



Urban Culture, Public Space and the Past:

Urban Peace and National Welfare

REFUGEES AND THE CITY

Annual Reader 2015 - Booklet II

Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space

Faculty of Architecture and Planning, TU Wien



raum skuor

Vienna University of Technology
Department of Spatial Planning
Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space

IMPRINT

PUBLISHER

Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space
Department for Spatial Planning
Faculty of Architecture and Planning
Technische Universität Wien

Karlgasse 13/2
A-1040 Wien
<http://skuor.tuwien.ac.at>
info@skuor.tuwien.ac.at

EDITORS

Sabine Knierbein
Elina Kränzle

CONTRIBUTORS

Karin Harather
Sabine Knierbein
Elina Kränzle
Elke Rauth
Nikolai Roskamm
Amila Širbegović

STUDENTS

Bernhard Angerer
Michael Berger
Victor Bukovszki
Olivia Christopher
Theresa Edlauer
Bernhard Gugg
Helena Götsch
Jozef Hurban
Ilgin Kurum
Sandra Lamyová
Lena Junger
Tatjana Marmat
Keisuke Otsuru
Mohammad Paiwand
Faiz Rasuli
Vanessa Schöps
Milica Ugrinov
Arda Uyanik

DESIGN

Helena Götsch
Valentina Kofler
Elina Kränzle

COVER

Displaced - Space for Change (2015)

Vienna, Austria, April 2016

ISBN 978-3-902707-21-5

REFUGEES AND THE CITY. (IM) POSSIBILITIES OF URBAN PLANNING (A MASTER PROJECT)

Ass. Prof. Dr. phil. Sabine Knierbein

Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space, Faculty of Architecture & Planning, TU Wien

Public space catalyzes, reflects and mediates geopolitical turnovers and paradigmatic population shifts in manifold ways. While the teaching team had prepared a project called "Refugees and the city. The (im)possibilities of urban planning" which incorporated a historical reading of cities that have actively accepted and welcomed refugees as new parts of the urban population during June 2015, the geopolitical momentum exemplified by the so-called "March of Hope" between Budapest (Hungary) and Vienna (Austria) has marked a new era of (forced) migration in Northern Europe. While Austria witnessed the decay of humanitarian national politics regarding the refugee camp in Traiskirchen (Lower Austria), the death of 71 refugee children, women and men that had been found dead on a motorway in Burgenland (close by the Hungarian border) and 20,000 people marching on Vienna's streets to protest against the inhuman measurements of the national state and in solidarity with the refugees, the approach to the planned master project for the winter term suddenly became self-evident, and out of a curiosity for theoretical reflection a need was born to take action to provide human living conditions for refugees arriving in Vienna (and elsewhere).

While the teaching team of the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space consisting of Sabine Knierbein, Elina Kränzle, Nikolai Roskamm and Amila Sirbegovic had agreed with our colleagues Karin Harather and Renate Stuefer (as well organizing an NGO called BINK) from the Institute for Art and Design to offer our courses in combined fashion as an open workshop during the Urbanize Festival 2015 which would take place in the former building of the financial department in the Vordere Zollamtstraße in Vienna, the news was circulated that this building would be actually used as emergency aid shelter for incoming

refugees. Out of a playful situation the project and our teaching concept was thrown into a real life situation, a lived space not just for us, but as well for the refugees who suddenly were humans with a face, a fate and a voice.

As all members of the teaching team except Amila and Elina had hardly been in touch with refugees (understood as a social group with basic needs, which however, are quite heterogeneous) before, we invited a partner from the civil society with long lasting expertise in the field of refugee work: Project School for all (Projekt Schule für Alle, PROSA) joined us with some of their refugee students (aged between approx. 16 and 25 years) who had volunteered to become part of our workshop week during the festival as part of mixed working groups.

During the first days, six groups constituted themselves around topics of (1) housing (2), industrial and office buildings, (3) public space, (4) hands-on approaches in emergency shelters, (5) open university and (6) networks in the city. All groups consisted of students from different disciplines relating to the field of spatial arts, refugee students from PROSA and further interested festival guests. One of their tasks was to organize a "Table of Plenty" for an evening event during the festival for which we invited faculty staff and students and further interested guests. Each group joined with an "expert" from the field of working with refugees: David Zistl (Flüchtlinge Willkommen, Wohnen in WGs), Nina Valerie Kolowratnik & Johannes Pointl (Fluchtraum Österreich), Lukas Kluszczynski (Caritas), and Nadia Rida (Mensch sein in Österreich) among others. That way, we wanted to connect to existing local, regional and national networks working with refugees and learn from their experience and expertise lessons to be included in further debates in architecture and planning.

APPROACH

The evening was a great success and the food offered a taste of translocall everyday lives of “accredited” refugees that have started to settle down in Vienna (i.e. the PROSA students).

The “Table of Plenty” was the beginning of a semester-long effort of the mixed students’ groups to delve into the topic of “Refugees and the City” from different angles. In January 2016 the students presented their projects in one of the afternoon teaching sessions of PROSA to the refugee students and thus exposed their research and ideas to an affected public. The final presentations in the winter term as well as a poster exhibition took place in the premises of Gebietsbetreuung *9/17/18 where guest critics from different academic backgrounds offered their respective insights and critique. There the idea was born to continue the exchange within the new network and organize a “Table of Plenty II”. Re-connecting with the people and organizations engaged in issues of refuge and arrival, and showing the progress of the various working groups that had formed since the Urbanize! festival, we would like to create a space to continue discourse, research and action in humane urban development and humanitarian aid performance through (emerging) city publics.



BOOKLET II

WINTER TERM 2015

Refugees and the City

THE APPROACH

- Refugees and the City. (Im)possibilities of Urban Planning 3
(a Master Project)
Sabine Knierbein

URBANIZE! FESTIVAL

- Do it Together! Turning Urban Theory into Practical Solidarity 6
Elke Rauth
The Art of Cooperation: Education Working Space as a Cooperative Incubator 8
Karin Harather

LECTURES

- Urban Professionals as Human Rights Performers? On 11
the Universality of Human and Refugee Rights
Sabine Knierbein
Mixing 14
Nikolai Roskamm
Practice, Methods, Tools: Researching Spaces Shaped by Migration 19
Amila Širbegović
Refugees and the City - Displacing the State of Exception 23
Elina Kränzle

PROJECTS

- How Temporariness Affects Accommodation and Living Standards of Refugees 28
Helena Götsch, Lena Junger
Living. Making. Being. Public Space 30
Viktor Bukovszki, Jozef Hurban, Ilgin Kurum, Sandra Lamyová, Keisuke Otsuru, Milica Ugrinov
The Inaccessible City 31
Michael Berger, Theresa Edlauer, Tatjana Marmat, Vanessa Schöps
Wien erkunden – gemeinsam! Collaborative Mapping Initiative 32
Bernhard Angerer, Olivia Christopher, Bernhard Gugg, Mohammad Paiwand, Faiz Rasuli, Arda Uyanik

DO IT TOGETHER! TURNING URBAN THEORY INTO PRACTICAL SOLIDARITY

Elke Rauth, *Dérive* Zeitschrift für Stadtforschung

When we launched the 6th urbanize! festival in October 2015, the topic “Do It Together - Prospects of a Collaborative Urbanism” set out to explore theory, ideas and existing best practice for collaborative city-making, aiming to promote the idea of collaboration over competition. A vacant building in the heart of Vienna offered plenty of space to stage the festival center and host a social laboratory inviting more than 100 international artists, designers, architects and urban theorists of all disciplines by an open call to take part in this Collaborative Playground.



Urbanize Festival 2015 (© Dérive, 2015)



DIY furniture at Urbanize Festival 2015 (© Dérive, 2015)

One of the festivals participants was the student project week “Displaced. Refugees and the City” organized by the Institute for Art and Design together with the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space, not

knowing how urgent the topic would become as the festival preparations took an unplanned turn: One night around 3 weeks before festival start the temporary used building got turned into an emergency accommodation for refugees and the first women, men and children arrived only a few hours after we had received notice and opened the doors for the emergency team of the Red Cross.

It was one of these autumn weekends 2015, when more than 20.000 people per day stranded at the Austrian borders, fleeing war and death in their countries with only a backpack full of their dearest belongings. It was absolutely clear for us that giving shelter to these people had an absolute priority and we were wondering if it would be appropriate at all to host a cultural festival in the same space. Talking to the Red Cross it became clear that only parts of the 10,000 m2 space could be used for hosting refugees and furthermore that in any crisis, no matter how deep and devastating it might be, there is a notion of everyday life, a need for moments of joy and mutual recognition as human beings. Cultural activities play a helpful part in this.

Encouraged by the Red Cross we decided to stay and started planning once again: We made room for first aid logistics and designed a new festival space allocation plan for workshops, exhibition, lectures and lab activities. We changed the entrance to the festival center in order to get out of the way of emergency help and informed all festival participants about the new situation inviting them on a voluntary basis to think about if and how their contributions to the festival could become useful for the new residents.

The festival program started and simultaneously a quite natural culture of solidarity and cooperation between refugees, visitors, festival participants, Red Cross and voluntary workers unfolded. It quickly

became clear that the 19th century office building was in many aspects unsuitable for housing refugees: It showed an enormous lack of living quality ranging from appropriate furniture to sanitary rooms and common spaces for playing, meeting or dining.

weekly radio show for the local free radio station with the new residents, where music and stories are shared, and numerous festival participants are involved as volunteers – helping with the daily routines as well as co-programming cultural activities.



Children playing in the photo exhibition "After the Game" (© Dérive, 2015)

The architect team Framework therefore developed a simple furniture design, usable as stool, bench or table, stackable as a shelf, easy to transport and cheap to make. The single plywood-pieces were prefabricated and everybody was invited to co-produce furniture for the house at the workbench in the festival's courtyard: At the end of the festival nearly 200 pieces of furniture had been produced and had made their way into each and every corner of the building.

The art and design team Adhocrates created indoor playgrounds and a team of students from Displaced. Refugees and the City started to improve quality of space in all parts of the house while students from the Universität der Nachbarschaften in Hamburg set up a pop-up living room in the hallway to name only a few of the many activities that took place. As often it were the children that tore down the barrier between festival and refugee space most effectively: The indoor playground was quickly inhabited and the kids discovered the basketball-setting of artist Andreas Nader's photo-exhibition After the Game and came to play every day. Soon the experimental pop-up mini-golf-trail in the courtyard offered distraction for grown-ups and children alike and the festival bar was inhabited more and more by the residents of the building.

The 10 short days of the urbanize! festival have sparked many sustainable processes that still take place in the former urbanize! festival centre that meanwhile has turned into a permanent housing unit for asylum seekers: Students of Displaced have decided to stay and work with full commitment on improving the quality of living with and for the residents. Members of Radio dérive are producing a

The co-produced furniture still functions as important basic equipment for private and common spaces and the former festivalbar has been turned into the self-organized tearoom and cultural space Cafe Vozo, which has developed into the heart of the building for its residents.

In retrospect, we have all learned a lot from this years' festival and I would like to close with three out of many findings that also resemble important lessons for collaborative city-making: 1. Prefabricated assumptions usually have little to do with the actual reality; 2. The availability of material and symbolic space – actual space to experiment with as well as a leap of faith and mutual trust for everybody involved – are key preconditions for the unfolding of innovative processes and cannot be overestimated; 3. If these components are in place a lot of utterly great and unexpected things evolve.

THE ART OF COOPERATION. EDUCATION WORKING SPACE AS A COOPERATIVE INCUBATOR

Ass. Prof. Mag.art. Dr.phil. Karin Harather, Institute for Art and Design, TU Wien

In spring of 2015, the dean invited our faculty (Architecture and Spatial Planning, Vienna University of Technology) to the “parliament of questions,” where future research and teaching focuses of the faculty would be defined via cooperative discourse. With our contribution we (Karin Harather and Renate Stuefer) initiated the “education working space,” a faculty-wide working group concerned with spatial issues in educational processes. Since we wanted to arrive at concrete actions as quickly as possible (research-led teaching), we first sought to cooperate with Prose - Project School for Everyone! This private, donation-funded educational initiative supports young refugees and migrants. It allows refugee youth as young as 15 years old, who had previously been excluded from the school system, to complete the compulsory graduation from school and to establish social contacts. Because the spatial requirements of Prose are constantly growing and its teaching is not bound by the rigid framework of the institutionalized education system, we understood that this represented ideal conditions under which to jointly define new meeting and educational spaces. In doing so it was important to us not only to jointly conceive of urban, informal, and consumption-free alternative models, but also (depending on the medium) to actually implement them together.

In May we began to prepare for a corresponding cooperative lecture format, with the objective of putting education-relevant processes in motion together with Prose and condensing them into concrete spatial scenarios of a humane arrival and stay. With the future.lab course “Artistic project Displaced - Participatory action research: urban educational spaces for young refugees” we left the usual place of learning at the university and entered into further collaborations: within the university with SKuOR - Interdisciplinary Center for Urban

Culture and Public Space and with design, build - Department of Housing and Design, and outside of the university in addition to Prose with blink, the Initiative for Building Culture Exchange for Young People and urbanize!, the International Festival for Urban Exploration.

The Cooperative Playground of the urbanize! Festival

Together with the teaching team at SKuOR and Prose we developed the open project week “Displaced. Refugees and the City” and the discussion evening “Displaced. City, space, and escape” at the Table of Plenty for this year’s urbanize! Festival.

In keeping with this year’s festival motto, “Cooperative Playground - do it together,” this intensive week from October 5-9, 2015 offered a productive testing ground for joint action: architecture and planning students, young refugees, teachers, and external participants brought their individual abilities to the table and, via participatory action research, developed new forms of informal learning - with each other and from each other.

The urbanize! Festival Center, where we worked throughout the week, mutated “into a cooperative playground: amid the ambience of a former finance building in the center of Vienna, urbanize! brings artists, urban activists, and urban researchers together to explore the possibilities and pitfalls of the collaborative processes. The Cooperative Playground opens up a playful field of learning and experimentation in the oeuvre City, located between social laboratory and self-made amusement park, in which the art of cooperation and its impact on the urban space can be tested - in workshops, joint work processes, whether one is watching, presenting, or using the DIY attractions. It provides a space for exchange and experimentation, in which ideas turn

into action, fiction becomes reality, and conversations become attempts. It is a laboratory and a bold collage of participants, festival guests, and visitors who through their participation co-produce the festival and thus work together on a prototype of the collaborative development of urban practices" (urbanize! program booklet 2015: 6; translated from original German).

Since the (spatial) framework had changed significantly shortly before the festival began, it was natural to keep our project orientation correspondingly open and flexible: the festival headquarters building – the former finance authority in the center of Vienna, which had long been vacant – was made available for short-term transitory housing for about 1,000 refugees by its future users, the University of Applied Arts, and its owner, the Federal Real Estate Agency. In keeping with the motto do it together, the Red Cross, which had assumed responsibility for the emergency quarters, and urbanize! agreed to share the building during the festival and to make it into a place in which the acute care of people seeking protection and the creative potential of urbanize! actors could develop synergies for future-oriented cooperation.

One of our first objectives during the urbanize! week was to gather everyone who was interested in the current challenges, particularly our colleagues in the faculty, at a Table of Plenty, and to prepare a thematically appropriate substantive, spatial, and culinary setting for this. Through six different "dinner parties" the aim was to explore existing and future practices and networking opportunities and to pursue a question with our guests: what can architects and spatial planners, university instructors, students, architecture professionals, artists, urban researchers, and urban activists do in light of the current challenges; what is our societal responsibility; what will our concrete contribution be?

The impulses triggered by the "dinner parties" have now been introduced in the recently added internal faculty platform "Escape – space – architecture," and we hope that this will initiate additional cooperative networks.

The cooperative dynamics of the project Displaced_Space for Change

Project groups were formed from the six different "dinner parties," and these will continue on through the urbanize! Festival as well as in various courses of the Master's Programs in Architecture and Spatial Planning and will be supervised by the teaching

teams with different focuses throughout the semester. Below I refer to the activities of the project group Displaced_Space for Change, led by my colleague Renate Stuefer and myself, which continues to work in the building even after the completion of the urbanize! Festival. Characterized by uncanny energy and dynamism, the work in recent months has focused not only on the implementation of acute architectural-spatial measures, but also on building efficient team structures, internal and external communication networks, as well as material, time, and financial sponsorship. The core Displaced team consists of Yasmin El-Isa, Rupert Gruber, Jacinta Klein, Lilian Mandalios, Elaine Mang, Julia Menz, Stefanie Mras, Maria Myskiw, Karina Ruseva, and Simon Uebleis-Lang, who are also supported by many, sometimes changing internal and external actors.



Table of Plenty at Urbanize Festival 2015 (© Dérive, 2015)

At the beginning of our activities on the ground, the former finance authority building functioned as an emergency shelter and housed up to 1,500 refugees. Lately, the building serves mostly as buffer quarters offering about 850 people a longer-term roof over their head and additionally taking in about 200 transitory guests on a temporary basis. Since this historic building was never intended for residential use and has been completely vacant for years, precarious conditions prevail.

The spatial structure of the former administration building permits neither cozy privacy nor welcoming, communicative assembly. Moreover, excessively rigid fire regulations prohibit the use of textiles on the premises unless they are properly treated with flame retardant. The unappealing, minimal furniture with benches and loosely hung garbage bags reflects the dismal and monotonous daily situation in which the residents of the building have found themselves for months. Since there are no lockable storage facilities, many people

URBANIZE! FESTIVAL

hesitate even to leave their assigned sleeping locations.

In close cooperation with the Red Cross and together with the building residents and other helping hands, the Displaced team has managed to achieve a minimal level of residential quality through targeted interventions. First, play and leisure areas for children were created during the urbanize! week. The Meeting Café, which opened in mid-November and offers a multi-purpose community area, is a “no budget” project planned through the cooperative, tireless work of the team and implemented with the support of internal and external helpers. In order to be able to jointly and independently fabricate much of what was required for equipment in the cafe (and subsequently also for other areas of the building), a workshop has been established.

After months of effort and tough negotiations, the lacking sanitary infrastructure has now been provided in the form of makeshift shower containers in the parking lot next to the building. Through the technical expertise of the students – the sophisticated planning, the cogent refutation of all counter-arguments, the subtle arrangement and structural adaptation of the containers that the Displaced team achieved through their own efforts – an optimal quality of space has been created in spite of these stopgap measures.

In the meantime, the University of Applied Arts has also entered into this cooperative process: teams from the “Social Design” program, as well as students finished with their classes and graduates have taken over diverse programming and activation functions. Together with the building’s residents, they look after the operation of the café as well as various events and workshops. Now, the University of Music and Performing Arts has offered to host seminars together with the people in the building. Even a TV studio will soon be set up there, where a daily program will be made with refugees and regular broadcasting operations will be established. The momentum is incredible, the networks expand by the day, and unimagined synergies suddenly make many things possible in this exceptional situation. And once again this shows that the high art of cooperation probably functions best away from bureaucratic structures, informally, on the basis of individual cooperation and the personal commitment of individual protagonists: away from monetary interests, with the simplest materials but plenty of warmth, a model-like place for intercultural exchange and encounter is created step-by-step; a place where one is willing to learn with and from one another; a place where the contemporary culture of welcoming is the actual practice.



Student building furniture for the refugee shelter (© Dérive, 2015)

URBAN PROFESSIONALS AS HUMAN RIGHTS PERFORMERS? ON THE UNIVERSALITY OF HUMAN AND REFUGEE RIGHTS

Ass. Prof. Dr. phil. Sabine Knierbein

Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space, Faculty of Architecture & Planning, TU Wien

Public space debates and more recent contributions about emerging solidary spaces have raised issues of minority rights, human rights and the 'right to the city', and have stressed the rise of insurgent practices that "are not only reactive and resistance-based, but also active and propositional" (Garcia Lamarca, 2016: p. xx). Practices, processes and places of solidarity-making have been coined as one viable alternative to the dominant order of production and power (Arampatzi, 2016), thus qualifying the empirically informed debate on performed acts of urban resistance as active dissent not just against, but altering prevailing neoliberal politics and expert-led post-political governance regimes (Wilson and Swyngedouw, 2015).

Public space has been analyzed as (potential) place of insurgence, dissent and the staging of an egalitarian politics of difference (Watson, 2006; Hou, 2010; Kaika and Karaliotas, 2014) where the political can be reclaimed through embodied action and acts of spatially exposing (vulnerable) bodies as part of face-to-face politics. Further contributions have coined public space as 'relational counter space' (Knierbein, 2015), where alternative and altering paths of development seeking to overcome the pitfalls of capitalist urban restructuring can be developed and practiced by (newly emerging) counter publics. In the field of refugee studies, self-organization and emerging intrinsic dynamic resistance of displaced people is given a similar weight as a mobilizing agent for change: A post-colonial reading of this situation depicts that Western humanitarian agencies and political and technical authorities represent refugees "in terms of helplessness and loss" (Rajaram, 2002: 247), and thereby consign them "to a mute and faceless physical mass ... Narration of refugee experiences becomes the prerogative of Western 'experts': refugee

lives become a site where Western ways of knowing are reproduced" (ibid.). These associations and institutions responsible for humanitarian aid may thus fail to consider that they do not succeed in providing refugees with a means to speak for themselves. Rather, they tend to contribute to a de-politicized and de-historicized image of refugees" (ibid.). Malkki suggest that "the figure of the refugee does not exist in a 'social void' ... People who find themselves refugees have .. become, precisely, thinkable as a ('problematic') social category in the national order of things, an exception made familiar through the media and through humanitarian appeals on behalf of their 'bare humanity'" (Malkki, 2002: 356). Other accounts have discussed refuge in the context of urbanity, urban-ness and cities (Agier, 2002; Sanyal, 2014), and emphasized the growing relevance of 'urban' practices of refugees that are no longer exceptions, but become the norm (Sanyal, 2014: 568). While camp-related everyday life has been coined as a denial of the right of mobility (ibid.: 560), Sanyal states that "refugees have often preferred to go to cities: work is more readily available, plus cities afford a degree of anonymity allowing them to escape the apparatus of humanitarian assistance and the stigma of refugeeness, and also promise easier assimilation into the host population." In addition, cities are potential hosts of already existing social translocal networks (of previous refugees or migrants from the same family, city or region) to which the incoming refugees can connect which offers a possibility of learning more easily about the local society. The movement of refugees into urban areas further complicates the mission of humanitarian agencies attempting to 'care' for them (Sanyal, 2014: 560-1, referring to Malkki 1995). Humanitarian agencies are now forming part of what Agier has coined as a "global space for the 'humanitarian'

management of the most unthinkable and undesirable populations of the planet" (Agier, 2002: 320), while the humanitarian aid itself is becoming an increasingly commodified field where humanitarian aid governance regimes consisting of private corporations and the traditional humanitarian agencies play an increasingly ambivalent role: "International humanitarian organizations intervene from beyond, taking on the role of the state while preserving its territorial integrity" (Sanyal, 2014: 560, referring to Elden, 2009).

Research on refuge is as often focusing on the relations between those who flee (their country, city or region), and those who 'offer' emergency 'aid' and 'support', as it problematizes the role between (blurred boundaries of) national states, and urban formations and cities, on the other. Thirdly, aspects of self-determined mobility and hindered mobility of refugees are at the heart of discourses about refuge, whereas so far, these discourses have mainly discussed empirical phenomena of forced migration in the Global South, or at the threshold between the Global South and the Global North. What Vienna is witnessing is a similar empirical phenomenon in cities of the Global North. We will thus 'learn' from what has been researched in the Global South and in Southern Europe and seek to transfer these previous findings into a changed lived space in Northern European cities. Thereby, the project depicts a timely and relevant topic.

Referring to Holston and Appadurai (1996: 195-6) Malkki recaps that "refugee-ness is negotiated (by persons who are refugees and the institutions whose mandate they are) in a world in which immigration and the complexities of immigrant status are ever more acutely politicized and economically consequential" (Malkki, 2002: 356). Immigration in this sense, can be understood as a "central link between classical issues of citizenship – imaged as a right-bearing form of membership in the territorial nation-state – and the city as this dense and heterogeneous lived space" (ibid., referring to Holston and Appadurai, 1996: 195-6).

It is exactly the ethnography of the lived spaces in terms of micro-social research that public space research has traditionally been concerned with, while structural aspects (and thus meso- and macro aspects of public spaces) have been introduced only in the last decade of analyzing public spaces as lived spaces. Simultaneously, public space research has also tried to show a way forward in

overcoming a strong overemphasis on public space as (discursive) public sphere in aid of a performative conception of public space as place of active formation of (counter) publics, and meaningful change (Bridge and Watson, 2011; Tornaghi and Knierbein, 2015). Low and Smith have indicated a gap between public space and public sphere literatures and have coined public space as the "geography of the public sphere" (2006: 6) while insisting that "an understanding of public space is an imperative for understanding the public sphere" (ibid.). More recently, reflections on the epistemology of public space have framed those places where subaltern counter publics (Fraser, 1990) can, on the one hand, be understood as "parallel discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counterdiscourses to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs" (Fraser, 1990: 67). In this sense relational counter(hegemonic) space facilitates insurgent action to enact dissent with politics regimes that fail to deliver democratic conditions, and to show a path forward in embodying egalitarian difference in the city.

These theoretical orientations come as no surprise after public spaces have been identified as core catalysts of capitalist urban restructuring where empirical evidence on the nuances and ambivalences of changing phenomena of the commodification of social relations over the last thirty years have been presented (Hou and Knierbein, 2017, forthcoming). Both public space and the political are not (just) about the exchange and balancing of rational arguments, they are as much about affective politics of care, geographies of insurgence and embodied spaces of 'the political'.

The lecture therefore, has offered a basic introduction to the field of human rights, and has introduced two international rights (instruments/systems) that apply to this situation

- Human Rights (as among others outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted 1948)
- Refugee Rights (as codified in the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, adopted in 1951 (Geneva Refugee Convention), adopted in 1951)

Human rights are universal and inalienable, all people are entitled to them just by the fact of being human. Refugee rights have been generally agreed upon by the states that have signed the Geneva Refugee Convention,

but some of these apply as customary international law and therefore are binding as well for those states that have not signed the convention.

Besides going through the most relevant paragraphs of these declarations that can be directly connected to the expertise and action fields of planners and architects, a general introduction is made that reflects on the different ways how and by whom human rights can be performed:

“The most obvious human rights defenders are those whose daily work specifically involves the promotion and protection of human rights, e.g. human rights monitors working with national human rights organizations, human rights ombudsmen or human rights lawyers. However, what is most important in characterizing a person as a human rights defender is not the person’s title or the name of the organization he or she works for, but rather the human rights character of the work undertaken. It is not essential for a person to be known as a “human rights activist” or to work for an organization that includes “human rights” in its name in order to be a human rights defender. The national and international staff of NGOs around the world working to address humanitarian concerns can typically be described as human rights defenders. People educating communities on HIV/AIDS, activist for the rights of indigenous peoples, environmental activists and volunteers working in development are also playing a crucial role. Many people work in a professional capacity as human rights defenders and are paid a salary for their work. However, there are many others who are volunteers and receive no remuneration. Typically, human rights organizations have very limited funding and the work provided by these volunteers is invaluable. Many professional activities do not involve human rights work all of the time but can have occasional links with human rights. A similar ‘special’ effort can be applied to other professions or forms of employment that bear no obvious relation to human rights. For example, some architects and planners choose to design their construction and development projects in a way that takes into consideration relevant human rights, such as the right to adequate (temporary) housing for the people who will work on the project, or the rights of children to be consulted on the design, if the building is of particular relevance to them. The actions taken by human rights defenders must be peaceful” (cf. United Nations Online 2016).

Bibliography

- Agier, M. (2002) *Between War and City*. Towards an urban anthropology of refugee camps. *Ethnography* 3.3, 317–41.
- Arampatzi, A. (2016) The spatiality of counter-austerity politics in Athens, Greece: Emergent ‘urban solidarity spaces’. *Urban Studies* February 3, 2016, 1-16.
- Bridge, G. and Watson, S. (2011) *The New Blackwell Companion to the City*. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester.
- Elden, S. (2009) *Terror and territory: the spatial extent of sovereignty*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Fraser, N. (1990) Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. *Social Text* 25.26, 56-80.
- García Lamarca, M (2016, forthcoming) From Occupying Plazas to recuperating Housing: Insurgent Practices in Spain. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* xx.xx, xx-xx (Paper accepted for publication).
- Holston, J. and Appadurai, A. (1996) Cities and citizenship. *Public Culture* 8.2, 355-376.
- Hou, J. (2010) *Insurgent public space. Guerilla Urbanism and the Remaking of Contemporary Cities*. Routledge, New York.
- Hou, J. and Knierbein, S. (2017, forthcoming) *City Unsilenced*. Urban resistance and public space in the age of shrinking democracy. Routledge, New York.
- Kaika, M. and Karaliotas, L. (2014) The spatialization of democratic politics: Insights from Indignant Squares. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 14.8, 1-15.
- Knierbein, S. (2015) Public Space as relational counter space. Scholarly minefield or epistemological opportunity? In C. Tornaghi and S. Knierbein (eds.), *Public space and relational perspectives: New challenges for architecture and planning*, Routledge, New York/London.
- Malkki, L. H. (1995) *Purity and exile: violence, memory and national cosmology among Hutu refugees in Tanzania*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago/London.
- Malkki, L. H. (2002) News from nowhere. Mass-displacement and globalized ‘problems of organization’. *Ethnography* 3.3, 351–60.
- Rajaram, P. K. (2002) Humanitarianism and Representations of the Refugee. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 15.3, 247-64.
- Sanyal, R. (2014) *Urbanizing Refuge: Interrogating Spaces of Displacement*. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38.2, 558–72.
- Tornaghi, C. and Knierbein, S. (2015) *Public Space and Relational Perspectives*. *New Challenges for Architecture and Planning*. Routledge, London.
- UN General Assembly, *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*, 28 July 1951, United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 189
- UN General Assembly, *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, 10 December 1948, 217 A (III)
- United Nations Online (2016) *Human Rights. Human Rights Defenders: Protecting the Right to Defend Human Rights*. Fact Sheet No. 29 <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/FactSheet29en.pdf>
- Watson, S. (2006) *City publics. The (dis)enchantments of public encounters*. Routledge, London.
- Wilson, J. and Swyngedouw, E. (2015) *The post-political and its discontents. Spaces of depoliticization, spectres of radical politics*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.

Vienna Visiting Professor Dr. phil. Nikolai Roskamm

Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space, Faculty of Architecture & Planning, TU Wien

Actually, 'mixing' is an important issue in urban design and urban planning. This was not the case at any time. In contrary, the field of urban planning is constituted in late 19th Century with the opposite idea of separation. Until the 1960s, separation of functions was the main issue of almost all urban planning approaches. Urban functionalism – thinking the city in separated, segmented, and divided units – was the connecting element in efforts of designing urban plans and realties. Modern urban planning was in its first hundred years of existing an apparatus of anti-mixing policy. Only since the 1960s, the separation goal starts being contested. In the 1870s and 1980s, the dividing-idea turned into its contrary. Actually, the new urban planning paradigm is the Leitmotiv of mixing within all urban levels. The thesis of my talk today is that mixing and separation are inseparable interconnected. History of mixing is at the same time history of separation, if we talk about 'mixing' we are talking about 'separation', too. Our issue is always 'mixing/separation'.

Separation (1): zoning

Modern urban planning is a product of the second half of 19th century. It arises from the discourses about the social state and public health. In many fields, it becomes a common practice to produce urban pathologies: thinking the city as an organic body, as a body that is definitely ill. The main instrument of the emerging urban planning idea was planning law; the most important part of planning law was zoning the city. The first zoning plans arise in 1874 (Budapest), 1878 (Dresden), 1879 (Erfurt), 1884 (Altona), 1891 (Frankfurt/Main) and 1892 (Berlin). The Munich 'Staffelbauordnung' from 1904 is the most comprehensive zoning plan containing a complex typology of different building types. Zoning was not to separate functions or types of use but forms of building and densities. However, consequences of zoning practice in modern urban planning is not easy to catch. Modern planning produces at every time the urban reality with its regulations. It is hard

to say how urban realties had been without zoning plans. Zoning practices always solidify already existing separations and produce new ones. The separation of the city in different zones is the founding act of modern planning.

Mixing (1): moral education of the poor

The issue of social mixing is visible within the work of James Hobrecht, urban planner in 19th Century Berlin. Hobrecht was author of the first general Berlin building plan from 1862. The ideas of Hobrecht are well known because he published some writings besides his practical work. Hobrecht postulates social mixing because of ethical reasons: "Who is in denial, that poorer classes are going to lose many benefactions, which mixed housing is offering. Not closing but penetration seems to me required for moral and therefore state considerations" (1868, 513). The education of the poorer classes is at the bottom of the modern urban planning idea of social mixing. Since Hobrecht the aim has a paternal-istic and moralistic note which creates an ambiguity that is inherent within mixing policies until today (Harlander 2000, 110).

Separation (2): garden city

Probably the most popular urban planning concept of the city in modern times is the garden city. The garden city idea is to build a new city as a small and well-structured new town. The garden city was a counter-model according to the existing big and dirty cities. In many cases urban planners hated the existing cities. Theodor Fritsch, protagonist of the garden city in Germany, claimed, that "cities are paradises of debauchment and desolate piles of stones. [...] The people of the big cities and industrial cores are in heavy jeopardy, the inhabitants of the towns are critically endangered" (1912, 28). Fritsch suggests a restart with building a garden city in separated zones, leaving behind all the un-planned urban mess. Two years after Fritsch published his *Stadt der Zukunft* (city of the future), Ebenezer Howard published his *To-morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*

(1898), which is more commonly known by the title of its second edition, *Garden Cities of Tomorrow*, and takes pride of place in the literature on the garden city movement. Howard's garden city was a country settlement with a limited number of inhabitants and was supposed to combine proximity to nature with the advantages of urban life (Howard 1968 [1898]). The respective advantages of town and country were fused in Howard's notion of the "town-country". Its benefits would include social life, social solidarity and a wealth of cultural activities. Just as town and country were to be brought together, the various classes would also be reconciled in a life of tight-knit cohabitation. Howard envisaged the abolition of property and hoped to bring the middle classes around to his brand of 'landed socialism' by reasoned argument (de Bruyn 1996, 173). In Howard's model, all of the settlement's land was to be declared the collective property of the parish, which meant that any increase in the value of the land due to economic development could be chalked up as communal gain. The concept of the garden city very quickly became the "most popular planning model of the modern age" and was admired by people "from Liebknecht to Himmler" (de Bruyn 1996, 173; Durth/Gutschow 1988, 168). With the "ideology of the 'garden city'" the "demoralised town planning fraternity had laid an historic challenge at the feet of higher earners", imploring them to abandon "the apparently incurable urban ailments of proletarianism and industrialisation" and to relocate to "a place of one's own where land was cheap" (Rodriguez-Lores 1991, 75). According to another prominent critic, "the garden city movement's recipe for the salvation of mankind" was "city-demolition" (Jane Jacobs cited in Bergmann 1970, 163). An alternative view sees the garden city idea as having emerged from the amalgamation of "bourgeois-romantic and socialist ideas" and as a "liaison that was as naive as it was pragmatic-sounding", while yet another commentator saw it as being synonymous with "progressive efforts to improve the living conditions of the lower-middle classes by way of town planning" (de Bruyn 1996, 171; Schubert 2004, 92).

Separation (3): functionalism

The terms of the town planning debate changed and broadened after the First World War. The prevalent mood during the Weimar Republic was a "complex amalgam of expressionist effusions, socialist utopian elements, anti-Wilhelminism and criticism of the metropolis; a critique that called for a

new city, new housing and a new man. But the general "animosity toward the monstrous late nineteenth-century metropolis" remained intact (Harlander 2006, 26). As the first welfare state on German soil, the Weimar Republic created the first systematic housing policy in Germany; finding an answer to the 'housing question' was declared the most pressing social policy issue at every level of government. The right to sanitary housing was enshrined in the constitution and provided a basis for far-reaching state interventions. The introduction of rent taxation laid the financial groundwork for state-sponsored city planning (Häußermann et al. 2008, 55; Durth/Gutschow 1988, 175; Peltz-Dreckmann 1978, 59). The garden city model was mainly applied to the construction of workers' estates in municipalities with social-democratic councils, though the original socio-economic policies were not implemented. Besides proximity to nature and low-cost housing, though, there was little of Howard's original concept in the proletarian and lower-middle-class estates that were in fact erected by the housing cooperatives. They were only called 'garden cities' on account of the beautiful landscapes in which they were built. The projects that were actually realised had little to do with Howard's economic model (Harlander 2006, 26). On the conceptual level, the historicising style of the Heimatschutz movement and the conservative proponents of the garden city movement elicited a reaction that coalesced into the Neues Bauen (New Architecture). The aim of these first architectural modernists (whom we now associated with the Deutsche Werkbund and the Bauhaus) was to develop entirely new forms of architecture and urbanism based on the available building materials and techniques.

One of the most important early representatives of modern urbanism was the Swiss architect Le Corbusier (1887–1965). Le Corbusier regarded the industrial, mass-produced dwelling as a "revolution in architecture" and as the outstanding achievement of "modern architecture" (Le Corbusier 2008). He distanced himself from the legislative, technocratic conceptions of town planning as well as from the romanticising notions of Camillo Sitte. For Le Corbusier, "social equilibrium" no longer depended on a solution to the 'housing question'; it was a "question of building" (ibid., 290). He set out to design the city according to the principles of industrial rationalisation, optimal sunlight, illumination and ventilation. His theories made urbanism the defining purpose of

human society. "Human tools," he wrote, "were always in the hand of man" – "we must teach the human beast to use his tools" (ibid., 293). Le Corbusier supplemented progress in constructive and material technology with an organisational, planning approach that divided "human functions" into living, working, leisure and transit (and applied the segregation of these functions to urbanism). Le Corbusier implemented the functional separation into the heart of the idea of the city.

The Athens Charter was the concluding document of the fourth Congrès internationaux d'architecture moderne which, having originally been planned for Moscow (the Russians ultimately declined to host the congress), was held on a ship from Marseilles to Athens and back (Giedion 1967, 698). After substantial revisions by Le Corbusier, the Athens Charter (or Charte d'Athènes) was published in 1943. The first complete German translation appeared in 1962. It became known mainly for the concept of the functional city. The reaction to and the consequences of the Athens Charter centred on an approach that Le Corbusier had been advocating for some time: the division of the city (into the four functions of living, working, recreation and circulation) and, derived from this division, a conception of city planning according to which its core task was to locate these functions in separate areas of the city. Less prominent in the present-day discourse on urbanism are the "three iron-clad necessities" of this functional division, namely the elements of "space, sun and air", which were taken from the classical debate on town planning (Le Corbusier 1962 [1943], 122).

The starting point for CIAM IV was a comparison of cities drawing on data from thirty-three metropolitan centres; here density was a central category for the analysis of the "present state of our cities" (ibid., 73). The results of the survey were clear: the big cities were characterised by "chaos and a lack of order" (ibid., 115). The analytical part of the Charter noted that population density in the cities (the excessively high ratio "between the headcount of the population and the area it occupies") was a fundamental problem. At a certain level population density would lead to "a permanent state of dis-ease and discontent"; such high population densities were a "fact of life in the poorer districts" (ibid., 73). Thus the Charter summarised the basic consensus among city planners for the first time. In addition, though, the various

national delegations had been asked in advance whether and how the population densities of their residential districts could be fixed, how many square metres of habitable area per person they regarded as the minimum and what further suggestions could be put forward to stem the "overpopulation of residential districts" (cited in Steinmann 1979, 140). The correct "ratio of building mass to vacant space" was the "one and only" formula that could solve the housing problem (ibid., 90). At the same time, the population density of a city needed to be high enough to make the "establishment of collective institutions" worthwhile. Once the population density had been decided upon the anticipated population was to be determined to allow for a "calculation" of the area to be set aside for the city. Decisions about how the land was to be developed and the ratio of developed land to vacant or landscaped areas were all part of the "weighty operation" that lay in the hands of the authorities and its "publication of 'site ordinance'". Population density or the percentage of built to unbuilt land (according to function, location and climate) were not to be varied otherwise (ibid., 92). Within the bounds of the laws established by such ordinance the "special initiative" and the "inventiveness of the artist" were to be given "totally free rein" (ibid., 88).

Le Corbusier's analysis revolved around the classic equation of (excessively) high population density with social and sanitary privation, and the denunciation of the metropolis is still present in the Charter in its pure form. Le Corbusier subscribed to the old model of city planning, which sought to change and shape social conditions through town-planning measures. This way of thinking had a "dominant influence" on the "conceptual thinking of the modernists" (Hilpert 1984, 32; Durth/Gutschow 1988, 202). One novel quality here is the strong focus on the demand for a fixed population density. According to the strategy explicitly formulated in the Charter (which was quite conscious of the significance of this demand), city planning was to 'fix' inhabitant density, that is, adjust the size of the population to the urban structures created by its own designs. That this sort of fixing contained a totalitarian impulse and that the legal stipulation of a certain population density went against the individual's right to self-determination was not something Le Corbusier addressed; the sublime realms of city planning were far above such considerations.

Mixing (2) The big turn

The urban planning debate in the late 1950s orbited the positions of Howard and Le Corbusier, both concepts with explicit separation policies. In 1961 Jacobs contended all this in her book *The death and life of great American cities* to the absolute contrary and advocated mixing and high density. "Also, to be frank, I like dense cities best and care about them most" (1961, p.22). Not only did she liked dense and mixed cities, she also disliked urban planning and opposed it with a fundamental attack, "As in the pseudoscience of bloodletting, just so in the pseudoscience of city rebuilding and planning, years of learning and a plethora of subtle and complicated dogma have arisen on a foundation of nonsense. [...] The pseudoscience of city planning and its companion, the art of city design, have not yet broken with the specious comfort of wishes, familiar superstitions, oversimplifications, and symbols – and have not yet embarked upon the adventure of probing the real world" (1961, pp.18-19).

On the other hand, Jacobs outlines a counter draft of the orthodox urban design position and creates with her own urban planning concept four conditions for producing lively cities: Firstly, districts must serve more than one primary function to ensure the presence of people using the same common facilities at different times; secondly, blocks should be short, to increase path options between points of departure and destinations; thirdly, buildings should be at varying ages, accommodating different people and businesses which can afford different levels of rents, and fourthly, there should be a dense concentration of people to promote visible city life. Jacobs stresses that all of these four conditions are necessary to generate diversity.

However, Jacobs reverses her opinion about separation and density in urban planning and reclaims mixed use and high building density as positive urban planning achievements. In Jacobs's opinion, mixing was requirement for a vibrant city, and she demands them to be adopted as an urban planning tool. This was a completely new position since no one before her had proclaimed mixing an urban planning goal. Jacobs was aware that her attitude was a tangible provocation and that arguing against the foundation of a discipline was running into danger of evoking hostile reactions. In Jacobs's thinking, a dense concentration of people was one of the necessary conditions for a flourishing and diverse city. Density and mixing could be considered as a positive

good, because it would be the "source of immense vitality, and because they do represent, in small geographic compass, a great and exuberant richness of differences and possibilities, many of these differences unique and unpredictable and all the more valuable because they are."

Furthermore, Jacobs draws on urban sociology. Even though Jacobs does not refer to Louis Wirth directly, it is obvious that her four conditions for city diversity are closely connected to the three conditions which Louis Wirth (1938) uses to define cities in his famous essay *Urbanism as a Way of Life: Size, Heterogeneity and Density*. In his evaluation, Wirth was a long way from the urban planning mainstream. His argument was that the three elements were a requirement and the basis for a more tolerant mindset and behavior of the inhabitants of cities. Indeed, Wirth's theory was not acknowledged in the urbanism debate until many years after its publication. Jane Jacobs did not go into detail as regards the history of urban sociology. However, her excursions into the fields of economics and sociology have opened the door for a different view on the orthodox role of mixing in urban planning. In general, Jacobs's point was not totally new, but the introduction of other perspectives to urban planning was new.

After Jacobs the value of mixing and high density in urban planning changed completely. Jane Jacobs's theory stands at the beginning of an impressive turn in the urban planning debate. However, this turn did not take place overnight. The official policy for urban renewal projects emerged in the 1960s: in official memos urban areas were classified as slums, which were to be demolished if they had a certain density. The orthodox urban planning strategy was based exactly on this outdated negative opinion. Especially in connection with slum clearance policies, the traditional interpretation was widespread and unimpaired: The goal for urban renewal was to demolish high density areas in old working class neighborhoods and to build new separated cities for modern people.

Hence, the turn did not take place as a result of a change in policy by senior urban planners but because of the postulations of the local pressure groups opposing orthodox practices of urban renewal. In the 1960s and 1970s urban planners faced residents of high density and mixed areas who began to react against slum clearance programs and to fight

for the preservation of their homes. In that sense, the turn was not the beginning but the result, less the outcome of the theoretical debate within the discipline and more of local resistance against urban planning practices.

Nevertheless, the turn was accompanied by theoretical debate, for which Jane Jacobs's book is the best example. The rejection of the existing dense city (particularly rooted in the German debate) became the subject of urban planning discussion. Jacobs's pamphlet was followed by books like *Die moderne Großstadt*, in which the author Hans-Paul Bahrtdt (1961) indicated the anti-urban approach of urban planning and urban design. Urban sociology was a controversially discussed topic in urban planning discourse and contributed a new interpretation of the existing city. The anti-urban position needed to be overcome before the urban planning debate could begin to consider the tolerance concept of urban sociology. After that paradigm shift it became possible to swap the position "mixing is mess" with the position "mixing is urbanity."

Conclusion: Breaks/Continuities

However, at the same time the orthodox position became reinforced. In Germany the first standard regulation for the separated city was issued (in the Federal Land Utilization Ordinance) only one year after Jacobs's book was published. The regulations were based on the traditional separation approach. In the late 1960s and 1970s it was controversially debated (Boeddinghaus, 1969; Borchard, 1970), but the roles of separating the city have remained unchanged. German planning law has had unchanged upper limits for 50 years, which are hardly ever challenged today. Therefore, the turn has taken place only in theoretical debate, the urban planning programs and guidelines, whilst the urban planning regulations still follow the orthodox position. And it is remarkable that nobody today talks about such obvious inconsistencies (Boeddinghaus, 2002).

However, the turn and Jane Jacobs's altercation may contribute to finding an answer to the question "how much paradigm did shift." The turn in urban planning is one element of that shift. Jane Jacobs claimed that defending the mixed city in the early 1960s was regarded as lower than taking sides with a man-eating shark. 20 years later urban planning policies favored mixing policies. So, on the one hand, there was a turn; mixing was attributed a new value. On the other hand, looking at it from a different

standpoint, there was no turn; what has not changed is the major role the concept of mix-ing/separation plays in urban planning and urban design itself. Mixing/separation has remained a key category for analysis and regulation; the discipline has maintained its 19th-century based foundation.

In conclusion I would say that to reflect on the understanding of the mixing/separation concept in urban planning and the substance of the urban planning turn in the 1960s is not as easy as it may at first seem. Indeed, mixing/separation was completely revalued in the urban planning debate after Jacobs. Even so, it remained at the center of urban discourse. What has not changed in the urbanism debate is the approach to building regulations as an instrument to govern and organize the urban environment. Mixing/separation still is a major planning concept (although with changed signs), it continues to be the foundation of urban planning and in the urban discourse.

Bibliography

- Bahrtdt, Hans.Paul (1961): *Die moderne Großstadt*. Reinbek: Rowohlt.
- Bergmann, Klaus (1970): *Agrarromantik und Großstadtfeindschaft*. Meisenheim am Glan.
- Boeddinghaus, Gerhard (2002): Zur nicht erfolgten Novellierung der BauNVO. In: *Baurecht*, 9, pp.1325-1342.
- Boeddinghaus, Gerhard (1969): *Die Bestimmung des Maßes der baulichen Nutzung in der städtebaulichen Planung*. Aachen: Dissertation.
- Borchard, Klaus (1970): *Städtebauliche Orientierungswerte*. In: *Akademie für Raumforschung und Landesplanung*, ed. *Handwörterbuch der Raumforschung und Raumordnung*. Hannover, pp.3181-3202.
- de Bruyn, Gerd (1996): *Die Diktatur der Philanthropen. Entwicklung der Stadtplanung aus dem utopischen Denken*. Braunschweig.
- Durth, Werner und Gutschow, Niels (1988): *Träume in Trümmern*. Braunschweig.
- Fritsch, Theodor (1912) [1896]: *Die Stadt der Zukunft*. Leipzig.
- Giedion, Sigfried (1967): *Space, Time, and Architecture*, 5th edn, London: Oxford University Press.
- Harlander, Tilman (2006): *Zentralität und Dezentralisierung*. In: C. Zimmermann (Hg.): *Zentralität und Raumgefüge der Großstädte im 20. Jahrhundert*. Stuttgart, S. 23-40.
- Harlander, Tilman (2000): *Leitbild Soziale Mischung – vom „empfehlenswerten Durcheinanderwohnen“ zu „gated communities“*. In: *Die alte Stadt*, 2/2000, S. 97-113.
- Hilpert, Thilo (Hg.) (1984): *Le Corbusiers »Charta von Athen«*. Vieweg, Braunschweig
- Hobrecht, James (1868). ORIGINAL...
- Howard, Ebenezer (1968) [1897]: *Gartenstädte von morgen*. Berlin.
- Jacobs, Jane (1961): *The death and life of great American cities*. New York: Random House.
- Le Corbusier (2008), *Toward an Architecture*, translated by John Goodman, London: Frances Lincoln
- Le Corbusier (1962) [1942, 1933]: *An die Studenten. Die »Charte d'Athènes«*. Rowohlt. Reinbek
- Rodriguez-Lores, Juan (1991): *Stadthygiene und Städtebau*. In: J. Reulecke, & A. Castell Rüdtenhausen (Hg.): *Stadt und Gesundheit*. Stuttgart, S. 63-75.
- Schubert, Dirk (2004): *Die Gartenstadtidee zwischen reaktionärer Idee und pragmatischer Umsetzung*. IRPUD, Dortmund.
- Steinmann, Martin (Hg.) (1979): *CIAM. Dokumente 1928-1939*. Birkhäuser. Basel
- Wirth, Louis (1938): *Urbanism as a Way of Life*. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 44 (1), pp.1-24.

PRACTICE, METHODS, TOOLS: RESEARCHING SPACES SHAPED BY MIGRATION

Univ.Lector Dipl.-Ing. Dr.techn. Amila Širbegović
Institute of Art and Design, Faculty of Architecture & Planning, TU Wien

As part of teaching team in winter semester 2015/16 on SKUOR for the master project "Displaced: Refugees and the City" I gave an input on methodology for researching city parts shaped by migration for students of architecture and spatial planning. The content came out of my research, planning and activists practice(s). The aim was to inspire students on experimenting in their own practice. If usual planner tools don't bring us further it is necessary to rethink them and try out unconventional methods or methods coming out of other disciplines. We are dealing with spaces which are contradictory but connected, where borders exist but which are in any case permeable, and in order to comprehend these complex spaces we need to rethink our approaches to these spaces in order to first of all understand the processes and secondly to act (plan, change, redesign) in these spaces.

In the autumn of 2015, after the "summer of migration", the subject of migration and city, late but still, found place in the architectural discourse. The claim to the politicians to act and enable possibilities and homes for the people fleeing and seeking a safer life became stronger, but there is also the request to the planners to support and develop new ideas of affordable living for all, the request to act out of their profession. It is reasonable that some planners are confused and overwhelmed with this agenda, when they everyday practice consists of commissioned work. Fortunately there are also groups of planners, who have been dealing with the issues of migration and space before. In the past they have been in minority and on the edge of the planner discourse, but after this summer they come more to the fore. As planners we create the environment of other people, we build and sell dreams, but we are not the only actors in shaping and reshaping the built and social spaces. That is the first lesson future planners need to learn. In order to be able to plan secondly we have

to understand the complicities of the spaces shaped by migration. In order not to do the same mistakes regarding migration research like other disciplines already did, by applying methods from above, we need to rethink our planning practice and on the one side to step away from thinking out of commissioned work and on the other side to start working more inter- and transdisciplinary. We need knowledge and expertise from other disciplines and people involved into spaces of migration. We don't have to do everything from the sketch, but we need to collaborate with the others in order to be able to develop the "planners approach" to migration processes.

The recommended step of understanding the spaces is presented here in form of two projects, one out of my research practice connected to my PhD "Inhabiting as/for migrants" and the other one out of a collaborative project "Monte Laa Our stories". Reaching into and trying out ethnographic methods coming out of anthropology doesn't make us less planners, it helps us understand the spaces that we are about to reshape. And yes, it is very modest, but its understanding is to be seen as the first step of understanding the post-migration city, with all its complicities and juxtapositions, so that in the future the development of more radical approaches becomes possible.



Migrating Interviews, Ottakringerstraße. Video still
(© Amila Širbegović)

The Interdisciplinarity as Method

"Our ways of seeing, and framing questions, are strongly influenced by the methods we have at our disposal, because the way we see shapes what we can see, and what we think we can ask." (Mason, 2006:13)

Dealing with social spaces impacted by migrational practice with the goal of understanding them (and be able to reshape them) is not dealing with any social spaces but mostly dealing with spaces which are very often characterised and perceived as marginalised, discriminated and disadvantaged. Erol Yildiz and Birgit Mattausch, sociologists and researchers of migration, post-migrational identities and the city, fifteen years ago made a demand in their book "Urban Recycling. Migration als Großstadt-Ressource" (2000) towards planners and urban planning actors to break with the existing racist interpretation patterns and to acknowledge and to appreciate the substantial contribution of migrants for the development and modernisation of marginalised city parts (Yildiz, 2008). The breaking with the existing racist interpretations happened partially among other disciplines, which can't be assigned to specific disciplines but mostly to interdisciplinary collectives dealing with critical migration research. What happened in last decades regarding migration research in European context? In the past the research of migration concentrated on migrants as disadvantaged and marginalised individuals as part of different ethnic groups. After that the focus was out on individual resources of entrepreneurs, in the 1990s a further development of migration research took place, where the change of perspective occurred, by linking the individual with the structural circumstances. Finally a broadening took place by adding the transitional perspective, which enabled the research of migration inside their resources and networks. This is where we should tie up as planners, whereas it is possible to research and also act in spaces shaped by migration, planning for but also together with people who have migrational experience, by regarding them as active actors of our society. The focus of my research was not only laid on transnationality in the practice but particularly on the local anchorages and the adjustment of national state to the state of globalisation (Ong, 2005).

Shift the City

The "Shift" in Shift the City is supposed to refer to the change of research of migration in an urban context from victimising and/or criminalising migrants to the post-



migrational discourse by self active and self empowered members, with or without migration experience, but connections to the researched city parts, of our urban society. This temporary lab of non/permanent space is an interactive web portal, a research project dealing with the relations between migration and city change and their visible manifestations in public space. It also deals with diverse approaches of actors in public space including the researchers and activist towards these spaces. Established in 2011 it was an experiment of the ongoing documentary of my PhD work and it grew into a virtual place where the work of different people (researchers, artists, activists), using various inter- and transdisciplinary methods in their practice, was made visible. The method of walking interviews, developed during the work is just one small piece of an open and ongoing process of the diverse methods collected and presented there. I see this portal, which arose out of my research practice, as a tool to be used by other researchers, planners and other actors in urban spaces such as politicians and city policies makers for future dealing with migration.

The developed interviews were based on strollology (Burckhardt, 2006) and narrative urbanism (Krasny, 2008), with the two different purposes: first as a research tool to gain information on city parts shaped by migration and secondly as a spatial intervention. Thus a research practice became transdisciplinary practice, where information was given by actors, and simultaneously the spatial intervention gave it partly back to the city space. The web portal is a try to transgress the knowledge gained by the research into the planning practice. Felicitas Hillmann (2011) has been dealing with the interrelations of networks of migrants, migration economies and the city parts, and she claims, that there is a gap of translation in matters of reciprocal action or interplay of migration and change of particular city parts. There is not only the gap in this matter but also regarding the transgression of research

practice into the planning. For those, who are formally reshaping the city, such as architects and spatial planners, there is a lack of information on social spaces, informal practice and correlation to the built space. Walking interviews, when provided by future planners, can work as elements against the detached and estranged planning practice out of architecture and planning offices (Krasny 2008). They attempt to provide a visibility to the different dimensions of social coherence and its influence in change of city parts. I made an attempt of bundling of these various issues, with a review on its advantages and disadvantages and of developing a critical approach to the role and the situation of the formal city planners.

Monte Laa – Our Stories

The idea of using oral history as a tool in research practice in order to find out if it can be used as a strengthening tool for building communities was developed by Daniele Karasz, an anthropologist and migration researcher. Daniele and me already worked on several projects together, we were also part of an interdisciplinary group “Was wohnt du”, initiated in 2009 through a project in Brunnenviertel (Vienna) by WochenKlausur (“the artists group WochenKlausur develops concrete proposals aimed at small, but nevertheless effective improvements to socio-political deficiencies.”). We were a group of people coming out from different disciplines and the common interest was the habitation. We dealt with the issues of prejudices toward the habitation of the “others”, independently the migration experience. With our first Monte Laa project, that we initiated as “Was wohnt

du” group we decided to deal with our own prejudices as planners and city researchers. We all had the formed (planner) opinion that living in Monte Laa, above the highway, on the edge of the city, without proper public connection can’t be working well, neither for the city nor for the inhabitants of this city part. With our intervention by opening a community space that was closed for the inhabitants there and the implementation of our project with various contents, we stepped into a social relation with the inhabitants. One of the conclusion of the project was that there is a strong community there and that the most of inhabitants are very happy to be able to live in that housing scheme. The detachment was there potential where the community binds became stronger. Half a year later, when Daniele asked me to join him on the new project in Monte Laa I was very much looking forward to researching this ambivalent spaces, already stigmatised and banned by the planners community. The project Monte Laa – Our Stories (Kárász, 2012) was commissioned by MA50 – Housing Research Vienna, and we were a team of three people, an anthropologist and two architects working together.

We know that approximately the half of the inhabitants and tenants living in Monte Laa settlement had migration experience. Nevertheless we decided to take a post migrational approach and research the living space of this people and their inhabiting history regardless their ethnic origin. At the same time we did decide to use our own multilingual competencies, so that we performed interviews in German, English and



Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian language. To break the unnatural situation of the interviews we used a personal object as entering task and a communicational tool, a very common anthropological tool, and we talked with the interviewees about their inhabiting history, where they used to live, in what kind of apartments, in which cities and city parts, why they moved to Monte Laa and what they appreciate there and what not. Their shared stories became part of an exhibition that was organised in the settlement at the end of the project and where all the inhabitants were invited. By mapping the places where people used to live, we gave visibility to the inhabitants and their personal history of inhabiting and thus privileged their knowledge. We produced a visualisation of this transnational space, without falling into the trap of ethnic research. Furthermore by implementing the exhibition in the settlement we also gave the conclusions of our research back to the community. Part of the exhibition was a spatial intervention on the balconies of the apartments, where we hang out quotations out of interviews on a tarp. Some of these were hanging there for years. The research had a direct impact on the communication and intervening of the inhabitants of Monte Laa.

These are two examples of applied methods in order to approach these specific spaces in the context of post-migration and simultaneously a try to transgress the gained knowledge into the planning practice but also make the everyday practices and the research practice visible to the others. When dealing with often stigmatised and discriminated spaces in the city, transdisciplinarity has the potential of bringing new possibilities for planners and also the possibility to develop their own position toward the subject of migration and the city. Mobility of people shaped cities and urban practices, without migration urban spaces all around the world wouldn't exist, and yet the planners are those who formally also create and reshape these spaces. The "summer of migration" was just the beginning and latest after this we need to rethink the position of our profession, our tools and approaches with the attempt to fill the lack of knowledge about affects of transnational and transcultural practices in city developing and city planning. The decision of dealing with spaces shaped by migration is also a decision if we as planners want to be part of the dialogue on migration and in the future do the best that we know: design spaces for the people.

Bibliography

- Burckhardt, L. and Ritter, M. (ed) (2006) *Warum ist die Landschaft schön? Die Spaziergangswissenschaft*. Martin Schmitz Verlag, Berlin.
- Hilman, F. (2011) *Marginale Urbanität - Migrantisches Unternehmertum und Stadtentwicklung*. Transcript Verlag, Bielefeld.
- Kárász, D. (2012) *Our Stories - Unsere Geschichte(n) - Oral History als identitätsstiftendes und gemeinschaftsförderndes Element im Wohnbau - ein Pilotprojekt in Monte Laa*. search and shape edition, Vienna.
- Krasny, E. (2008) "Narrativer Urbanismus oder die Kunst des City-Telling" In: Krasny, E. and Nierhaus, I. (Hg.) *Urbanografien*. Dietrich Reimer Verlag, Berlin, p.29-41.
- Mason, J. (2006) "Mixing Methods in a Qualitatively Driven Way". In: *Qualitative Research 2006* 6, p. 09-25, www.sagepub.com/rose/Docs/Mason.pdf accessed on 31. Aug 2015.
- Ong, A. (2005) *Flexible Staatsbürgerschaften. Die kulturelle Logik von Transnationalität*. Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main. Wochenklausur. <http://www.wochenklausur.at/index1.php?lang=en> accessed on 13 December 2015.
- Yildiz, E. and Mattausch, B. (eds.) (2008) *Urban Recycling. Migration als Großstadt-Ressource*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel-Boston-Berlin.

REFUGEES AND THE CITY - DISPLACING THE STATE OF EXCEPTION

Univ.Ass. Elina Kränzle MSc
Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space, Faculty of Architecture & Planning, TU Wien

1. Discourse: A protracted crisis

In the public discourse on the refugee crisis international and national politics have focused on how to distribute, administer, manage the situation of the immigration of thousands of refugees. While some Balkan states have pursued a strategy of re-fencing their borders to keep those unwanted out of their territory, on the international level there are negotiations on how to create refugee camps in the regions closer to the conflicts to not even have to encounter “trouble” at the border. All these reactions of the European states are carried out as emergency actions, emergency defined as a critical situation that needs immediate action; in this case to give shelter to the arriving refugees. But emergencies are also defined by their unexpectedness and exceptionality, which does not account for the current situation. Europe’s states’ surprised stance is marked by hypocrisy in a context where refugeeism and migration as consequences of war, exploitation and hunger are no longer characterized by temporality but by permanence.

Temporary refugee crises have ceased to exist, instead so-called “protracted” crises have produced people without citizenship rights, many of them living in “camps villes”, in many ways normalized refugee camps, for five years and more (Kostenwein 2014). From the astonishing number of 60 Mio displaced

people world-wide, 14 Mio live in a situation of what the UN terms a “protracted crisis”, which means people being displaced for more than five, ten, or Palestinian years. The Dadaab refugee camp in Kenya, which was set up in 1991 for 90,000 Somali refugees from the civil war, today is “home” to 400,000 people. The reality of global refugeeism as experienced in the refugee camps in the regions of crisis cannot be disconnected from to the migration to central Europe. Despite the protraction of global crises refugees are still taken care of in camps, in border zones, from the international to the local scale, all based on this “fictive temporariness”. Those who have made their way to Europe, having crossed x number of borders, living in a status of asylum seekers, encounter new borders and are housed in what could be termed urban fractures. Empty office buildings, tents next to train stations, or factory buildings in industrial areas are transformed into emergency shelters, into camps for a temporary stay. Looking at examples of refugee housing in Germany I want to discuss the handling of the on-going migration crisis and trace the paradox between the constancy of the issue and the temporality of the states’ answers. Based on accepting refugeeism and migration not as temporary issues, which alternative approaches can we think of in handling the issue, and what are the prospects of the urban scale in this global issue?

“This is the ultimate contradiction of camp life: how to locate hope for the future in a desperate situation that appears permanent. People are trying. Life in Dadaab and all the other camps is a daily exercise in manufacturing hope. But for many, the fiction of temporariness no longer holds. And we are seeing the results of that realization washing up on Europe’s beaches.”

(Rawlence, 10.10.2015)

2. Defence and distribution: International and national crisis-mitigation

In October 2015 the Austrian Minister of the Interior Mikl-Leitner bluntly called for the “Fortress Europe”. When Europe’s immigration policies and handling of refugees have already been criticised for many years for reinforcing this fortress, the conservative politician referred to the taboo term as a solution to the so-called refugee crisis. Which action patterns can we detect in the handling of the right to asylum that is now asked for by so many fleeing war and violence? How is the emergency situation of the people, and not the states, considered in asylum politics?



A former agricultural building transformed into housing: Permanent refugee shelter in Thuringia (© Elina Kränzle)

In Germany and the EU Asylum politics have been a marginal topic, marginal in terms of its geography as well as in its position in the public discourse. The question of how to practically implement the right to asylum is a matter of dispute between the EU member states, as “asylum procedures in the EU are about geographically defined legal responsibility, not about reasons of refuge” (Beyer 2005,1). What they fight about are responsibilities at the European borders, capacities of refugee shelters and how to speed up the asylum procedure. Since the introduction of the Dublin II procedure the central European states have achieved to displace the issue to the EU’s margins for many years. The fortification of the borders as well as the introduction of the EU border patrol FRONTEX were the main instruments of a “homeland security” to control immigration to the EU. Until now safe third states were a national means to speed up asylum processes but recently the EU Commission proposed a list of these safe third states, including the Balkan states as well as Turkey, for all its member states (Rath, 14.09.2015). Now at the centre of the discourse, after more and more refugees have reached the central European states, most governments still think the right to asylum is dealt with best at the borders. In November 2015 the EU made a -

Kenan Malik called it “stinking” - refugee deal with Turkey, granting the state more than 3 Bio Euros to improve surveillance and patrol at its borders to block the route to Europe for Syrian refugees, as well as to keep refugees in camps in the region and for taking back “irregular migrants” (Malik, 27.11.2015). A reaction between “pragmatism and panic” (Krupa, 30.11.2015) involving Turkey with the promise of easier Visa-procedures as well as taking on the negotiations on the states’ accession to the EU with more enthusiasm.

In Germany, the example of the distribution of refugees to different federal states and their housing in camps highlight the technocratic ways of politics dealing with the right to asylum on the national level. For a “fair” distribution of the refugees in the state, the system “EASY” was established, which regulates the registration and distribution of refugees to the different federal states according to the size of the population as well as tax income. But as the registration and distribution takes some weeks, the system is not fit to offer shelter short-term and therefore some states such as Bavaria had to set up temporary camps. But despite the quota for the distribution among the federal states, a lack of spaces for refugee shelter on the local level lead to the concentration of refugees in cities and their temporary housing in school gymnasiums and other buildings which offer a high capacity but lack other important qualities. Political action is not oriented to improve the miserable situation of refugees, but oriented to procedures and jurisdiction to distribute the “refugee burden” economically and efficiently.

3. Framework and Form: The institutional structuring of the right to asylum in Thuringia, Germany

The Greek origins of the word „asylum“ mean as much as home, shelter or refuge. But what is the reality of asylum today? How are refugees’ living conditions formed by the spatial conditions of their shelter? With the example of the institutional management of the right to asylum in Thuringia, Germany, I want to share a differentiated description of the „subculture refugee shelter“, which is almost always located at the edge of the city.

The first article of the Decree “ThürGUSVO”, which describes how the right to asylum is to be realized in in the state of Thuringia, states that collective accommodations for refugees need to be in spatial proximity to central institutions of primary care, such as medical care or schools, to foster participation in social

life. The spatial analysis of refugee shelters' locations revealed that many of them are far from fulfilling the requirements, as the decree is only described in abstract terms. Furthermore, good access to public transportation is crucial for refugees with limited purchasing power to reach the institutions important for their daily life as well as for their asylum procedure. The German asylum procedure law states, that asylum seekers are not allowed to leave the jurisdiction of the foreigner's department that they are assigned to, meaning that refugees' place of residence is limited by the borders of a county. The so-called "residence obligation" is a law that was abolished by many federal states to allow refugees more mobility, in some cases even across borders of federal states. In Thuringia though the residence obligation is still valid. But there are agreements between different counties, which enlarge the territory where refugees can legally stay. These concessions led to a confusing map of lateral county agreements. Many of the restrictions that refugees are faced with in their daily lives are caused by national law. But some of them are an effect of the federal state jurisdiction, such as the residence obligation and the location of refugee shelters. The analysis of Thuringia's interpretation of the asylum law lead to the conclusion that the state pursues a very restrictive policy towards refugees.

Zooming in on the actual sites of refugee housing I analysed three examples: Breitenworbis, Saalfeld and Weimar, which led to a differentiated picture of camp realities in Thuringia. In a first evaluation of the housing conditions, Breitenworbis, a privately run refugee shelter, is an example of a refugee shelter characterized by heteronomy, isolation and passivity of its inhabitants. On the other hand the way the refugee shelters in Saalfeld and Weimar are run (by publicly employed social workers) showed how community and co-creation as part of refugees' daily lives bring about a positive living experience in a refugee shelter. Apart from the conditions inside the refugee shelter though, the location is one of the most important factors influencing refugees' experience of living in such a camp. In Thuringia it is still uncommon for refugee shelters to be integrated into a residential zone. Rather they are spatially displaced, in industrial or commercial areas where no one else is living. Even if a refugee shelter is part of a residential zone, it is still located at its borders. This spatial displacement of refugee housing is a materialization of refugees' status in German society: Refugees are living in a state of exception, sometimes for many

years depending on the length of their asylum procedure, characterized by harsh legal restrictions. These legal constraints as well as spatial displacement have always been justified with the temporality of the accommodation and neglect the reality of the protraction of asylum procedures.



One room for one family: Permanent refugee shelter in Thuringia (© Elina Kränzle)

4. Perspectives: Urban societies' capacity of inclusion

"Cities become both a vortex of social decline, as well as possible contact points for social and political regeneration. On the one hand, cities are large enough to reflect the complexities of the world, while on the other hand, they are small enough to develop new and adapted forms of democratic control and discover new local forms of the global aspect." (Corijn 2005, 88)

Confronted with not just the numbers of the refugee influx but with thousands of actual bodies arriving, cities have adopted a hands-on manner to provide shelter and food. Even more so emerged an incredibly engaged civil society in the daily support of refugees, from taking care of basic needs and health, to the reunification of families, which were separated during the escape. But beside these emergency actions, cities also have to realize their capacity to enable immigration and inclusion into an already diverse urban society and provide refugees with affordable housing as crucial aspect of their citizen's rights in the long run. The spatial and qualitative analysis of refugee housing in Germany revealed both the spatial and the structural displacement of refugees outside society based on the premise of temporariness. To develop a long-term perspective for the inclusion of refugees and migrants "we have to go beyond a positivistic understanding of the issue and move towards a deeper conceptualisation of refugee status and housing to improve living conditions beyond the basic needs" (Brun 2001, 17).

Urban societies' capacity of inclusion is based on a new conception of culture and questions an essentialist notion of place. This notion is based on the idea that nations represent homogeneous cultures where newcomers, like refugees, are out of place (Brun 2001, 17). The idea of the nation state and a national culture has to be included in a discussion of refugee housing, which was underscored by the racist views I was confronted with in my interviews. As Stuart Hall points out, the modern character of nation states is not just a defined territory or political entity but producing meaning as a "system of cultural representation", in which "people are not only legal citizens of a nation; they participate in the idea of the nation as represented in its national culture" (Hall 1992, 292). This discourse of national culture has always been imagined in relation and more so as opposed to an other. In recent years, with movements like Pegida or the political party "AfD - Alternative für Deutschland" in Germany cultural definitions of race have found their way into discourses about nationality and have unveiled that big parts of society reject immigration:

"We increasingly face a racism which avoids being recognized as such because it is able to line up 'race' with nationhood, patriotism and nationalism. (...) It constructs and defends an image of national culture - homogeneous in its whiteness yet precarious and perpetually vulnerable to attack from enemies within and without. (...) This is a racism that answers the social and political turbulence of crisis and crisis management by the recovery of national greatness in the imagination." (Gilroy cited in Hall 1992, 292)

In contrast, it is significant how politicians have expressed their national identity in reaction to the friendly reception of refugees by volunteers as well as the political decision by the German chancellor Merkel to receive more Syrian refugees: "If we now have to start apologizing for showing a friendly face in

response to emergency situations, then that's not my country", Merkel expressed in reaction to critique of her politics (Nelles, 16.09.2015). The Austrian federal president Heinz Fischer stated "I'm proud to be Austrian" at a Refugees Welcome concert in Vienna. When we look at a national culture as a discourse, "a way of constructing meanings which influences and organizes both our actions and our conceptions of ourselves" (Hall 1992, 292), the politicians' statements could be read as a clever strategy to influence the discourse of the national culture integrating the aspect of hospitality. Nevertheless it is critical to use national designations in a context of global migration and diversified societies. The concept of nation states excludes all those displaced, who have lost their country of origin but are not granted a part in their new destination, producing a new type of homeless population. The ways in which refugees are being managed today, in camps, are identified by Malkki as the well-trying instruments to create a space of exception for those outside the national order, to keep the national order:

"These 'problems of organization', in the managerial voice of the Allied military, are conjugations of a still robustly national logic. The very notion of displacement implies emplacement, a 'proper place' of belonging, and this place has long been assumed to be a home in a territorial, sovereign nation-state. The specific device of the refugee camp also operates in intimate relation to the logic of the national order of things." (Malkki 2002, 353)

Despite these expressions of "refugees welcome" little action has been taken to improve refugees' living conditions, except by engaged volunteers. Rather, an urban culture and an urban identification could be an alternative to the reproduction of a national culture which is marked by exclusions and racisms.

"Finally the sovereign will have to be judged on whether he was able to change the position of the refugees and to offer them a part in social life, meaning if it is able to not again displace the state of exception to the periphery, but to end it." (Kretschmar, 05.09.2015)

In January 2015 New York City achieved to rescale migration politics to the local level. With the introduction of the communal ID 500.000 illegalized inhabitants of NYC will receive a legal document which will grant them citizen rights such as access to public infrastructures and social care, tenants' rights, being able to open a bank account, or voting rights in the city (Mogilyanskaya 2015, 48). When on the federal level a migration reform was still not achieved, a reform which is also pending in Europe, New York City's democratic mayor Bill de Blasio effected a reform himself. This action is a realization of Corijn's quote on the capacity of cities for innovation of global issues on local scale and could be a role model also for the inclusion of refugees in urban societies. We have to finally overcome the "fiction of temporariness", which has produced refugees' displacement in camps, and develop approaches where people are not seen as a temporary burden, but as a permanent asset to diversified cities.

Bibliography

- Beyer, Elke. 2005. *Europäische Migrationsgeografien*, Polen. Berlin: AnArchitektur e.V.
- Brun, Catherine. 2001. "Reterritorializing the Relationship between People and Place in Refugee Studies". *Geografiska Annaler* 83 B (1).
- Corijn, Erik et al.. 2005. "The urban character as a political project". In Boudry et al. "The century of the city. City republik and grid cities. White paper. Brussels, Flemish Government
- Malik, Kenan. 27.11.2015. "The EU's Stinking Refugee Deal With Turkey".
<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2015/10/eu-stinking-refugee-deal-turkey-151026093515679.html> (accessed 10.10.2015)
- Malkki, Liisa H. 2002. "News from nowhere - Mass displacement and globalized 'problems of organization'". *Ethnography* 3 (3) (accessed 10.10.2015)
- Mogilyanskaya, Alina. 2015. "Die ultimative Einwandererstadt New York City führt ein kommunales Personaldokument ein". *Dérive - Zeitschrift für Stadtforschung* 61
- Nelles, Roland. 16.09.2015. "Unapologetic, Unequivocal: The Real Merkel Finally Stands up".
<http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/merkel-refuses-to-apologize-for-welcoming-refugees-a-1053253.html> (accessed 10.10.2015)
- Kostenwein, David. 2014. "The Refugee Camp without Refugees? Ein el-Sultan and its Socio-Spatial Fragmentation. Diplomarbeit at TU Wien. (accessed 10.10.2015)
- Hall, Stuart. 1992. "The question of cultural identity". In Hall, Stuart; Held, David; McGrew, Anthony. "Modernity and its futures". Cambridge, Polity Press
- Kretschmar, Daniel. 05.09.2015. "Ausnahmezustand ohne Souverän".
<http://taz.de/Debatte-Fluechtlingspolitik/!5226718/> (accessed 10.10.2015)
- Krupa, Matthias. 30.11.2015. "EU-Türkei Gipfel - Zwischen Panik und Pragmatismus"
<http://www.zeit.de/politik/2015-11/fluechtlinge-eu-tuerkei-ahmet-davutoglu> (accessed 10.10.2015)
- Rath, Christian. 14.09.2015. "Die Türkei als sicherer Staat?".
<http://www.taz.de/!5229196/> (accessed 10.10.2015)
- Rawlence, Ben. 09.10.2015. "The Other Refugee Crisis". http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/10/opinion/the-other-refugee-crisis.html?smid=fb-share&_r=3 (accessed 10.10.2015)
- Freistaat Thüringen. 2011. „Thüringer Verordnung über den vorübergehenden Aufenthalt von Asylbewerbern außerhalb des Bereichs der Aufenthaltsgestattung“. http://www.fluechtlingsrat-thr.de/images/stories/Thruinger_VO_Residenzpflicht.pdf. (accessed 20.06.2012)

HOW TEMPORARINESS AFFECTS ACCOMMODATION AND LIVING STANDARDS OF REFUGEES - A CASE STUDY ON THE FERRY DUSIKA REFUGEE SHELTER IN VIENNA

Helena Götsch BSc, Lena Junger BSc,



In 2015 a new draft law, “Asyl auf Zeit” (Temporary Asylum), was proposed which would force a compulsory check-up on every positive asylum permit after three years. In 2016 this law was implemented, addressing even those refugees granted asylum with the uncertainty of being deported, confronting them with the temporariness of their stay. After a long period of working on different topics such as empty spaces, welfare state, migration and integration/inclusion, this draft law was the impulse to focus on the effect of temporary thinking on refugees, but on a more local level. We decided to make a stadium which was temporarily used as a refugee shelter and where we both volunteered our case study.

The following question guided our research: **“What are the effects on the accommodation and living standards of refugees resulting from seeing the refugee situation as temporary?”** The research evolves around the Ferry Dusika refugee shelter, located in the second district in Vienna, where a stadium and its sports hall are used partly to accommodate refugees.

Planned as a transit-emergency shelter for one or two nights it turned into a more permanent place where asylum applicants stayed for weeks. The research focuses on three aspects: Firstly, the simple **existence as accommodation** of the Ferry Dusika Stadium as it is. Looking at the low living standards for the refugees accommodated in the stadium, such as missing privacy, the question is: how long is too long? The second aspect is the **dependency** of the stadium on volunteers and donations, which kept the stadium going. How long can voluntary networks and donors serve as a replacement of state duties? The last research focus was the possibility of the **inclusion** of the inhabitants in the surrounding neighbourhood and therefore becoming a part of Vienna. Furthermore the exchange between the inhabitants and volunteers plays a big role. These aspects were researched with the following questions: How are the people there involved in interactions with others? What role does the location of the stadium play? The research demonstrates the low living standards of the Ferry Dusika Stadium and the problems resulting from temporariness. It manifests in no privacy, in high pressure on volunteers, in boredom of the inhabitants with only little possibility of interacting with locals. Without the appropriate living standards the refugees do not have the possibility to raise their quality of life. To the question how long is too long, there is no clear answer. Yet gathering all the outputs of our research we conclude, eleven weeks is too long for refugees, as well as for volunteers in these given exploitive conditions of the Ferry Dusika Stadium. It is fundamental to realise that **refugees are not temporary** and we as planners have to step up and make refugees and their needs a part of our field of competence to give them the possibility of a better quality of life.



LIVING. MAKING. BEING. PUBLIC SPACE

Viktor Bukovszki BSc, Jozef Hurban, Ilgin Kurum BSc, Sandra Lamyová, Keisuke Otsuru BSc, Milica Ugrinov BSc

The focus of this report is the relationship between the city and an unprecedented influx of migrants of destroyed homelands – displaced people. Contemporary cities are made up of extremely temporary and contingent communities emerging from the radical mobility of people. It is argued that the cohesion of these communities needs to be addressed where individuals engage: In public spaces. By simulating situations of interaction, the study explores a description of public space based on the “quasi-object theory” and the concept of the “networked self”. Communities in this perspective are built up by participation in an exchange, in circulation. The individual assumes a role by having a position in this circulation; the collective is built when roles are passed on; the public space is alive, while the game is played. A strong public will be shown to be able to relentlessly reproduce circulations on various networks of participants. Inclusive public spaces will be described as the ones with the more diverse networks accepted.



Table of Plenty at Urbanize Festival (© Authors,2015)



Video Production. VoZu Cafe (© Authors,2015)



Video Production. Karlsplatz Tube Station (© Authors,2015)

THE INACCESSIBLE CITY

Michael Berger BSc, Theresa Edlauer BSc, Tatjana Marmat BSc, Vanessa Schöps BSc

During the current refugee crisis the lack of accessible living space became an important issue. Besides building new spaces, the use of vacant spaces is a better alternative for providing living space in a fast way. We focused on vacant office and industrial spaces and their potentials. We chose two buildings with different preconditions which should describe alternative ways of dealing with vacancy. Through these two different cases we want also to show ways of making the city accessible.

On the one hand we planned apartments for the vacant office building in the 9th, not only for refugees, but also for locals to live in a multicultural surrounding. On the other hand we came up with the implementation of common space in the former textile factory in the heart of the 15th district. Due to construction regulations it is prohibited in Vienna, unlike in other major cities, to use such buildings as a home for apartments. Therefore we want to build spaces, which can be used as places to spend leisure time and to get connected with people from other cultures.

The idea behind all that is the maximum utilization of unused and vacant spaces to implement refugee homes in the city and not in the outskirts or suburbs where they would live isolated from the rest of the society. Furthermore, ghettoization could be prevented and avoided. These circumstances would support the integration of refugees and support the acceptance of them within our society.

This concept can be seen as a sort of master plan for the city, investors and owners, which can be applied to almost every vacant building in an urban area. The needs and wants of the people who will live in such places will define the look and usability of those apartments or leisure time spaces and not vice versa as we have it in almost every other living situation.

Future investors and the City of Vienna should see our project as a thought-through realization of what is actually possible with vacant spaces.



Building 9th district (© Authors,2016)



Building 15th district (© Authors,2016)



