role of the user is significant.

Concluding Remarks

The production of public space in informal settlements contributes to understanding how spaces are created and transformed in physical terms, and illustrates the interaction of the different political, social, cultural and economic forces that are involved. Informality is a central characteristic of this process, in which the agency of people is crucial, and the look for different ways to accomplish the tasks is particular. Conflicts are permanent in the clash of the different actors with different agendas, but to a large extent these problems are sorted out. It can be argued that informality is not good or bad per se, and in this sense, it can not be either romanticised or marginalised; but it can be further studied in their contribution for more inclusive, diverse and people-centred urban spaces.
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Understanding the city as a condensed and complex assemblage of materialities, actors, narratives, and discourses (See Amin/Thrift 2002, Farias 2011, Lanz 2015), the urban might be seen as an ongoing negotiation played out in public spaces. Public space in its diverse appearances and formats (as streets, places or institutions) is a paradigmatic urban space of often antagonistic ideas and contradictory practices, of local as well as global interests. Following Manuel Delgado it is less the organized, administrated, rational and planned space but an incalculable, ephemeral space in constant movement; it is not characterized by stability and continuity, but instead it is a dynamic and situational process materially and discursively disputed (Delgado 1999). But at the same time public space can be described as an ideology, used by real estate speculators, politics and urban planners as a tool to create exclusive areas of consumption and control (Delgado 2011).

In this vein an ongoing critique of public space in urban research and studies, is that of a concept inherent to European ideals of the urban and public spheres (Braig/Huffschmid 2009): As a Western notion of the city not only as an (utopian) ideal but as the universal norm, to be applied everywhere (Robinson 2003, Huffschmid/Wildner 2014). Postcolonial approaches in urban studies criticize these perspectives as euro-centric positions, which claim urban modernity to be based purely in Western cities and that the south have to catch up on developing processes. These concepts are considered not only as inadequate but also as obsolete and outdated (Lanz 2015, Robinson 2003). Postcolonial theories instead call for a decentralization of perspectives, to open the theoretical and methodological field (Appadurai 2000, Roy/Ong 2011.) Olaf Kaltmeier calls for a de-colonializing reflection on methods in urbanism (Kaltmeier 2012). He develops a kind of manifesto for a critical (de-colonial) methodology that uses self-reflection and collaborative approaches to analyze the various phases of the research process. Critical reflection, he states, begins with the research question, takes into account issues regarding the researcher’s presence in the field, processes of data collection, and also looks at questions of authorship, representation, and finally, reception (Kaltmeier 2012: 30ff).

These ideas connect with current debates within the field of urban research, where there is a growing realization that complex urban configurations cannot be examined using the classical methods of social science. As a result of critical reflection on knowledge production in present-day society, a number of new research approaches has arisen (Lury/Wakeford 2012, Streule 2013, Wildner 2014). These challenges are based not only on an increasing interest in interdisciplinary knowledge, on new formats, but also importantly on the growing necessity to communicate research results outside of the scientific communities as well). The social scientists Celia Lury and Nina Wakeford (2012) call for a critical reflection that goes beyond disciplinary boundaries of social sciences, to invent methods that generate and facilitate a new perspective on urban public spaces in global and post-colonial contexts. Research in this sense is understand in terms of a productive and performative process, and therefore itself is to be reflected upon as a social practice (Law/Urry 2004).

In the lecture I present some examples of ongoing projects I am conducting with the Berlin based group metroZones - center for urban affairs (www.metroZones.net). In these projects urban research is delineated as a practice of (decentralized) knowledge production, as movements between knowing and not-knowing, as methodic experiments, critical self-reflection, and, above all, as processes of experience. The methodological
conceptualization is mainly based on ethnographic approaches, which are informed by exploratory and inductive procedures. The micro level of everyday practices, the actors and their inner perspectives are focal points as well meanings and significances ascribed to urban environment. On a macro level these inside perspectives are analyzed under aspects of practices of power relations and governance that are involved in the constitution of space on local and global scales. Most of the examples are not primarily academic research projects, but located in a broader context, experimenting on the interface of urban research, cultural and artistic production. These projects include various phases of research and teaching. As such they are directed towards diverse participants and publics.

**Example 1: Novosibirsk**

In cooperation with Novosibirsk State Academy of Architecture and Fine Arts, the Goethe-Institute Novosibirsk in March 2015 metroZones was invited to give a one week workshop on urban transformation processes. The group of participants was composed by architecture students and anthropologist, but also urban actors such as artists and cultural mediators, who were invited to participate and reflect on their city. The leading research question was on (post socialist) urban transformations processes in Novosibirsk and how their effects become manifest in local public spaces. We took a closer look at two kinds of paradigmatic public spaces, their characteristics, qualities and conditions by means of qualitative methods as derive, mappings, and interventions which were applied in fieldwork onsite. The transdisciplinary mix of the group, from academics to practitioners, was not only new and inspiring for the participants, but very fruitful for the discussions in exchanging perspectives on the city.

**Example 2: Berlin /Hellersdorf**

As part of a city-funded project of art in public space on the periphery of Berlin initiated by a Berlin Art organisation, NGBK, metroZones looked at a massive housing project on the eastern periphery of Berlin. Hellersdorf was planned in the early 1980s, but never completed. Due to its peripheral location, the unfinished condition and the extensive scale of the area it has a fairly bad image in the cityscape, backed by the precarious economic and social situation of many of its inhabitants. The idea of metroZones’ research and art project was to reflect on this stigmatized neighborhood, gathering inside perspectives and working from the perceptions of people living and working in the area. In a series of workshops with institutions and inhabitants of the area the narrations and mappings of perceptions of neighborhood, of the ambivalent descriptions of the inside and outside, private and public spaces, were collected, interpreted and transformed into public wall papers.

**Example 3: Bogotá**

CALLE 22, conceptualized together with the Columbian architect and artist Roberto Uribe, is a research project on public space in Bogota, using art as a kind of vehicle and strategy to discuss and address public space. Against the background of Bogotá’s history marked by civil wars in different phases of urban development as well as massive political and everyday violence, public space becomes a very rare and contested good. The practice-based research project focussed on one specific street in the city center. La Calle 22 marks a transition between the colonial city and the modern Bogotá, transverses quite different urban situations as recently gentrified areas of private universities, former relics from the heyday of theaters and cinemas as well as inner-city run-down areas, red light districts and working-clas neighborhoods. Though it is located in the center of the city it gathers a number of characteristics of the periphery, a certain density that describes the urban development and configurations of contemporary Bogotá. The transdisciplinary project Calle 22 implemented art practices.
as research tools to focus on the street as a paradigmatic and highly complex space while configuring its potentials as urban public space. Within workshops and intensive fieldworks the subjective embodied experiences, the observations, conversations and mappings led to urban interventions (www.calle22.org). The projects of LA CALLE 22 emphasised active intervention in public spaces by artists and researchers, getting involved at the location, initiating debates, and encouraging discussions. These discussions are both, a central element of the data material gathered and as artistic products a display of the research results. In this sense (collaborative) procedures are used, very much in the spirit of “live methods” (Back and Puwar 2012), that interact offensively with the field of research, while at the same time providing analytical statements on the situation.

In each of these examples of here presented ongoing research projects, I understand urban research as specific creation of micro-publics, as social, spatial, and political practices that not only describe social reality, but also enact it in all its phases (Law / Urry 2008: 391). However, these research projects are not primarily solution-oriented. Spontaneous and unforeseeable situations are created, invented, or provoked; their outcome for now remains open. They experiment with schemes, settings, and systems of order, in the spirit of “inventive methods” (Lury / Wakeford) for urban research in public space.
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A good part of lauded livability of Vienna’s dense urban fabric may be attributed to the city’s streets and squares, not only because of the harmonious continuity of their facades which blend historical and modern features, but also because of the multifaceted character of their social space. Streets and squares are a vital part of daily routines for Vienna’s inhabitants and visitors. Some of these routines are visible or even celebrated in support of diversity (when recognized as constituents of values, narratives and imaginaries through which society constructs itself as real), the others go unnoticed or are disguised (when falling outside of the dominant culture). This binary, developing across a vast span of customs, norms and imaginations, is not static though, as at different moments various routines constitute society’s imagery of everyday life. Irrespective of whether a certain everyday life practice emerges as visible in a consensual or contentious manner, planning and design professionals have their share in making it noticed: as a beautiful piece of urban culture, as a mundane matter or as a matter of concern. Practices of exchange at city’s marketplaces have got their Wikipedia pages as part of Vienna’s urban flair, the rhythms of the elderly crossing the road have been included in traffic planning as a mundane routine of a significant share of the city’s population, whereas the involvement of planning activists in the production of transitional spaces of refugees has both contributed to and been defined by an increasingly polarised public space. Yes, everyday life practices are a political matter. It is consensual or contentious politics of space through which they are established, contested and imagined as either openly or imperceptibly present in urban public space. Regardless of their dimensionality or acceptance everyday life practices constitute a city’s cultural difference and are ingrained in space. As such they are inevitably intertwined with the professional practices of planning and design. Because the shared space of streets and squares can simultaneously be loved, celebrated, feared, despised or even dismissed by different people. What might be an unpleasant or even intimidating space for someone, is a loved or needed place for somebody else. A street or a square is perpetually imagined in countless ways and continuously reinvented. It embodies both utopias and pragmatism of the past (urban planning), displaying what society has desired and how it has desired, while simultaneously indicating its wishes for the future.

A street or a square is a mental and physical space where public life unfolds, where urban futures are negotiated and where the change materializes. This is where social and cultural difference is manifested, negotiated and curbed. And yet, all these notions seem not to have been sufficiently addressed in planning and design processes, in spite of the declared objectives towards shaping inclusive spaces. Moreover, a recent pedestrianization of Vienna’s major business street, Mariahilferstrasse, rather rendered planning and design disciplines as exclusionary practices, extended hands of power structures and polygons for gaining and exerting political influence. The heated debate on the street’s requalification resorted to an administrative demarcation of a series of territorial and institutional boundaries that defined who was included, apparently leaving many outside of the debate and the reinvented social life (legitimization of the project was eventually sought after through a referendum with a binary choice for or against pedestrianization, which was carried out in two of city’s 23 districts). The project, Vienna’s Green Party’s baby, followed an almost intuitive rationale that streets and squares...
which conform to walking rhythms are more inviting to the vastest difference of bodies, yet it once again revealed the city’s streets as continuously contested materialities and imaginaries. It also displayed to what a great extent their production has been dominated by representations of space of planning and design disciplines. The ubiquitous presence of plans, cross-sections, models and other visuals was used for producing the ‘other’ and discouraging a genuine inclusion of that ‘other’ into participatory practices and reinvented social life. Complex notions of city’s lived streets and squares have been subdued to simplistic conceptions and representations of space of elites in power, including planning and design professionals.

While approaching urban spaces from the professionally determined normative stance, professionals of planning and design disciplines have been taught and have learnt to replicate hegemonic conceptions and representations of space. Overwhelmed by loud political voices and short time frames (deadlines), and preoccupied with their professional toolkits and normative positions, they seldom engage with a street as lived space produced through a variety of everyday life practices (beyond performative strategies and staged tactics). In so doing they continue to reproduce binaries of winners and losers, included and excluded. Planning and design disciplines are therefore confronted with a fundamental question of reinventing own positioning in regard to the city which is increasingly understood, contested and imagined as the place of difference. How can a planner or designer genuinely and sensitively engage with cultural and social difference, and broad variations of visible and invisible everyday life practices?

The project-based course titled “Turning a street upside down”, which was developed by Prof Nikolai Roskamm and me, aimed at gaining an experiential understanding of the agency of both planning and design professionals and city publics in producing Vienna’s streets and squares understood as both places of encounter and a materialized history of ideas. They imbue the city’s spaces with desires, thus giving rise to utopias and producing meaningful places. Offered as part of the module “Welfare farewell? Exploring the Past(s)” of the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space in the summer semester 2015, the course was developing methodologies to experiencing, researching and imagining Vienna’s streets and squares, which would be more attentive to lived cultural experiences and reflexive of the agency of professionals in constituting or curbing cultural difference.

Participants were encouraged to consciously engage in space of a Vienna’s street or square of own choice and embark upon locally-embedded learning which was open in terms of results. This included relinquishment of some control over the research process as a means of bridging the chasm between expert knowledge and knowledge contained in social practices of multiple and diverse urban publics. Suggested methodology therefore combined intuitive learning approaches with the explorative use of institutional knowledge pertaining to the matter of concern. The intuitive component allowed for reflecting on own positionality and sensitive learning from local inclusive cultural practices, in particular those of insurgent nature that fall outside of conventional social practices and endorsed (urban) cultures, assuming a dynamic interaction between researchers and the local social space. The institutional knowledge provided a needed systematic component that put emphasis on soundness in thought and the growth of knowledge on the politics of space. Asked to start from the most common tool in hands of designers and planners for describing and designing a street, a graphic representation of a street cross-section, participants conducted a semester long research to gain profound knowledge of practices, processes and agencies in the production of space, articulate gained insights in the format of utopian or visionary practices, and reflect on their own (professionals’) role in constituting cultural difference of a street or square. While various methods borrowed from different fields were allowed for gaining insight and understanding of space, they also need to be recognized as powerful formative tools in image and discourse production.

Three research groups embarked upon the path of exploring three different urban environments employing and developing different approaches. In light of the objective of the course to develop place-specific intuitive methods for situated learning and creating imaginations for lived space of the street, all three groups unsurprisingly chose methods of action and ethnographic research, learning from and with design graphic tools, experimental hands-on approaches, as well as action-based and involved practices.

The group engaging with a pocket of green space behind Vienna’s landmark building of Secession, undertook an approach that was most in line with the currently widespread paradigm of performative
urbanism. Starting from the claim that the considered piece of green space surrounded by major thoroughfares functioned as a traffic island rather than so needed public green space, the group quickly conceived and implemented an action centred on the idea of a playground that aimed at drawing a broader public attention to this space void of street life. While the action was conceived as a showcase how this space could be activated, it actually delivered quite an opposite insight. The action proved insufficient means for attracting people from outside of the circles of friends and acquaintances or a broader public attention; yet having spent a day in that space, the research group scratched upon social space which existed at this space. The group encountered frequent users of space who shared quite a different perspective and imagery of this pocket of green space. This was a valuable point of departure for this group from which they were able to reflect on the own normative standpoints on the ideal public space, as well as broader issues of performative strategies and tactics.

In a similar manner the group engaging with Lerchenfelder Straße approached their street from a strong normative stance: in search of public life in the street they started from the considerations of the street’s physical space and visible materialities from the planners’ perspective of an ideal-type urban street, thus drawing a conclusion that their street was in need of improvements. However, their approach to space consisted of an extensive detailed analysis as a precondition for conceptualizing and undertaking any action. A structured analysis of material practices and physical conditions provided the researchers with useful technical information, yet only once they set out to engage with everyday life practices with the aim of gaining a more insightful knowledge of as many as possible dimensions of social space of the street, they departed from their normative stance and adopted a more relational perspective on space. They immersed into social space of the street by undertaking walks along the street, which they were conducting in an intuitive manner, putting emphasis on subjective personal experiences and individual “conversations” with the street. These experiences were finally echoed in subtle installations in the form of tagging the street with images of a skylark (German Lerchen), as elements inviting for interactions by offering an evident subject for a small talk.

The group engaging with space of Siebenbrunnenplatz approached their square with a systematic approach of social research which proved useful for gaining knowledge about social life on the square, yet did not aid the researchers in recognizing and confronting own preconceptions and prejudices pertaining to the place and their normative perspective on quality public space. Yet, instead of adapting their research question to the set of available methods, they were encouraged to honestly engage with both the place and the matter they were concerned with. Story telling as a method empowered them to return to the square and explore it in a more intuitive way encompassing social dimensions falling outside of their initial considerations, and further allowed them to reflect on their findings and own role in the production of place by reconciling neat methodological research and intuitive exploration of space.

Imagining a lived place proved to be a challenging task for planning professionals, as their toolkits are often rigidly demarcated by and restricted to their professional cultures. As a consequence, their actions, too, tended to stick with the attempts of reinterpreting old representations of space, rather than taking on the challenge to build on embodied experience. Three projects developed during this course however proved that creating meaningful visible change with limited resources and time is possible if an approach is both sensitive to different realities and capable of building bridges between them.
7 - WELL(-BEING)-SQUARE
TURNING UPSIDE DOWN A PLACE
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1 Introduction
Well-being has become a ‘buzz-word’ in public space discourse. The ‘well-being’ concept has been used in various locations and contexts, like therapy centers, parks or schools. The core of the concept is about ‘being well’ and this requires some conditions to be satisfied. Well-being is a multi-dimensional phenomenon. While there is also a psychological level in the concept of well-being, this research project aims to look at the physical appearance of public spaces and the influence on peoples well-being.

2 Observation and guided interviews

Observation took place on Friday, 24th April 2015, 4PM. Viewpoint was a bench next to the well. The first impression were identified by playing kids, groups of elderly people and the pavement cafes, but also by the fact that few people stayed long enough. After the well was closed, a lot of people crowded around it, especially the benches behind the well were taken by different groups. The grocery shop “Billa” and the gastronomy seemed to be well-liked around the pavement cafes. Besides the amount of people sitting here takes across the square and the entry to an underground-garage created the impression of a conflict point. We conducted four guided interviews at the Siebenbrunnenplatz. Local people mentioned the lack of greenery at the square as on negative aspect. Some residents had a high bond towards the square, because they grew up in the neighborhood.

Guided interviews took place on Wednesday, 13th May 2015, 4PM. We conducted guided interviews at the Siebenbrunnenplatz. Local people mentioned the lack of greenery at the square as on negative aspect. One woman had a high bond towards the square, because she grew up in the neighborhood.

Last but not least, public space is a key aspect for well-being. The feeling of well-being is a concept provided on the consumption of public space. The possibility to enjoy the warm weather by sitting on several benches in pleasant atmosphere and the offerings of the market and the ice-cream.

3 Theory

Definition of well-being in theory

Social dimension: possibilities to be part of the society
Political dimension: possibilities to participate in decision-making processes
Economic dimension: consumption possibilities and command over resources

Public space, as an essential contribution to peoples well-being, affects and is affected by all three dimensions.

What is Well-being at Siebenbrunnenplatz?

Well-being is strongly connected with green space. A lack of green is the most negative (not only in this place), but he also misses the greenery, especially the magnolias.

4 Conversations

WHIO: man, 25-30 years
WHIO: Friday afternoon, May
WHERE: ComixBox
WEATHER: sunny, not

He liked the square, it fits his work (Comics), but he also likes to sit there in the sun and read.

WHIO: two elder women
WHIO: Friday afternoon, May
WHERE: Seilbahnercafe
WEATHER: rainy, cold

The general usability enhancement of the café since a week even though the weather has not changed. They enjoyed the square and the ambience.

WHIO: woman, around 40 years old
WHIO: Friday afternoon, May
WHERE: next to the well
WEATHER: sunny, not

She used to sit in the sun for a little bit for a friend, but now she has to go somewhere else.

WHIO: man, around 40 years old
WHIO: Friday afternoon, May
WHERE: wienbecker well
WEATHER: rainy, cold

He could not enjoy the square around the well with the bench because there is a bus stop in the middle.

WHIO: woman, around 40 years old
WHIO: Friday afternoon, May
WHERE: Seilbahnercafe
WEATHER: rainy, cold

The memory of the square and the continuous existence of the well makes it something special and provides the feeling of well-being.

In this square, you can relax and enjoy the weather.

5 Conclusion

What is Well-being at Siebenbrunnenplatz?
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What is well-being at Siebenbrunnenplatz?

What is well-being at Siebenbrunnenplatz? What does it mean for public space? Can we find the feeling of well-being at Siebenbrunnenplatz? The starting point was an observation and short guided interviews, afterwards we looked into theory about well-being and public space, and the different possibilities to be part of the society. We used a multi-level approach and had informal conversations with people and the square to find out more.

Turning upside down a place

What is Well-being at Siebenbrunnenplatz?

Well-being? Are you well? Being well? We conducted guided interviews at Siebenbrunnenplatz. Local people mentioned the lack of greenery at the square as a negative aspect. One woman had a high bond towards the square, because she grew up in the neighborhood.

But inside the results of our approach of selecting straight-forward quotes concerning determinants of well-being were not as promising as we hoped for. So we decided to take a look into theory.
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Once upon a time four students thought about well-being in public space. They were interested in how people feel and what aspects matter. But it was not that easy...

The Story of WELL-BEING...

The Reinprechtsdorfer Straße is located in the 5th district of Vienna. It comprises the area between Matzleinsdorfer Platz to the Wienzeile. The Siebenbrunnenplatz is situated in the middle.

The Reinprechtsdorfer Straße is very lively. But they couldn’t find a concise answer. So they decided to go to the library and search for literature to get more knowledge about well-being.

There are many definitions of well-being. Some see it as a way of life and others as a state of health. The students had different impressions and discussed them together. They already got first ideas about well-being on the square.

But they still can’t be sure what well-being means at Siebenbrunnenplatz.

All four of them reflected on what they have learned about well-being, but there wasn’t a concrete answer. So they decided to go to the library and look into literature to get more knowledge about theory.

There were so many definitions and concepts. The students read a lot but didn’t know how to use all of that information. After a while they decided to close the books again and rather get in contact with locals there.

Back again they met a man reading comics. There was a comic box and he was the person in charge. He told the students about the effects of that box in the area and some personal memories about the square.

The square was redesigned in 1999 and locals still have memories about former times. There was more greenery before. Now it’s a no-traffic zone.

A few people narrated that green areas are very important for well-being.

People were talking about temporary uses of the square. They really appreciated what’s going on there, even though some functions of the square are more important than others.

Children appropriated the square by playing on and around the well. Even though it’s forbidden, there are great possibilities for little adventures. Meanwhile their parents can happily eat ice cream.

The students went to the Siebenbrunnen Café. There they met elderly ladies having a lively discussion. The ladies meet there regularly, even though they don’t live there anymore. They talked about the past in the most beautiful place they know.

The square is a meeting place for locals and visitors. It’s a great place for children to play and adults to relax.

Especially the green areas are very important for well-being. People need a place to relax and unwind. They enjoy being in nature.

As the Reinprechtsdorfer Straße and Siebenbrunnenplatz are very close to each other, there should be more interaction between them.

The students summarized what they have learned about well-being in public space.

Finally the students summarized that different dimensions and experiences matter. They found out that there can’t be a generally valid definition of well-being.
PUBLIC LIFE IN LERCHENFELDER STRASS
TURNING UPSIDE DOWN A STREET

Ehsan Bazafkan BSc, Aglaja Bitzinger BSc, Projectass. Dipl.-Ing. Grazia Bonvissuto, Isolde Plakolm BSc
PROJECTS

ANY IDEAS?

UTENSILS

ACTION!

REACTION!

By now, which is more than a week later, nearly all of the chalk drawings and writings have vanished and Lerchenfelder Straße seems unchanged and just like before. We will probably never know if we managed to start a conversation that surpassed mere small-talk, but we achieved something else. Out of our own subjective perceptions of public space, we developed an analytical approach and a methodology helping us to gain a deeper understanding of a place and a way to share it with the public.
An intervention to raise attention

In our cities we have different spaces, some more frequented than others. Some spaces seem, in our subjective perception, to be unused, forgotten, lost. But can you even lose space? Obviously it is not like a key, that can get lost - yet our group chose the word "lost".

Why lost? It is a public space, but where is the public? It is a space owned by the city of Vienna, but where does the city show action? Did they lose sight of that particular place? Did the people in this area (the public) lose sight? The starting point of our project is that we experienced this place as a “lost space”, dominated by cars, and not very attractive for people. A place that seems to be abandoned and therefore lost. In order to raise attention, we did an intervention.

Within the progress of the project the title gets edited with a question mark – is it really a lost space? In a booklet on the project we present how we learned and experienced space, people and the relations in between.

„It sounds contradictory, but there should be found a way to keep the current calm and hidden circumstance but at the same time opened to people who try to make us of it.“

„If we conclude finally, we can see many similarities to the collaborative research, education and action, as well known as „Participatory Action Research“ (PAR).“

Extract from the booklet