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This reader comprises contents, outputs and retrospectives on the teaching and learning activities of the City of Vienna Visiting Professorship Programme 2017 “Urban culture, public space and the future – Urban equity and the global agenda”. The visiting professor for 2017 was Ed Wall. He is an academic leader at the University of Greenwich (UK) in the field of landscape and urbanism, he runs his own office, Project Studio (www.projectstudio.co.uk), he is a visiting professor at Politecnico di Milano (Italy) and he recently finalized his doctoral thesis at London School of Economics (UK). Jointly with the local 2017 team (Assoc. Prof. Sabine Knierbein, MSc Elina Kränzle, BSc Katharina Höftberger and external lecturer Marlene Wagner), we developed a particular approach to the annual theme through a postcolonial focus on recent or planned urban design projects in the urban periphery.

During the year, we investigated planning programs, draft plans, and everyday cultural evidence of future cities and districts seen within projects. We discussed them with involved actors, and placed them in relation to models of future academic education, enquiring: What are the pressing socio-political issues relating to urbanization? How should such issues be responded to in public spaces? And which current issues in urban practice are oriented toward academic education?

When climate change, resource conservation, and migration increasingly shape urban agendas, wide-reaching urban action is needed to develop a cross-border professional ethics. This includes principles of fair construction, planning, and design that are becoming more relevant as the local sites of action being studied are increasingly "globalized". This trend follows the call to strengthen the focus on human rights in the education of planners, builders and designers. With regard to global political programs with an urban focus, such as that at UN-Habitat, new developments are becoming apparent that stylize public spaces into the central places of global urban coexistence. For the students, such a global framework of thought and action represents a means to come to understand planning and design of public spaces from the perspective of the Global South, for example. Here postcolonial approaches used in planning and design come to fruition. This is about overcoming patterns of intellectual and cultural domination in favour of allowing mutual learning processes to flourish in the spirit of global and local collaboration. The most urgent issues of global urbanization are discussed from different cultural, ethnic and humanitarian perspectives in the context of public spaces.

Through closely analyzing and reflecting on the economic, political, ecological and cultural forces which drive rapid urban transformations we can arrive at developing concrete speculations and implementing visions for fairer socio-economic systems, for ecological survival, for better urban futures. To close the third year of funding phase III “Urban Culture, Public Space and the Education of Urban Professionals”, the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space dedicated its teaching activities in the academic year 2017 to exploring issues of urban equity in the courses aimed at planning and architecture students in the master programs of TU Wien. In the summer term, we developed the course Module 11 “Exploring Urban Futures – Urban Equity”, consisting of a lecture, seminar and exercise, combining theory and practice perspectives from Landscape and Urban Design with those from Urban Studies. In the winter term, the project "Lost in 'Transdanubia' - Translating the global urban agenda through local urban action" and the excursion to South-East London "Urban Agendas caught between local needs and global pressures" were realized. In these formats students investigated, discussed, took apart and mapped urban phenomena through the engagement with urban theory, planning programs and master plans and with everyday urban life. Through various readings and case studies the courses focused on the contested ways that cities are made, from everyday uses of public spaces to urban redevelopments directed by global economic forces. In times of growing inequalities we addressed the need to rethink urban education and urban practices to include principles of human rights and fair construction, planning and design in increasingly "globalized" local sites of action.

During the courses, relations between scales of
global national policies, metropolitan agendas, urban design codes and public spaces were discussed. We approached questions of how urban development on its different scales is linked to the unequal distribution of spaces and resources, less inclusive practices of making cities and greater needs for spatial justice. In the method-led exercise course students explored these themes through site-specific approaches of researching and reimagining public spaces in Vienna through developing and working with “incomplete cartographies”.

This reader aims to comprise the semesters’ inputs and outputs, offering summaries of the more comprehensive lectures and insights into the students’ work in the seminar, the exercise and the project. Furthermore we present some of the students’ essays from the lecture as well as the “incomplete cartographies” that were developed in the exercise course in summer term. For the winter term, this reader comprises selected students’ work of the project and a short impression of the excursion to South-East London. Additionally, the students who participated in the excursion produced their own reader (URL: https://skuor.tuwien.ac.at/wp-content/uploads/London-Excursion-Reader-2018_END.pdf).

We would like to thank all contributors to this booklet and all students of module 11, the doctoral seminar “Doing Urban Studies”, the project and excursion for their dedicated participation in these semesters’ teaching. We would like to acknowledge the valuable contribution of Prof. Charis Christodoulou from Aristotle University of Thessaloniki for realizing the doctoral seminar “Doing Urban Studies” in collaboration with Assoc. Prof. Sabine Knierbein. For the module courses in summer term, we warmly thank all local actors who kindly shared their knowledge in excursions and presentations, more specifically on the Sonnwendviertel development, Hauptbahnhof, and Arsenal: Christoph Hrncir, Magistratsabteilung MA18, City of Vienna; Dr. Franz. J. Maringer, Verein Initiative Arsenal; Sam Osborn, Community Cooking, Caritas Wien; and especially Christoph Gollner and the local urban renewal office GB*10, for the possibility of organizing the final presentations and a small exhibition in their premises in Favoriten district. Furthermore, we would like to thank our guest critics for their valuable and constructive feedback at the final presentation: Johannes Pointl, TU Wien; Radostina Radulova-Stahmer, TU Graz; and Lisa Schmidt-Colinet, Akademie der Bildenden Künste Wien. For the project courses in winter term, we would like to thank Dipl. Ing. Marlene Wagner as an external lecturer in the project for her valuable contribution. Especially, we warmly thank all local actors for supporting and participating in the students’ activities and sharing their knowledge of their neighbourhoods, more specifically Michael Graner (Kleine Stadtfarm), Vicky Matejka (Team Agenda 21 Donaustadt), Joseph Taucher (Gemeinderat Donaustadt), Sabine Gstöttner (Tresor Treffpunkt Essling), Werner Schandl (Hirschstetten-rettten), Julian Gredinger (Stadtteilnetzwerk Stadlau) and Renate Biber (Stadlauer Kaufleute), Reinhard Sander (Jugendzentrum Hirschstetten), the Nachbarschaftszentrum Donaustadt, ACTiN Park, Wohnpartner, Casa Kragan.

We would like to acknowledge the continuous support of the Department of Spatial Planning, Faculty of Architecture and Planning at TU Wien, that has allowed the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space to develop open-ended, explorative teaching modules. Last but not least, the funding of the City of Vienna has made another year of the City of Vienna Visiting Professorship program possible, for which we would like to thank the staff of the Administrative Group for Urban Development (Vice Mayor Maria Vassilakou) and the Group Planning (Planning Director Thomas Madreiter). This year has been the last year of Visiting Professorship funded by the City of Vienna. We are deeply thankful for nine years of trustful and continuing collaboration with all our partners from the City of Vienna. A special thanks to: Gine Zabrana, Jutta Kleedorfer, Erich Streichsier, Andrea Kreppenhofer and Eva Kail who have been with us on this decade-long intellectual and academic journey. Our programme has been continued by TU Wien during the summer term 2018 with Prof. Dr. Barbara Pizzo (La Sapienza University Rome, Italy) being our guest professor. From 1st October 2018, the programme will be relaunched under a new focus and with a new external sponsor as the KTH + TU Wien Joint Visiting Professorship Program in Urban Studies 2019-2021. Main institutional bodies involved are Centre for the Future of Places, ABE School, KTH Royal Institute of Technology Stockholm, Sweden (Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tigran Haas) and the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space, Department for Spatial Planning, Faculty for Architecture and Planning (Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sabine Knierbein).
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The lecture units offered by Ed Wall during the summer term 2017 have been focused on theories and cases of making public spaces, specifically the relations between differing scales of action, planning and operations. Intersecting critical urban theory with empirical cases reveals tensions between more local, regional and global scales of public spaces and highlights experiences of exclusion and inequity during processes of production. Three overlapping themes structure the lectures, including; public space, urban design and landscape.

1. Public space: Exploring the varying definitions and contested claims to public space from its architectural forms to its social dimensions.

2. Urban Design: Discussing practices of creatively defining cities and urban forms through a range of scales and approaches.

3. Landscape: Investigating the notion of landscapes as relations between people and their environments – relations strongly informed cultural, geographic and economic perspectives.

The table below describes some of the cases and theories discussed in each lecture unit as they relate to the themes of public space, urban design and landscape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Space (1)</th>
<th>Urban Design (2)</th>
<th>Landscape (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making public spaces (lecture unit 1)</td>
<td>Design as process (Madanipour); Crowd-fund (ZUS); Occupations (Various);</td>
<td>Community (J&amp;L Gibbons, EXYZT); Infrastructure (Project Studio);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights (Smith, Mitchell); Publics (Mahoney, Newman and Barnett); Privatisations (Smith and Low); Taking space (Massey, Mitchell);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master plans for development (lecture unit 3)</td>
<td>Property (Mitchell and Staeheli); Masterplanning (Sorkin); Neighbourhood-scale (Shane, Lynch); Fragmentation (Shane);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections; Public spaces (Various);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-landscape (lecture unit 5)</td>
<td>Art and activism (Matta-Clarke);</td>
<td>Plurality (Bender); Appropriations (Mitchell); Power (Bender); Image (Corner, Cosgrove, Urry and Larsen); Manifestos (Ukeles); Collage (Ukeles);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape vs Public Space (Mitchell); Occupations (Various); Post-capitalism (Harvey); Taking space (Massey, Mitchell);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of public space (lecture unit 7)</td>
<td>Design code (Sorkin, Lehnerer, Whyte, Alexander, CABE); Rules (Talen);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism (Haw); Governance (GLA, CABE, Appleton);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informality. Between infrastructural forms and informal actions (lecture unit 9)</td>
<td>Imbalances of power (Sassen, Roy); Urbanization (Tonkiss);</td>
<td>Aestheticization (Roy);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global North, Global South (Sassen);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained but informed (lecture unit 11)</td>
<td>Non-plan (Banham, Price, Hall, Barker); Utopias; Events (Archigram);</td>
<td>Environmental (CUP, Cruz);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial agency (Till); Community (Assemble, The Decorators);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Lecture Units offered by Assoc. Prof. Sabine Knierbein during the summer term 2017 have all been organized around a threefold structure to connect public space urban culture related research to deeper social and political theories and more recent accounts in urban design theory and practice. Each lecture comprises sections ranging from:

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

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

3. **Urban Design Theory:** Learning about recent concepts and approaches in urban design theory suitable to deal with issues and concerns relating to the lived spaces of cities and current modes of transformation of urban societies

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Studies (1)</th>
<th>Political Science (2)</th>
<th>Planning Theory (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Public Space under Siege I</em> Urban Restructuring and the Contemporary City</td>
<td><em>Public Space under Siege II</em> Post-positivist Planning and Postmodern Urbanism</td>
<td><em>The Body under pressure. Affect, politics and urbanismo afectivo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postfordist urban policies, birth of 'neoliberal' urban policies, growing urban inequalities (Madanipour, Knierbein and Degros)</td>
<td>Post-Positivist Planning (Allmendinger, Huxley)</td>
<td>Embodied space: role of embodied action, body-politics (Moore, Low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmentality (Foucault)</td>
<td>Postmodern urbanism (Elin, Durth, Chrysler et. al., Heynen/Wright)</td>
<td>Politics of Affect (Massumi, Hardt, Thrift)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Contested everyday space and social non-movements. On critical urbanism</em></td>
<td><em>Urban emancipation and the post-political city. On inclusive and democratic urbanism</em></td>
<td>Performative urbanism (Wolfrean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet encroachment of the ordinary (Bayat)</td>
<td>Critical urbanism (Goonewardena)</td>
<td>Urbanismo afectivo (Krasny, Knierbein, Viderman; Madanipour, Goffman, Rendell; Heynen and Wright)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday urbanism (Crawford, Chase et. al)</td>
<td>Everyday urbanism (Crawford, Chase et. al)</td>
<td><em>City Unsilenced and urban resistance. On worlded urbanism</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech-led and technocratic expert regimes and post-politics via neoliberal governance regimes (Wilson and Swyngedouw, Oosterlynck and colleagues)</td>
<td>Presentist democracy (Lorey, Rancière, Swyngedouw)</td>
<td>Post-colonial approaches (Ong and Roy; Lanz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic urbanism (Madanipour, Kohn)</td>
<td>Democratic urbanism (Madanipour, Kohn)</td>
<td>Social non-movements (Bayat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worlded urbanism (Roy)</td>
<td>Worlded urbanism (Roy)</td>
<td>Worlded urbanism (Roy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this lecture I described contrasting approaches to defining and claiming public spaces. I began by explaining how notions of public space, public sphere, publics and publicness are emphasised in different disciplinary fields. I discussed how public spaces are claimed and defined architecturally as squares, streets, parks and plazas, contrasting with contested publics and the public sphere where people come together around issues of social concern. In the first part of the lecture, I discussed the overlaps between the terms and I argued that processes of producing public spaces (from architectural projects to large public gatherings) could frame the publicness of public space sites. In For Space Doreen Massey writes: ‘For instituting democratic public spaces (and indeed the spaces of places more generally) necessitates operating with a concept of spatiality which keeps always under scrutiny the play of the social relations which construct them’ (Massey 2005, 153). I therefore highlighted competing claims to public spaces and proposed that rather than denying such differences through narrowing the terms of what public space could be open approaches to making public spaces should be balanced with sufficient scrutiny to such claims.

In the second half of the lecture I presented three cases of public space that challenge singular perspectives or conceptions of public space: the Roaming Forest (Project Studio 2010), The Test-Site (IABR/ZUS 2015) and the Dalston Mill (EXYST 2009). While these projects can be read as architectural projects they also emphasise relational approaches to space and they open up questions of contemporary public spaces and public spheres. Each of the projects resonates with Massey’s assertion that ‘Space is product of interrelations constituted through interactions’ (2005, 28). The Roaming Forest was an installation realised for the Landscape Urbanism Biennale in 2010 that opened up opportunities for a wide range of participants to physically make public spaces. The component parts of the Roaming Forest were designed to be movable by individuals, groups and the municipality requiring constant negotiation in order to make and remake public spaces. The second case of the Test-Site is a network of public spaces initiated by a team of designers and realised through a combination of crowd funding and municipality support. The forms of the public spaces, as pathways, bridges, roof terraces and interior spaces, challenge traditional conceptions of both public space and public sphere. Furthermore, the inclusive approach to the continued operation of the Test-Site brings together commercial stakeholders with community groups and municipal authorities with local residents. In the third case, the Dalston Mill was proposed as part of the Radical Nature exhibition at London’s Barbican Centre, where a vacant area of land was planted with a wheatfield and an adjacent mill and bakery were built to grind the wheat and bake bread. From its origins as an art project, the site has subsequently been developed into a community garden (following a design by J&L Gibbons) and has become a central social space in this area of East London. As with the previous two projects the process-orientated approach by the designers and the importance of realising these public spaces as collective works are core to their success.

I concluded the lecture by emphasising the significance of the practices of making these public spaces. What Madanipour terms ‘accessible places, developed through inclusive processes’ (2010, 1) could be a useful frame for bringing closer conceptions of publics and public sphere with more architectural concerns for physical public spaces. As Smith and Low describe: ‘Investigating the means of making and remaking public space provides a unique window on the politics of the public sphere, suggesting an even more powerful imperative to focus on public space’ (2006, 7).
This lecture unit is composed of two parts. These (1) address different interpretations of patterns of urban restructuring (e.g. postFordist, neoliberal), and (2) offer a political science-inspired reading of Foucault’s theory of governmentality as an explanatory frame for a historical analysis of urban restructuring.

(1) Public Space in European Cities in Transition
In the first part of the lecture, we will investigate how public spaces are used and transformed into core catalysts of processes of urban transformation and capital accumulation in European cities. Five policy categories through which public spaces are current addressed by district, municipal, regional, national or wider policy frames (such as the EU) have been introduced: (1) economic revival; (2) social inclusion; (3) cultural diversity; (4) environmental care; (5) urban governance (see Madanipour et. al. 2014, 1-8). Public spaces are broadly understood as crossroads, where different paths and trajectories meet. Sometimes, these policy fields overlap, at other times they collide or even contradict. By presenting case studies of public space design and development projects as well as by introducing core theoretical findings from public space research, the objective of the lecture is to show how these processes interact with market forces, historic legacies, social norms and cultural expectations. We also discuss whether and how the activities of municipalities relate to the needs and experiences of citizens and urban dwellers, by learning about how municipalities explore new strategies and innovative practices for strengthening public spaces and urban culture.

(2) Foucault’s Governmentality and the Rise of Neoliberal Restructuring
This part connects an understanding of the relations between capitalism as a socio-historic phenomenon, urban restructuring, public space and the European City. While neoliberalism is often coined as a US American project that surged especially in the course of the global oil price shock 1973 and finds its first political expressions particularly in Reaganomics (USA) and Thatcherism (UK), we will broadly discuss Foucault’s (2008 (2004)) findings on the initiation of the Austrian and German neoliberal project in the course of national state restructuring after the 2nd World War. Foucault proposes a certain way to understand how governing is achieved by elaborating on the concept of “governmentality” which means the art of government. As a social theorist, Foucault was interested in government as an activity or practice, and in arts of governing as ways of knowing what that activity consisted in. He understood power as “guidance” (Lemke 2000, 51). Enquiries into the practice of governing the forms of (self)government, were coined as ‘the conduct of conduct’ (Ibid., 50). Hence, although power is an omnipresent dimension in human relations, power in a society is never a fixed and closed regime, but rather an endless and open strategic game. With this analytically sharpened perspective, Foucault explains how the neoliberal political project came into being initially as a way of thinking in economics, and later as a practice of governing.
I began the third lecture, Master Plans for Development, by discussing the definitions of the terms ‘master’, ‘plans’ and ‘development’. That masterplans relate to practices of control and transformations of large areas of land provided a useful context from which to discuss issues around large-scale urban transformations. I illustrated the issues that I highlighted in the lecture through empirical research undertaken in London. I then concluded the lecture by presenting several international urban design cases that provide alternatives to masterplanning approaches. I presented five specific aspects of masterplanning:

Mediating Scales
I described that masterplans are mechanisms for redeveloping neighbourhood-scales of cities, what Lynch terms ‘districts’ (1960, 47), and that they prove useful devices for mediating between other scales: masterplans are informed by political strategies and economic agendas from global to metropolitan scales; they in-turn inform the spaces and development parcels of sites, projects and phases; masterplans tend to also greatly impact on new programmes of events and the social interactions of people in public spaces. While masterplans are frequently considered top-down approaches to the transformation of cities their ability to reconcile this range of scales makes them unique and powerful urban development tools.

Property Relations
I explained that masterplans bring the public and private realms of cities closer together as space between buildings is considered public open space while the building envelopes are largely defined by property relations. This reflects Madanipour’s claim that ‘land and property development is the vehicle through which the built environment is produced’ and in order to ‘understand the urban design process... it is essential to gain an understanding of the property development process’ (Madanipour 1996, 121). Giving a particular emphasis to public space, Mitchell and Staeheli write in The People’s Property (2008): ‘property is a crucial part of the equation that creates public space and forms the public in its many configurations’ (2008, 128).

Legal and Government Mechanisms
While Mitchell and Staeheli focus on ‘property ownership’ that they describe as ‘a powerful tool in the regulation of space and, thereby, the public’ (2008, xxiv) I discussed other regulations of space that accompany masterplanning. I explained that when neighbourhoods are redeveloped through masterplanning there are a range of mechanisms (such as Business Improvement Districts) that can impact on new public spaces and public space management. Michael Sorkin writes: ‘The importance of these instruments [BIDs] has only grown as government has become increasingly enthralled by the model of the “public-private” partnership’ (2011, 292).

Urban Visions
I argued that Masterplans have a central role in creating visions for how large areas of cities could be transformed. They offer visions for urban change, with architectural drawings and renders illustrating comprehensive changes to buildings, public spaces and infrastructures. From my research I reveal that the visual images of such developments are essential throughout the planning process and for attracting investment. Visual techniques that are employed reflect picturesque methods from landscape painting and landscape architecture, techniques that selectively frame views and recreate cities as scenery. I introduced a critique of such landscapes that I further explained in the lecture, Post-Landscape.

Piecemeal
Despite the presentation of comprehensive visions presented through masterplanning I presented empirical research that revealed masterplanning processes that unfold in more piecemeal and incremental ways. The large-scale geographies and long time frames for redevelopment result in plans that are repeatedly changed and amended and phases of development following economic rhythms and political cycles. As the masterplans were implemented incrementally developers were able to gain from renegotiated agreements, however, the uncertainty created due to repeated changes in the plans impacted negatively on existing residents and businesses.

In the final part of the lecture I described three projects that open up alternative potentials to masterplanning: The East Jerusalem Masterplan by Sorkin Studio (2001) proposes to emphasise ‘the „normal” infrastructure’ of the city (www.sorkinstudio, 2017); a strategy for a neighbourhood in London by Frontwork (2017) focuses on small-scale additions and renovations of buildings and open spaces; while the Puente Mirador project in Medellin is a small connection in the city it has brought together two otherwise separated neighbourhoods and provided a new public space.
This lecture unit is composed of three parts. We will (1) switch scales from European-focus towards a Global South perspective on processes on global (urban) restructuring and urban everyday life thus challenging and further explaining the sociopolitical context in which theories of planning and design have been unfolding in the past couple of decades. Then, a repetition of key findings from my previous lecture will (2) be offered in order to clarify further questions and concepts while starting to introduce the concept of post-positivist planning theory. As follows, (3) a transfer from post-positivist planning to post-modern planning will be presented, thus allowing students to make connections, but also to distinguish between different intellectual traditions that these theories have been emerging from.

(1) Global (Urban) Restructuring
Asef Bayat (2013 (2010)) identifies a “historic shift in the periphery” towards the integration of “liberal economic policies, through the Economic Reform and Structural Adjustment Program” and emphasizes that this “has led to the erosion of much of the social contract, collective responsibility, and welfare state structures. Thus, millions of people in the global South … must now rely on themselves to survive. Deregulation of prices on housing, rent, and utilities jeopardizes many poor people’s security of tenure, subjecting them to the risk of homelessness.” (Ibid., 43). This shift has been provoked, for instance, by a reduction of spending on social programs (e.g. the EU’s cut on food vouchers in Refugee Camps of the Middle East and Africa)). Its symptoms have become visible e.g. through shrinking access to decent education, health care, urban development, and social housing schemes, but also in the direct everyday routines, for instance through gradual removals of subsidies on bread, bus fares, and petrol which have affected radically the living standard of millions of vulnerable groups (Ibid., 43). In a “drive for privatization, public sectors have either been sold out or ‘reformed’, which in either case has caused massive layoffs without a clear prospect of boosting the economy and creating viable jobs”, thus leading to increased rates of unemployment, homelessness and health and malnutrition issues, affecting both the poor groups by pushing them even further to the margins, but also the urban middle classes who are now facing to fall into conditions of poverty and social hardship as well. Such socially excluded and informal(ised) groups are by no means new historical phenomena. However, the recent global restructuring seems to have intensified and extended their operation (Ibid, 44). Bayat asks how this growing urban grass roots in the global South “respond to the larger social and economic processes that affect their lives”? In his eyes, globalisation has a “tendency to informalise through programs of structural adjustment, rendering many people unemployed or pushing them to seek refuge in informal production, trade, housing, and transportation” (Ibid., 64). This lecture part indicates that processes that we have considered as regards the multiple roles of public spaces in European cities in the previous lecture have long been unfolding in a more rupturing way already in cities of the Global South, particularly under the banner of laissez-faire neoliberal urban policies. Which role, however, does planning play in all this, and how has this been theorized? The lecture units will first develop on thoughts developed in the West while later challenging Euro-centric perspectives through insurgent planning theory approaches developed by scholars from the Global South.

(2) The Genealogy of Post-Positivist Planning
In this section we briefly recall my previous lecture inputs on Foucault’s conception of governmentality. This part elaborates an understanding of planning as a form of governmentality: practices shaping the actions of others and strategies for the management of a population. Foucauldian analysis of planning as a form of power is not to attempt to correct the misuse of technical rationality, nor to dissolve power in ‘perfectly transparent communication’, but to show the unwitting effects of these regimes of practices, to break free of the common-sense acceptance of categories, to open up ways of thinking differently (Huxley 2002, 146). Allmendinger (2002, 5) points to the fact that there was a changing understanding of the social world in the 1960s and 1970s, as the steady belief in naturalism dominating the social sciences and planning for most of the 19th century began to diminish at that time. What was called into question was the “understanding of the universalisation of conditions of knowledge; the neutrality of observation; the givenness of...

PUBLIC SPACE UNDER SIEGE (II)
POST-POSITIVIST PLANNING AND POSTMODERN URBANISM
Assoc. Prof. Dr. phil. Sabine Knierbein
experience and the independence of data from theoretical interpretation” (positivism). Now data, theories and disciplines began to be understood as belonging to larger social and historical contexts in which they were applied, changed and developed (post-positivism). One way of post-positivist planning has been well-distributed both in the Anglosaxonian and German-speaking planning communities, that is, pragmatic communicative planning (Selle, Germany, since 1991), collaborative/communicative planning (Healey 1993, 1997) and deliberative planning (Forester, USA, in 1999).

(3) Post-Modern Architecture Theory and Post-Modern Urban Design
While the connections between Foucaultian analytics and post-positivist approaches to planning can be quite directly drawn along Huxley’s interpretation, connecting neoliberal thought, postFordism and the post-positivist turn to theorizations in architecture and urban design results as a far more difficult endeavor. This is visible as planning theory and the social sciences seem to be more neatly entangled with insights from the social sciences than the praxis of urban design. Vice versa, as the aesthetic and aesthetic philosophical aspects play a greater role for urban design and (parts of) architectural theory, instead of drawing strongly on post-positivism as a reference frame, urban design debates in the 1980s/1990s have much more developed around issues of postmodernity (Ellin 1999 (1996), Durth 1988 (1977)). Also, contributions to architecture theory, for instance the work of Crysler et. al. (2012), show a much clearer relation to urban studies, social sciences and humanist debates than for instance approaches to theorize urban design praxis. This finding in itself is of key importance, but again exceeds the limits of this text. It is not the aim to create general linkages between these varying and internally also not homogenous debates, but rather to identify existing or missing linkages between these debates and their relevance for and referencing of a critique of everyday life, or lived space.

Nan Ellin (1999 (1996), 2011) had issued a strong critique of spatial fragmentation, environmental degradation and social isolation, conceived of as resulting from the praxis of modernist architecture and urban design. Ellin (2011, 589) emphasized the loss of a “sense of place” and a “sense of community” visible in cities. Both Heynen/Wright (2012, 41) and Ellin (2011) mention that particularly the pace at which change occurred in the 2nd half of the 20th century in their disciplines and on an urban level, has dramatically increased. Whereas modernism seemed to respond to challenges of establishing social order for the mass society; post-modernism was crafted to overcome the felt placelessness, thereby addressing a need for urban community (Ellin 1999 (1996), 155, citing Ley 1987, 40). Regarding different ways of working between modern and post-modern urban designers, a previous insistence on structural honesty and functionality (associated with modernism) was now contrasted with the goal to satisfy needs that were not merely functional and to convey meanings’ other than building tectonics (cf. ibid., 156). Ellin also provides a clear link to everyday life and lived space, thus issuing a radical call to re-politicize urban design praxis through critical theory: “Since urban design interventions invariably have an impact on people’s lives (...) the work of urban designers is inevitably political whether or not they choose to be politically engaged. But the denial of urban design’s political component contributes to exacerbate existing inequalities, one of these being Euro-American hegemony” (Ellin 1999 (1996), 182). Her statement reveals an early orientation towards postcolonial revisions of architectural theory, a facet that will be addressed towards the end of this section in more depth.
In this lecture I presented a critique of urban developments that employ historic Anglo-Saxon approaches to landscape and I proposed other relations between people and the land. In the years following the collapse of the global economy (from 2008) several commentators (see Fisher 2009; also see Harvey 2015; Mason 2015) began to consider a future of post-capitalism. Witnessing corresponding transformations to urban landscapes in London and around the world, through Occupy protests and other social movements, I became interested in the potential end of English traditions of landscape. Strong associations between the growth of European capitalism in the fifteenth and sixteenth century and the emergence during this time of a new way of understanding landscape provide historical contexts for this argument. Barbara Bender states: ‘True, the word [landscape] was originally coined in the emergent capitalist world of western Europe by aesthetes, antiquarians and landed gentry’ (1993, 1). The appropriation of what was often common land, and its subsequent enclosure, engrossment and commodification, marked a significant moment in the development of distinctly English landscapes. Kenneth Olwig describes: ‘...first representations of landscape scenery in painting tended to be views seen from the window of the urban patron whose portrait was being painted and that the same persons who imported Dutch surveyors and engineers to England to restructure and rationalise their properties, imported landscape paintings and hired landscape architects.’ (Olwig 1993, 332).

Market relations began to supersede what had been feudal arrangements with the land and its peasantry. Lords became landowners, evicting and relocating populations, collecting rents from tenant farmers and transforming land into property that could then be bought and sold. This rupture in social and spatial relations simultaneously facilitated the growth of capitalist economies. Over the subsequent centuries enclosed lands were refashioned as scenic settings for this recently landed gentry. Fences and walls of enclosure were removed or hidden from view (often replaced with hasahas) in attempts to control access, dictate views and make claims to extended landscape views of borrowed scenery.

Representing and reconfiguring environments through visual images has continued to inform contemporary landscapes. Dixon Hunt’s detailed critique of what became known as the picturesque, explains that the results of ‘a growing preference for form at the expense of the ideas that might be expressed through it... are unfortunately still with us today’ (1994, 16). In particular, over the last three decades, historic landscape techniques have been employed in the privatisation of public spaces; they have contributed to elevated land values; and they have dictated the accessibility, uses and activities of urban redevelopments. As visual techniques from landscape painting are co-opted in architectural computer renderings to facilitate aggressive real estate markets picturesque approaches continue to misrepresent how designed spaces will manifest in use and form. These scenic priorities require increased control over urban spaces, which are frequently sought through enclosures and ownership of sites and the subsequent architectural conditioning and management of what activities will be undertaken and by whom. What results is a continued transfer of land to commercial interests and narrowly controlled access to refashioned urban spaces, many which are claimed to be public.

In this lecture I presented three frames of traditional landscape approaches – predominantly visual approaches; scenes considered from static positions; and singular perspectives framed as representations and urban spaces, enclosed and transformed through design – and I discussed alternative techniques that could define future relations with the land. I explained that different cultural approaches to landscape, as described by Bender, embrace landscape as a process rather than a visual and social product. I also advocate that ways of understanding landscape could consider Doreen Massey’s propositions for space (2005) and Nancy Fraser’s description of the public sphere (1990). I proposed that contemporary ideas and practices of landscape could learn from public space, as described by Don Mitchell (2005). I concluded the lecture by describing the potential of writing proposals as manifestos, employing collage techniques and activist approaches to reframing space.
The lecture will (1) offer an understanding of embodied protest as an affective form of staging dissent and thereby shaping ‘the political’ in the city. In a successive part (2) it will explain the concept of ‘politics of affect’ to link the empirical and methodological reflection to a wider strand of thoughts in social theory. Finally, (3) a transfer will be established between considerations linking embodied space conceptions, politics of affect and a new strand in post-positivist planning, that is, performative planning.

(1) The Role of the Body in Protest

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

(2) Politics of Affect and Non-Representational Space

Since the 1990s, a debate of affects/affectivity has been conducted across many disciplines, driven by cultural and feminist studies. This approach combines the focus on the body (feminist theory), with a focus on affect (queer theory, cultural studies). Theories of affect address the minds’ power to think (reason) and the body’s power to act (passion). They force us constantly to pose the problem of the relationship between mind and body with the assumption that their powers constantly correspond in some ways (Hardt 2007, ix). Affects are experiences that derive from spatial encounters, not always conceivable in language, but sensed bodily (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2011). Understanding space as relational (i.e. as materially constituted through social relations) means to include the affective dimensions of embodied space and bodily spatial action (e.g. occupations). In this vein, affection assigns a relational moment, through which the capacity to act is decreased or increased through the encounters between bodies, affected or/and affecting each other (Massumi 2008). In (urban) human geography, affect has been related to an approach coined non-representational theory (Thrift 2007) which sought to alert geographers to the (a) embodied and performative nature of practice; (b) to much of which consists prior to reflexive or cognitive thought; (c) to use an understanding of affect to overcome certain pitfalls of traditional models of social and spatial enquiry which maintain dualisms between theory and practice, and between thought and action. Non-representational theory includes much of the non-intentional and non-discursive aspects of everyday life into an understanding of space and links this to the way politics and the political work beyond reason, using a combination of reason and passion, of thinking and acting. Thrift as well used the concept of “performance” to understand “the art of producing the now” (Thrift 2000, in Dirksmeier/Helbrecht 2010), the urban present conditions of everyday life. “The greater our power to be affected (…) the greater our power to act” (Hardt 2007, x).

(3) Space and Performativity

As Ali Madanipour (2003, 124f) has emphasized, “performance, and the presentation and exchange of symbols, therefore, lies at the heart of social life.” Also, the work of Goffman (1990) on public space has pointed to the importance of performance in social interaction: “Goffman argues that everyday life can be seen as an arena where the self performs in a number of different ways (…). For Goffman individuals (…) act very differently according to the environment that they find themselves in.” (Highmore 2002, 11). That way, his approach to the everyday “suggests an inventory of performances spatially arranged across the geography of everyday life. In some ways this points to some shared concerns with a much more recent interest (or renewed interest) in performativity” (Highmore 2002, 50). In public space research linking to planning, urban design, and architecture, the
focus on performance has been omnipresent since the 1990s. However, as architectural education is more recently undergoing (again) a social turn, performance has been (re)discovered also in contributions to start theorizing architecture urban design, albeit somewhat disentangled from these earlier thinkers. Sophie Wolfrum and Nikolai v. Brandis (2015) have published a book on performative urbanism. For Wolfrum and v. Brandis (2015, 5), “performative urbanism seeks to go beyond the mere interpretation and analysis of urban phenomena”, as the focus is not on perception, “rather on action, politics and design”. To understand the performative potential of architecture – a key to access urban design praxis – a relational conception of space needs to be introduced in architectural education (ibid., 12f), thus rending an understanding of architecture as going far beyond objects and images by following Eco’s (1972, 326 in Wolfrum and v. Brandis 2015, 5) take on architecture as “the art of articulating space”. Whereas the authors draw references on Lefebvre’s notion of the social production of space and related lived spaces, they later turn towards slightly more deterministic forms of architectural praxis: “Lived space is induced by architecture, space is produced while experiencing architecture.” (Wolfrum and v. Brandis 2015, 15) and the stated idea that architecture can be designated as a “performative cultural technology par excellence” (ibid., 16) determine an overtly strong role of the architect and of buildings in the social production of space. Here, a rather flat ontology of everyday life as cultural praxis and meaning making (based on a conception of the architect as a sociocultural meaning maker) is implicitly forwarded, whereas the deep and ambiguous complexity of a social critique everyday life remains widely unchallenged. The strength of performative urbanism lies first and foremost in its emphasis on a needed integration of city field trips and excursions, travelling, the science of strolling or “promenadology” (Wolfrum and v. Brandis, 11, citing Burckhardt 1995), which all ideally enhance a careful observation of everyday life, an intensive involvement with the locality, and point to the banality of transitory places (ibid., 11 Relations to Careri’s (2002) notion of walkscapes and to de Certeau’s (1988) notion of the act of walking are made.

Another contribution by Elke Krasny, Tihomir Viderman and the author of this treatise (2016) has shed light on solidary and affective spatial practices in contexts of crisis, austerity and unsettled urban routines: urbanismo afectivo (English: affective urbanism). Urbanismo afectivo is an invitation to architects, designers and planners to develop own critical perspectives on the representations of multiple city publics and their cultures and everyday life practices in the dominant cultural and institutional setting of Western liberal democracies. Thereby, a complex understanding of historical, political and social conditions that shape public space is fostered in an era increasingly dominated by (seemingly contradictory) paradigms of growth and austerity. The key starting point is the finding that uneven growth accelerates spatial injustice and results in the precarization of bodies, labor and space. Urbanismo afectivo focuses on activists, farchitects, cultural producers and neighbors who strengthen mutual social relations through public space based work to counteract the crisis, with new forms of civic planning and civic funding emerging in (partly new) public space in which urban movements counteract the imposed austerity measures. More widely, it deals with the introduction of feminist perspectives about politics of care, particularly in order to establish a professional position against a politics of austerity and its many fatal social consequences. Establishing trust, affect and solidarity is first and foremost possible on the scale of everyday life where bodies can equally meet.

In conclusion of this lecture unit, Jane Rendell’s position has been interesting as she has argued “the ‘performative turn’ in architecture and architectural theory has lagged behind other disciplines (…)”. (Heynen and Wright 2012, 52, quoting Rendell 2012, 95). Approaches like performative urbanism and urbanismo afectivo offer an opportunity to learn more and to deepen an understanding of the performative in the field of architecture and urban design, albeit in two basically distinct ways as regards their social relevance, reflexiveness and conception of ‘the political’.
"... what interests me is what the world would be like if we were free of conventional limits. Maybe I can show what could happen if we lived by a different set of rules." (Lebbeus Woods quoted in New York Times, 2008)

This lecture focused on urban rules, or more specifically on inventive codes written and employed in the design of cities. The lecture developed the notion of written manifestos, presented in the earlier Post-landscape lecture, through the method of design code. In Urban Design since 1945 Grahame Shane describes design code as 'a written, systematic and logically consistent body of laws and statutes that regulate a situation, activity or place' (2011, 348). There is a long history of such codes being used in the planning of cities (see Talen 2012), from the practical to the visionary. Michael Sorkin advocates the use of written code in his utopian manifesto Local Code (1993) and in his blog contributions for Lebbeus Woods (www.lebbeuswoods.wordpress.com 2011). Sorkin’s approach to design code is important as he aims to ‘[...] seeks, in its limits, not to restrain associations but to free them.’ (Sorkin 1993, 11). This reflects the approach of Alex Lehnerer in Grand Urban Rules where the rules are advocated for their ‘[...] capacity to open up a space of possibilities’ (2009, 67). I structured the lecture in four parts: legal codes for design; claims to public spaces; public space regulations; Department of Public Space; conclusions. The first three sections provided contexts for a project, the Department of Public Space, which I initiated with students in order to challenge the ways that public spaces are regulated through the use of design codes.

In the first section I presented my experience of legal codes that have been used to define the deed for Governors Island in New York. I was interested that in the development of the island some land-uses were to be restricted (such as casinos) and specific forms of public space were required (such as 40 acres of public parkland, 20 acres of which should be contiguous). In particular, I was intrigued that such specific spatial prescription was made before the masterplanning stage and that the code subsequently informed all stages of design. This practical application of codes reflects the more speculative approach that Sorkin employs (1993): in code V-1.1 Sorkin writes: ‘The Beach will be a continuous portion of the City, 4 square miles in area. It will adjoin a standing body of water which will have a minimum of 8 square miles.’ The key to writing design codes is to avoid prohibitions but rather to provide clarity and direction to the opportunities for defining urban spaces.

In the second section I presented the context of public spaces in London. What we find when considering London’s public spaces is that there has been a proliferation of forms, definitions and regulations: public spaces are owned by the state and by private interests; they are managed by local authorities and by commercial operators; and they are used for a diversity of individual and group activities. The processes of producing public spaces reveals many individuals and organisations making claims to designing, using and managing public spaces. In The Right to Public Space (2003), Don Mitchell describes, ‘then as now public spaces were only public to the degree that they were taken and made public’ (2003, 142).

We see a differentiation of public spaces as different individuals and people make claims to own, redesign, manage and occupy public spaces of London. Contestations over public spaces result in uneven levels of funding provided to different parts of London, they manifest in contrasting regulations and rules and they are experienced through inconsistent access, especially for marginalised groups of homeless people, teenagers and political protestors. I presented the regulations that accompany public spaces throughout London in more detail in the third section.

In the final section I presented the The Department of Public Space. The project aims to address the issues of different regulations across proliferating forms of public spaces that are produced, managed and used differently. Through employing the use of design code on the platform Twitter the Department of Public Space acts both as an open forum for the sharing and gathering of priorities for public spaces and as an independent regulator to oversee how public spaces are managed and used. With a limit of 140 characters and the use of selective hashtags the Department of Public Space provides an educational tool for learning about design code and a potential method for keeping under scrutiny the development, management and use of public spaces in London.
International Public Space Research offers a plethora of approaches to adopt, appropriate and act in public space through changing everyday practices (e.g. everyday urbanism, ordinary city, insurgent planning, insurgent public space, etc.). The importance of places of everyday life in the city is once again stressed by reconsidering lived space dimensions (e.g. in planning and architecture). The first part of the lecture will empirically lean on (1) Asef Bayat’s analysis of social change in cities of the Middle East in which public protest is not the prime resource for mass social change, but what Bayat calls Social Non-Movements. While (2) the focus of this stream of thought rests on marginalized groups and those parts of the urban society that do not feel integrated into mainstream society and hegemonic governance, a growing critique of (bourgeois) social movements (and their failures) gains momentum. The lecture will (3) establish a link between these recent ways of challenging architecture and planning education through the focus on the everyday dimension of urban space.

(1) Social Non-Movements and Quiet Encroachment of the Ordinary (Asef Bayat)

More recently, contributions to understanding cities with a focus on lived space have countered the modern and Westernized conception of everyday life as a trigger for the collective mobilization of city publics, mediated through a critique of modern public space and Western social movements. Bayat (2013 (2010)) states that most parts of basic social change in regions of the global South are actually organized through what he dubs “social nonmovements”. Social nonmovements are fragmented and individualized mass movements that interlock activism with the practices of everyday life (cf. ibid., 12). Bayat (ibid., 33) refers to the actions of social nonmovements as “quiet encroachment of the ordinary”. Quiet encroachment, in this sense, is first and foremost a mix of individual and collective direct action rather than a politics of collective demand making (ibid., 93). In order to register this type of everyday activism in the cities of post-colonial societies, the goal of these prolonged direction actions by dispersed individuals and families is to “acquire the basic necessities of their lives (...) in a quiet and unassuming (...) fashion” (ibid., 35).

When further interpreting Bayat’s work regarding the increasing global pressures on public space, the paradoxical situation emerges that, on the one hand, neoliberal policies push certain sectors of humanity towards the margins (e.g. by dispossession and dislocation, leaving people to live in public space for lack of a proper home) and thus enhance the need for public spaces suited to fulfilling humanitarian needs in times of a restructuring-based crisis. At the same time, however, lived space is the sphere in which that same neoliberal modernity is reproduced over and over again. This leads to the situation that, through the informalization and precarization of mass sectors of urban society in the global South, the societal need for public space increases at the same time as economic pressure on public space as a locational factor is intensified. This may eventually lead to an increased chance of civic upheaval, individualized mass mobilization and revolution, as this paradox is not being solved, but instead public space is being simultaneously torn in opposite directions, a process contributing to the weakening of its socially cohesive and pacifying role, a process which constantly nurtures and reproduces social, cultural and political tension.

Bayat’s book Life as Politics is a key resource of understanding how a renewed attention to post-colonial approaches to urban studies can produce a change in research perspectives and categories when critically navigating through the prevailing (Western/Northern) models of urban research, analysis and interpretation (cf. ibid., 35).

(2) Urbanism as Theoretical Critique: Critical Urbanist Praxis (Goonewardena 2011)

Another contribution to the field of theorizing urban design has been Kanishka Goonewardena’s (2011) chapter on Critical Urbanism, published in the Routledge Handbook of Urban Design. Goonewardena further develops his neo-Marxist conception of how to understand planning theory as a constant enquiry on the troubled relation between urbanism and capitalism, while reconsidering the role of cities under capitalism. Although he acknowledges that urban design as a discipline and professional field is mainly involved in the hegemonic mode of the production of space, he points to the fact that “not all students of urbanism are at (...) peace with the ruling mode of production” making up a
counter sphere of a "non-conformist minority in urban design, architecture and planning". (ibid., 97f) Goonewardena refers to Debord’s (1967) conception of ‘urbanism’ as the sum of urban development and planning practices in postwar France where it was not merely one among the many “forces of production” in late capitalism, but the main “mode of appropriation of the natural and human environment by capitalism” (ibid, 98), the one that creates the condition of possibility for the rest. In this sense, urbanism forms the foundation of capitalism. Goonewardena (2011, 98) issues caution that in the praxis-oriented branches of architecture, planning and urban design, “the nexus of urbanism and capitalism is typically understood, if at all, the other way around. Capitalism (dis)appears in these pragmatic disciplines as the natural - unexamined - basis of urbanism.”

"Can capitalism live without urbanism? Can urbanism live without capitalism?" Critical urbanism addresses these questions concerning the articulation and possible - indeed desired - disarticulation of the dialectic between capitalism and urbanism” (Goonewardena 2011, 98f). Urban social revolution, in this sense, is inconceivable without a radical transformation of space. Its objective is not merely the equitable redistribution of generated social surplus, but the emancipation or liberation of humans not just in the sense of political, but of truly social character. Indeed, the urban-social revolution for Lefebvre as much as for Debord predetermines itself precisely upon the prospect of everyday life acting on the urban level, and the urban level unites them. The question here would be: “How can a radical urban praxis mediate between our knowledge of the city we have and our ideas of the city we want?” (ibid., 99) For Goonewardena, the answer would lie in the Situationist International’s approach to unitary urbanism as “an urban experience produced neither by capital nor the state, but by radical-democratic politics organized by ordinary people in their everyday life” (ibid., 100). By using a historical reference to the Paris Commune in 1871, Goonewardena refers to the insurgents’ idea that they “had become the masters of their own history, not so much on the level of ‘governmental’ politics as on the level of their everyday life.” (ibid., 100 citing Debord et al. 1962). Here a clear reference to Marx’s “people making their own history just as they please” can be found, whereas also Trotsky’s idea of “everyday life as the ultimate testing ground of revolution” is present in Goonewardena’s argument (ibid., 100-102). An “urban strategy” therefore assumes for Lefebvre a central role in the struggle, one that would be waged against the dominant logics of the global level G, primarily if not exclusively on the intermediary urban terrain (level M), drawing nourishment from the critical and utopian energies released from contradictions of everyday life, the level of lived space (level P) (Goonewardena 2011, 105, referring to Lefebvre (1970). “Whereas the hegemonic forces in Lefebvre’s totality run from the global through the urban level to the level of everyday life, counter hegemonic struggle seeks to reverse their direction.” (Goonewardena 2011, 105).

The implication for critical urbanism is at hand: “there can be no social(st) revolution without an urban revolution, no urban revolution without a social(st) revolution, and neither without a revolution in everyday life” (cf. Goonewardena 2011, 105f). Now it would be unwise to expect such an insight to be of much interest to those planners, architects and urban designers who have made their professional or academic peace with the way liberal democracies traditionally work (cf. ibid., 106). "This is the backdrop against which Lefebvre’s novel concept of the right to the city must be understood - not as another addition to the self-contradictory liberal-democratic list of “human rights”, but rather the right to a radically different world” (cf. ibid, 106). “The extension of urban theory in such directions assumes paramount import in the current imperial conjunction, as the far-flung order of our global social totality appears to be at a moment of geopolitical - economic reformating if not crisis, to enquire into the possible roles assumed by cities and their subjects in a new world system” (cf. Goonewardena 2011, 106). For the future of “critical urbanism” now rests on delivering not only the aesthetics but also the politics capable of doing justice to the emancipatory possibilities (cf. ibid., 106). Finally, Goonewardena emphasizes that the urban is indifferent to all difference as it unites differences on the one hand, whereas cities do not create, but centralize creation and thus, in a way, create everything. (ibid., 106).

(3) Everyday Urbanism

Alternative urbanisms relating to the power and features of everyday life have enriched the spectrum of public-space-focused urban design and community planning interventions (e.g. everyday urbanism, ordinary city, insurgent planning, insurgent public space, etc.). These approaches have emerged at different disciplinary fronts, e.g. landscape architecture, urban design and community planning. One of the seminal works has been Chase et. al’s (2008 (1999)) book on Everyday Urbanism, in which “urbanism” identifies a broad discursive arena including many disciplinary and further perspectives into a multidimensional consideration of the city whereas “everyday space” delineates the physical domain of everyday public activity as a connective tissue that binds daily lives together (Crawford 2008 (1999), 6). These contributions stress the relevance of lived space dimensions for shaping public space, both in its product and materialized as well as
in its process and social dimensions. Margaret Crawford (2008 (1999), 7f), for instance stresses that “Design within everyday space must start with an understanding and acceptance of the life that takes place there” (ibid), thus closely connecting her work to Lefebvre’s oeuvre as a way to reconnect humanist philosophy, social experience and design praxis: “lived experience should be more important than physical form in defining the city. (...) The city is, above all, a social product, created out of the demands of everyday use and the social struggle of urban inhabitants” (Crawford 2008 (1999), 7). In this sense, “design within everyday space” works against the grain of professional design discourses based on abstract principles, (quantitative, formal, spatial, or perceptual) as professional abstractions inevitably produce spaces that have little to do with real human impulses (cf. ibid, 7f). For Crawford (1999, 8) everyday life is a good starting point into the practice of urbanism, as “it is grounded in the commonplace rather than the canonical, the many rather than the few, and the repeated rather than the unique” (ibid., 8). In that sense, “the expert” has usefully shied away from tackling everyday life research, and experts have learned to think of themselves as being outside of everyday life and elsewhere as in lived space (ibid., 8). Rhetoric and meta-language is used as permanent substitute for experience (ibid., referring to Lefebvre ). Crawford (2008 (1999) 9) casts everyday urbanism as a counter movement to the alienation from everyday life inherent in urban design praxis: “To avoid this breach with reality, everyday urbanism demands a radical repositioning of the designer, a shifting of power from the professional expert to the ordinary person. Widespread expertise in everyday life acts as a leveling agent, eliminating the distance between professionals and users, between specialized knowledge and daily experience” (ibid., 9). In everyday urbanism, “the designer is immersed within contemporary society rather than superior to and outside of it, and is thus forced to address the contradictions of social life from close up” (Crawford 2008 (1999), 9). Although this approach has received numerous criticisms at the turn of the millennium, it is also necessary to emphasize that particularly with the rise of citizen-based innovation models, citizen-sciences and user-based innovation (e.g. in sharing economy approaches), everyday urbanism is currently facing a new rise, particularly as the user-centredness is part of a new overall paradigm in the political economy and governance of urban societies. But in urban design discourse again, the everyday notion of urbanism has been set against global star architecture, by taking it as the source for the minor register, the micro-architectures and the empirical reality of cities, “to uncover and make meaningful the idiosyncratic, yet authentic, qualities of places, and in particular the places of everyday life.” (Southworth and Ruggeri 2012, 500). Crawford’s (2008 (1999), 14) everyday urbanism approach, however, resonates in another way strongly with Lefebvre’s oeuvre, as she highlights its unorthodox, open-ended and unconventional nature (see also part I): “Unlike most urban design techniques, it can maneuver in the nooks and crannies of existing urban environments. An accrational approach, it makes small changes that accumulate to transform larger urban situations. (...) It is not intended to replace other urban design practices but to work along with, on top of, or after them” (ibid. 14). Also, she clearly depicts that choosing a professional positionality is required when doing everyday urbanism, yet at the same time she acknowledges that one particular requirement for designers is to work with their own multiple roles in a flexible way: “Everyday Urbanists can step in and out of professional roles if they discover other ways of accomplishing their goals. Although frustrating to critics, this shape-shifting quality provides Everyday Urbanism with a flexibility noticeably absent in other urban design approaches and is (...) fundamental to operating in a world of constant changes” (Crawford 2008 (1999), 14). It is here, were a procedural or relational theory of space is used in everyday urbanism, as the city is being considered as constantly changing spatial fabric, as constantly materializing urban everyday life praxis.
In this lecture I explored conceptions of informality as well as issues of informality relevant to making cities. The three main texts that I referred to in the lecture were: The Informal City by Michel Laguerre (1994); ‘The Contradictions of Informality’ from Cities by Design: The Social Life of Urban Form by Fran Tonkiss (2014); and the essay by Saskia Sassen from Informal City (Brillembourg, Feireiss & Klumpner 2005), ‘Fragmented urban topographies and their underlying interconnections’. The three texts intersect each other, with Laguerre setting out models of informality and Tonkiss providing a critique of many of these informal conditions and practices.

I began the lecture by explaining my research and practice experience exploring notions of informality. I presented the Informal Public (2008) project undertaken with Sam Johnston for the London Festival of Architecture where a series of maps were produced in conjunction with markings within the public spaces studied. Both exercises made physical recordings of the activities occurring in Elephant and Castle (South London) that resisted the rules or codes of the place (as set out by architects, developers, security, local authority and others). The project explored the premise that the informal is always defined by its relationship to the formal: as Laguerre writes, informality ‘either accepts or resists the rules of the formal system’ (1994, 6).

Through describing specific conditions of Elephant and Castle I argued that that informality should not be merely associated with low-cost or marginalised areas of the city. In Elephant and Castle contrasting forms of street markets have been opened since 1990, from those selling everyday goods and groceries to pop-up craft markets and festival markets. While some market stalls have ‘resisted’ or contravened rules for development and street vending the architectural forms and physical conditions of places are not suitable indicators for their degree of informality.

In the second part of the lecture I discussed gradients of informality and the importance of avoiding oversimplified dichotomies associated with informality, such as bottom-up versus top-down, illegal versus legal and spontaneous versus permanent. That informality is not always illegal, bottom-up, local in scale, spontaneous, temporary or originating from poorer parts of the world, such as the Global South, is important to emphasise. In regards to the latter concern, Sassen writes: ‘Informality has long existed. Today after a century of efforts by the regulatory state, we see an expanding informality in the global North that I characterize as a systemic feature of advanced capitalism, rather than an importation of the third-world.’ (2005, 83).

In the third part of the lecture I focused on what Laguerre describes as models of informality. He conceptualises the informal, describing different perspectives, including: the formal and the informal as two alternative systems; the informal and the formal as two opposite parts of the same system; the informal existing as an enclave within a larger formal system; the formal operating as a smaller enclave within an informal system; the informal as a parasite to the formal system; and finally, the informal existing within interstitial spaces of the formal system. These concepts are useful in order to understand many situations of informality that are experienced in contemporary cities: As Roy describes: ‘[…] a differentiated process embodying varying degrees of power and exclusion’ (2005, 148).

In the final part of the lecture I concluded by highlighting issues of informality as they may relate to urban design practice. Firstly, informality is a gradient of actions. Although Laguerre refers to informal ‘spaces’ (1994), I argue that informality relates more closely to the ‘actions’ of individuals and groups. Secondly, there is intense interaction between the formal and the informal and this relationship is always changing through processes of formalization and informalization. Thirdly, although the informal is both a tactic of both rich and poor access to formal (and informal) systems is not equal. Laguerre (1994) argues that the informal is defined by the formal and this relationship is segregated and hierarchical. Fourth, I recognize that informality is essential: ‘Those who lack power, those who are disadvantaged, outsiders, discriminated minorities, can gain presence in such [informal] cities’ (Sassen 2005, 86). And finally, the informal can be a useful reference for analysing urban issues (Sassen 2005) and establishing alternative urban models (Tonkiss 2014).
Debates over emancipation, albeit not always explicitly outlined as the subject of planning and design discourses, have been providing valuable inputs to urban research and practice, ever since the linkages between emancipation and the city have been affirmed in the philosophical foundations of the social sciences. Throughout the 20th century a series of emancipatory spatial practices as well as accompanying scientific debates rendered urban spaces a liberating ground of opportunity and possibility, cosmopolitanism and freedom from a multitude of political, cultural, social and economic constraints. Although design and planning disciplines have been revising their practices to render the making of cities a more emancipatory process, the city as an artefact was to a great extent dominated by the Eurocentric narrative of modernism. Following the critique of the modernist approaches to conceiving, perceiving and living urban spaces raised in urban theory, the turn of the century witnessed the final rejection of the grand narrative of modernism as a mere relic of Western imperialism. This paradigm shift has freed up space for a plurality of responses carved along different strands aiming at the production of places of emancipation, which equally rely upon theoretical and practice-based approaches to the making of cities. This lecture (1) introduces the concept of the “post-political” thought in urban theory, (2) links it back to earlier thinkers who have stressed the importance of dissent and agonism to constantly revive democracies in practice and (3) outlines current strands in urban design theory that deal with democratic underpinnings of urban design theory in connection to wider critical debates on urban governance and the post-political condition. The lecture will give insights into a new book project that has been initiated through new innovative forms of transdisciplinary teaching the practice and theory of urban emancipation at the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space in 2014.

(1) The Post-Political Condition

Post-political thought has entered urban studies debates quite prominently with a seminal book called “The Post-Political and Its Discontents” (Wilson and Swyngedouw 2015). These authors have stated that “the gathered insurgents have expressed an extraordinary antagonism to the instituted - and often formally democratic - forms of governing, and have staged, performed and choreographed new configurations of the democratic” (ibid., 3). Wilson and Swyngedouw characterize processes of post-politicisation with the following aspects: (a) depoliticisation; (b) disappearance of the political; (c) erosion of democracy; (d) weakening of the public sphere; (e) politics of ethnicized and violent disavowal; (f) exclusion and containment of different political-economic models. While facilitating a transfer of core political theories on post-political thought to the realm of urban studies, they present three core thinkers of post-foundational thought, that is, Jacques Rancière, Chantal Mouffe and Slavoj Žižek (and differentiate the nuances of their positions). In summary, they state that “[i]n post-politics, political contradictions are reduced to policy problems to be managed by experts and legitimated through participatory processes in which the scope of possible outcomes is narrowly defined in advance. ‘The people’ - as a potentially disruptive political collective - is replaced by the population - the aggregated object of opinion polls, surveillance, and bio-political optimization. Citizens become consumers, and elections are framed as just another ‘choice’, in which individuals privately select their preferred managers of the conditions of economic necessity” (ibid., 6). Swyngedouw (2007) has labelled this consensual mode of governance as post-political condition characterized by patterns of depoliticization; the disappearance of the political; an erosion of democracy; the weakening of the public sphere and a politics of violent disavowal.

(2) Mouffe’s Democratic Paradox

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

(3) Inclusive and Democratic Urban Design

In two chapters of the book 'Urban Design, Space and Society', Ali Madanipour (2014), the book editor, elaborates features of 'Democratic Urbanism' and of 'Inclusive Urbanism': "The division of labour is one of the oldest features of urbanization. (...) Specialization and division of labour, however, is a process of bifurcation with different impacts in the economic and social fields: on the one hand, it leads to higher productivity; on the other hand to social fragmentation and stratification." (ibid., 129f) In the latter sense, the division of labour, according to Marx and Engels (1968) needs to be understood as "a source of inequality and alienation, creating a stratified society with a hierarchical organization based on property ownership and exploitation." (Madanipour 2014, 132). This division of labour is reflected in urban space (ibid., 134). Madanipour (2014, 136) points to the fact that the "emphasis on the functional organization of space is turning the social character of urban space into a technical one, so that the way cities are organized can be treated as a technical problem to be solved by professional designers and planners. Spatial organization, however, is a social process with all the complexities that this entails." In his view, public spaces are an essential ingredient of the infrastructure of social relationships, as it is here where temporal and political power are displayed, where society is controlled, where this control and power is challenged. This way, public space has "a strong role in democratic politics, allowing groups to form, demonstrations to take place and social difference to be played out in the public domain, developing awareness, confidence and action" (ibid., 191). Public space is also the place of difference of ideas and opinions, "where many sided truths coexist and where tolerance of different opinions is practised" (ibid., 201).

Contemporary controversies about the political and democratic quality of urban design is about "the extent to which the state has embraced the market’s values and behavior, how far private interests influence the shape and quality of the outcome, and how far the outcome is accessible and inclusive" (ibid., 197). At its core, says Madanipour (2014, 202) "the relationship between the public and private goes to the heart of a key concern of social philosophy: the relationship between individual and society, between self and others." On the side of the individual, the state needs to protect the private sphere, social and political rights of the individual whereas on the side of the overall society, the state needs to establish and protect a realm that caters for the needs of society, whereas a normative tension between the two exists (cf. ibid., 202). For contemporary times, "liberal politics promotes a normative separation of the public and private realms", while "the actual circumstances of public life have created conditions of increased ambiguity" (ibid., 217).
In this lecture I presented other ways of designing cities and public spaces. I highlighted a range of practices from utopian art and architecture visions to practical responses to neighbourhood conditions. I began the lecture by explaining three contexts for questioning the role and position of professional designers and the potential for new ways of designing and researching cities. Firstly, in 2014 the news channel Al Jazeera broadcast a series of documentaries, Rebel Architects. Each episode focused on designers working in different ways or untrained architects and builders undertaking essential work in their towns and neighbourhoods. Secondly, in 2015 the architecture and art collective Assemble won the Turner Prize for their renovation of a neighbourhood in Liverpool, England. The prestigious art prize was awarded to the collective for their work with residents of four streets in the Granby neighbourhood where they facilitated a small-scale and local community regeneration. Thirdly, in 2016, Alejandro Averena, founder of the architecture practice Elemental, won the Pritzker Prize for architecture. Many projects of Averena’s practice, such as Quinta Monroy (Iquique, Chile), are based on low-cost solutions that place ecological and social priorities ahead of architectural forms. Each of these occurrences highlights a growing challenge to traditional architectural and urban design practices, questioning the segregated and hierarchical structures of professional disciplines and the potential of other inventive ways of working. The three contexts highlight: the tendency of focusing on buildings as objects; the role of architects and urban designers; the top-down practices of control that are inherent in architecture; the linear process of architecture development, that is marked by initial and final stages; and the professional language employed by architects, including their drawings and visual projections.

In the second section I focused on how other ways of working can be envisioned. In Spatial Agency: Other Ways of Doing Architecture (2011), Awan, Schneider and Till critique the term ‘alternative’, claiming that such a term creates a binary structure that constantly refers to the thing that is alternative to: they write ‘As soon as one submits to the terms of reference of margin/centre then one inevitably submits to the terms of reference of the centre’ (2011, 26). Rather than reacting to or against a particular system I highlighted the potential of adopting techniques from other disciplines, cultures and techniques, ways of working that can be adopted directly or adapted and advanced.

In the final section I focused on specific project examples in order to emphasise the potential of new relations between professional and untrained approaches to city making: firstly, engaging with community groups; secondly, the importance of inclusive processes of design; thirdly, the appropriation of design processes by individuals and groups; fourthly, the reinvention of architectural practices, as discussed in the second part of the lecture; and finally, aspiring for but keeping under scrutiny the freedom of spaces and practices of other approaches to city making.
This lecture unit is an attempt to better understand that the current waves of urban protests are inherently linked to rapidly changing structural conditions and the decline of (national) democracies. It (1) offers an insight into the post-occupy struggles in public space against a new tech-led gentrification (San Francisco), (2) emphasizes recent political theory accounts that seek to explain the omnipresent democratic deficits of state governance and (3) establishes a link to what Ananya Roy has coined as worlding cities, a post-colonial perspective for research and theory that might be transferred to more practical steps of worlded or worlding urban design as well.

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

In Brazil, rounds of Free Fare Movement protests joined by thousands of young people, students repeatedly forced the local governments to cancel the increase of bus fare. In Taipei, university students took over the country’s Parliament building and occupied it for 24 days in protest against the passage of a trade pact with China that would further erode the nation’s economy and democratic institution. Yet as well cities in Europe increasingly witnessed the resurgence of emancipatory struggles and practices of resistance: In Greece, Portugal, and Spain, the indignados movements organized demonstrations against austerity policies. In Stuttgart, protestors demonstrated against the redevelopment of the city’s main railway station by occupying the public park that would be vastly destroyed by the redevelopment.

In Istanbul, citizens protested against the proposed urban design project foreseen for Geczi Park near Taksim Square by setting up encampment on the park. Yet there are even more recent acts of urban resistance visible. Two case are analyzed in downtown San Francisco: a study of the google bus blockades, in combination with a research into changing sociocultural and socioeconomic uses of a sports pitch in San Francisco’s Mission District. Along the google bus routes, tech-workers from the Silicon Valley are considered as the new gentry to habit the houses of former communities of color (Afro-American and Hispanic-Americans). The tech-engineers also ‘hire’ a sports pitch which is part of the everyday life of young people of color, who grew up using the pitch continuously and in an inclusive manner. Successive outbursts of urban resistance in San Francisco address the social, cultural and political impacts of tech-led gentrification processes in the wider Bay Area. These recent acts of urban resistance share many things in common. In addition to the popular use of social media and the adoption of a horizontal structure for mobilization, many of the protests have re-introduced public space, in forms of streets, squares, parks, and parliament buildings, as the stage for political struggle against rising authoritarian forms of governing, the social impacts of uneven global restructuring and an increasing informalization and urban poverty. This re-centering of focus on public space is particularly significant as it comes at a time when public space, understood as the embodied geography of the public sphere have been undermined after decades of corporatization, privatization, commodification, enforcement of hyper-security in many parts of the world.

(2) Egalitarian Democracy (Jacques Rancière) and Presentist Democracy (Isabel Lorey)
While rising urban inequality has characterized cities of the liberal west at least since the 1970s, urban scholarship has dealt in different ways with developing analytical tools to unravel patterns of uneven spatial development, social inequality and urban poverty. While class-analysis has been criticized in the course of a growing individualist reorganisation of (not exclusively) Western capitalist societies (e.g. Beck 2007), more recent contributions from cultural sociology have reinstated class analysis and linked it back to the scholarship of (urban) inequality (Tyler 2015). On the other side, new ways forward have been sketched that call for public spaces to stage equality and for emerging city publics to pursue egalitarian claims. The second part will thus dive deeper into explanations for the current pitfalls or market-and-state led governance regimes. Rancière for instance states that democracy is “not a political regime” (Rancière 2010, 31, cited in Lorey 2014, 50), nor “a type of constitution, [or] a form of society. The
power of the people is not that of a people gathered together, of the majority or the working class. It is simply the power peculiar to those who have no more entitlements to govern than to submit” (ibid. 2006, 46–7, cited in Lorey 2014, 50). Democracy, in this sense, is the constituent power of “those who have no part – which does not mean the ‘excluded’ but anyone whoever” (ibid. 2010, 60, cited in Lorey 2014, 50). The demos corresponds not to a people, but “the one who speaks when s/he is not to speak, the one who part-takes in what s/he has no part in” (ibid. 2010, 32, cited in Lorey 2014, 50). With the reference to Rancière’s fundamental critique of representative democracy, Lorey (2014) expands on this thought as a critique of representative democracy as a form of bourgeois democracy by developing the concept of ‘presentist democracy’ which she claims has been practiced through the principle of horizontality in the recent civic uprisings globally. For her, the modern promise of coming democracy has remained unfulfilled, as the political democracy remains separated from an achievement of claims of social equality. For her the struggles taking place to achieve democracy (democracia real ya) take place in the ‘now-time’ (’Jetztzeit’), but that does not mean they are untouched by the past. The now-time is specifically not a temporality that remains as an immediate presence, as an authenticity of body and affect only. It is constructive temporality, in which the slivers of history are newly composed, in which history persistently emerges. The now-time is the creative midpoint, not a transition of the past into the future.

(3) Worlded urbanism (Ananya Roy)

Ananya Roy’s work around the concept of the subaltern urbanism, is a good starting point for urban designers interested in relating their work to urban research that aims at reconfiguring stereotyped versions of non-Western (mega) cities with the objective to emphasize the power of urban inhabitants, particularly poor populations, to act. Such a subaltern urbanism starts from the perspective that the urban subaltern are an agent of change (Grubbauer 2017, 282, referring to Roy 2011, 227), providing own spatial agency:

As regards planning and colonial hegemony, Roy (2010, 41, original emphasis) emphasizes that “planners must pay attention to the battle of ideas, to the politics of knowledge and the ethics of expertise. Although it is crucial to understand what development does to poor subjects, it is also important to study how development constructs its subjects, how some ideas come to be seen as best practices, and how structures of power are perpetuated through such systems of knowledge” (ibid). Following a plea for a (postcolonial?) Foucaultian analytics, she (ibid, 42) promotes that “in all of this there is much that can be learned by looking to the counter-hegemonic, through a journey to the margins. Here is revealed not necessarily the pristine alternative to the global order but planning forms that are unanticipated, struggles that are ongoing, and the sense that the battle of ideas has not been fully lost” when considering how planners approach the concrete issue of urban poverty.

Ong (2011) and Lanz (2015) have also pointed to the relevance of everyday urban practices within postcolonial urban theory, a key facet which the licterer of this course has amended through the finding that, in this sense, any attempt at worlding urban theory means to undo what is considered as normal, to ‘de-everyday’ it (part I). Vice versa, any attempt of analyzing lived space can be enriched not just empirically but also by the intellectual critique that postcolonial theorists have issued, thus enhancing our specters and paths of de-everydaying lived space. Linking this postcolonial critique with a pedagogical and empirical focus on urban poverty (no matter in which city around the globe) might be a quite precise theme to start with. Another focus on the socially innovative features of insurgent planning approaches might enrich the debate on the planning theory level.

Jyoti Hosagrahar (2012, 70) reflects on how postcolonial thought travelled from an initial debate in the humanities towards the field of architecture and urbanism, and delineates that “postcolonial perspectives in architecture and urbanism offer ways of thinking about built form and space as cultural landscapes that are at once globally interconnected and precisely situated in space and time.” Postcolonial perspectives thereby particularize universal narratives and globalize narrowly parochial ones. To Hosagrahar’s understanding, “postcolonial perspectives in architecture and urbanism do not form a well-defined body of knowledge or a fixed set of stylistic tropes even today” (ibid., 71). She then identifies a couple of lines of introducing postcolonial thinking from the margins: (1) an emphasis on the particularities of region, site and context; (2) an-depth knowledge of place and people; (3) social responsibility in design; (ibid., 80f). These can be directly linked to a deep critique of everyday life and an analysis of urbanization processes through the lens of lived space.

Ananya Roy (2011, 308) has proposed the concept of worlding to recover and restore the vast array of global strategies of urban development and the production of urban space and models of urbanism that include those previously marginal in the production of urban research and theory: “I am interested in a genre of postcolonial analytics that critically deconstructs the ‘worlding’ of knowledge. My interest lies not in the urban environments that
are usually designated as postcolonial cities but, rather, in how, postcolonial theory may enable new lines of urban research and theory. Worlding means (1) an analysis of the worlding of the world but equally (2) an effort to imagine other worlds (Roy 2014, 18, quoted by Lanz 2015, 78). It becomes clear that everyday life as mediated through spatial praxis is a means of detecting colonized/colonizing relations, but also of overcoming (implicit, explicit) patterns of racism and neocolonialism in contemporary urban development through ‘worlding’. Worlding and urban everyday practices “creatively imagine and shape alternative social visions and configurations – that is ‘worlds’” (Ong 2011, 12). There are many key lessons for architects and urban designers to be learned here.
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Introduction
This essay brings into dialogue two lecture units and traces the points of connections and divergence of their key theoretical and empirical concepts. The two units that are discussed below focus on: (i) the embodied dimension of protests as an affective form of staging dissent and the ‘politics of affect’ (Unit 6) and (ii) the informal spaces and their relation to formal urban structures (Unit 9). Inspired by the key theoretical points of the two lecture units, the essay supports that contemporary cities that experience austerity politics and rapid transformation of the social and spatial landscape, like Greek cities, constitute paradigmatic sites where informal and embodied spaces emerge.

The structure of the essay is as follows. First, it draws some insights into the key concepts, elaborating mainly on urban informality, performativity and embodied spaces. In doing so, it supports that a relational understanding of informality in urban spaces can assist us to develop a complex and nuanced understanding of contemporary urbanization processes. In this line of argument, it supports that informality should be understood as a performative practice. It continues by pointing out the relation between the body and urban space, emphasizing the importance of embodied practice and performance as practices that open up new political spaces. Second, it explores the emergence of informal and embodied spaces in Greek cities during the austerity period. In specific, it focuses on the analysis of the Syntagma square occupation and the social solidarity structures, using the theoretical tools of informality, embodied protest and performativity. Finally, it argues that when informality, embodied space and performativity are discussed in parallel, a dynamic framework for the understanding of lived everyday spaces is developed.

Theoretical framework:
informal and embodied spaces
The first lecture unit that is analyzed in this essay, explores the concept of informality and supports that we should develop a relational understanding of informality. During the last decades, there is an increasing academic interest on spaces of informality by scholars that attempt to trace the multiple and diverse futures of contemporary urban development. Nevertheless, theoretical and empirical approaches to formality and informality are far from constituting a univocal and homogeneous framework. The existing literature can be categorized in two broad sections: (i) the approaches where informality is understood as a totally separate sector from formality and (ii) the approaches that attempt to surpass this binary distinction and recognize formality and informality as modes of urbanization that exist in parallel. The following section examines each of these approaches and focuses mainly on the second one.

When informality and formality are understood as distinct oppositional categories, informality is often linked to the urban development of the mega-cities of the Global South. Thus, two contradictory discourses prevail. On the one hand, informality appears as an uncontrollable dark aspect of certain areas where specific rules and values exist. The binary between formal and informal –housing, economy, settlements- often carry with it implicit positive connotations of formality and a devaluation of informality. On the other hand, informality in cities of the Global South is often presented as a kind of heroism, resistance and spontaneity, through which poor people manage to find successful alternative ways of living.

Before moving on a relational understanding of informality, it is crucial to point out that there are four ways through which informality can be conceptualized (McFarlane, 2012): (i) as a spatial category, such as the informal settlements and the slums, (ii) as an organizational form of the society, such as the unorganized/unregulated labour, (iii) as a governmental tool and (iv) as a negotiable value and practice, something that is an alternative to all the three previous understandings. In the same vein, Laguerre (1994) attempts to move beyond commonly accepted dichotomies, such as formal and informal and develop a complex reading of informal processes. According to him, formality and informality are not two opposing poles but gradients of actions that should be understood always in relation to one another.

So, reading formality and informality as parallel practices, Colin McFarlane (2012:101) supports...
that informality can be understood as a mode of knowing the city, recognising that "people [...] move between formal and informal activities and arrangements, not just over the course of their lives but also over a single day". While people perform their everyday lives, they employ certain formal or informal urban practices and consequently they perform a certain kind of subjectivity. As McFarlane (2012:104, emphasis added) support, "informality is performed: it names a way of doing things". In the same vein, Tonkiss (2014:91) argues that "informality should not be equated with practices of 'urbanization from below'. Rather processes and practices of informality are a systematic feature of rich and poorer countries".

Moreover, a crucial point is that informality is not inherently illegal; and vice versa formality is not inherently illegal. Understanding formality and informality as performative practices that are taking place in specific social, political and spatial contexts, we can understand that they can be performed by diverse social actors with different –even contradictory- purposes. As Roy (2009, as cited in McFarlane, 2012:93) emphasizes, even "the state can use informality as an instrument of accumulation and authority". So, moving beyond the idea that formality and informality belong to different kind of urban spaces and to different social categories of the population (for instance formality belonging to state offices and formal institutions while informality to poor neighbourhoods), will assist us to think of formality and informality as performative urban practices rather than pre-existing urban geographies. “From this perspective, rather than viewing informality and formality as fixed categories, or as mutually exclusive, the two appear as lines of changing practice and movement, taking place not above or in advance of urban life, but within its unfolding” (McFarlane, 2012:101).

It is exactly at this point that the notions of performance and embodied space become important to the framework of this essay. The second lecture unit that is analyzed in this essay focus on embodied space and the performative turn. The main points of the unit are: (i) the embodied practices in urban spaces, such as occupations (mainly in the field of anthropology), (ii) the relation between space, affects and politics (in the field of social sciences) and (iii) performative urbanism (or urbanismo afectivo) (in the field of urban studies).

During the previous decades, many sociologists, anthropologists and geographers tried to deconstruct and analyze the relation between the body and the mind. While at the beginning body and mind were conceived as separate domains, anthropological theories evolved and brought into dialogue the concepts of body, space and culture. One of the most important contributions in this turn is the theory of Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu (1984) employs the term habitus, in order to understand how the body, the mind and emotions are interrelated and "how social status and class position become embodied in everyday life" (as cited in Low, 2003:12). So, [the] integrated notion of embodied space addresses the metaphorical and material aspects of the body in space as well as body/space to communicate, transform, and contest existing social structures" (Low, 2003:16).

The performative turn, according to Dirksmeier and Helbrecht (2010:40), marks a strong turn in the understanding of action not only as practical but also as "symbolic, public as well as social" (Eyerman, 2004). The concept of performance, which remains until today a mostly marginal theoretical tool in cultural urban geography, addresses centrally questions on everyday experience which are inadequately addressed through the representationally oriented approaches (Latham, 2003:1994). To put it in Thrifts' words (2000:577), performance is "the art of producing the now". This understanding of performance emphasizes the event-character of urban practices. Developing a political conceptualization of urban performances, Dirksmeier and Helbrecht (2010:45) point out that when examining urban performances it is important to put centrally "questions of authority and power, mechanisms of subalternization, issues of hegemony and difference".

But how can theories of embodied space and performative urbanism help us explore the ongoing rapid urban transformations? Both of these theories are highly important for the understanding of the recent urban politics. Austerity urbanism affects many cities worldwide and pose great challenges to the urban inhabitants. “These challenges result in the increasing and accelerated precarization of bodies, labor and space” (Krasny, 2016:17). As Krasny (2016) supports, the recent experiences of urban crisis and the processes of public protests bring at the forefront important academic and activist discussion on the politics of care. Here, we can identify a link with the discussion on informality, which will be analyzed through the following case studies. In specific, Krasny (2016:19) points out that before the very recent works on immaterial labor by thinkers such as Michael Hardt or Silvia Federici, “numerous types of what is now called affective labor has been equated with (invisible) work, such as domestic work, service work, care work”, that can be also understood in terms of informality.
Moreover, in recent years, we witnessed diverse types of embodied occupations of urban spaces. The theory of embodied space operates as a useful tool in analyzing these occupations and protests. Sheehan Moore (2013:6) emphasizes that it is important to understand occupations “not only as declarative – i.e. as political statements – but also as embodied and spatial practice”. As he points out, the recent literature has focused extensively in the discursive dimensions of the occupation, but paid little or no attention to the bodily dimension of protest. Moreover, Judith Butler (2015) broadens the theory of performativity beyond speech acts, so as to include centrally the actions of the body. Butler (2015:10) argues that when protests manifest and persist in space, “the very public character of the space is being disputed and even fought over when these crowds gather”. In her words (2015:11),

“when bodies assemble on the street, in the square, or in other forms of public space (including virtual ones) they are exercising a plural and performative right to appear, one that asserts and instates the body in the midst of the political field, and which, in its expressive and signifying function, delivers a bodily demand for a more liveable set of economic, social, and political conditions no longer afflicted by induced forms of precarity”.

Based on these central concepts of informality, embodied protest and performativity, the following part aims to bring some insights from the Greek cities in the age of austerity, so that connections can be better established between the theoretical concepts.

**Informal and embodied spaces in Greece in the years of austerity**

During the last years, Greece, like many others cities of the European South, is experiencing a deepening social, political and economic crisis. The effects of the crisis and austerity are evident in every aspect of the everyday life of urban inhabitants and give rise to a series of new urban imaginaries. The urban space constitutes the terrain through which urban dwellers create new collective forms of everyday life. This essay argues that these spaces can be read as informal and embodied spaces. In developing this argument, the following part focuses on the case of Greece since 2010, elaborating on two processes that can be the starting points for a parallel examination of the two central concepts. These processes are (i) the Syntagma Square occupation and (ii) the informal solidarity initiatives (solidarity economy and social clinics) that have emerged during the years of the ‘more-than-financial’ crisis in Greek cities.

In May 2011, and 10 days after the occupation of Puerta del Sol in Madrid by the Indignados, a large gathering took place in Syntagma Square in Athens. In the following days, the Syntagma Square was occupied by thousands of people who through their presence in the square re-appropriated public spaces in and around the square, that were until that time mainly occupied by tourists and commercial activities. The protesters claimed the square as the space to enunciate their dissent to the continuous devastating austerity measures and the deterioration of their lives.

Although the discursive dimensions of the occupation are crucial, the main point within the context of this essay is the importance of the embodied dimension. According to Moore (2013:12), the discursive reading of occupations can help us understand “a politics of ‘anti’ - that is, a politics that is primarily deconstructive and oppositional” that emerge through these occupation. However, pointing more attention to the embodied dimension of occupation leads us to an understanding of “‘alter’ politics, which addresses itself to open-ended alternative physical and political realities”. Consistently, a closer reading of the Syntagma Square helps us understand that while the protestors stayed at the square for several weeks a network of new spaces and social relations were built. The large number of people that were spending whole days in the square have organized a network of self-organized, horizontal and collective practices, such as solidarity kitchen, clothes exchange, first-aid station and informal hospital (Kaika and Karaliotas, 2014). The bodies that gathered in the public space of the square “open[ed] up political possibilities for the future at the same time as oppose[d] the politics of the present” (Moore, 2013:16, emphasis at the original). In Butler’s words (2015:9-10, emphasis at the original),

“After all, there is an indexical force of the body that arrives with other bodies in a zone visible to media coverage: it is this body, and these bodies, that require employment, shelter, health care, and food, as well as a sense of a future that is not the future of unpayable debt; it is this body, or these bodies, or bodies like this body or these bodies, that live the condition of an imperilled livelihood, decimated infrastructure, accelerating precarity”.

After the square occupations in 2011, a plethora of community groups and neighbourhood organizations emerged in urban neighbourhoods. These initiatives were –and still are- organized through informal meetings and networking and build their relationship through the informal spaces of peoples’ everyday lives. So, practices that can be helpful in understanding the relation between informality and embodied
performativity are practices of the emerging informal solidarity economy such as the anti-middleman movement. Through the grassroots organization of solidarity economy initiatives, people began to imagine and practice new “modes of economic conduct of interaction different from those currently dominant in Greece” (Rakopoulos, 2013:102). An important issue that the anti-middleman movement raises in terms of the above discussion on informality, is the efforts that the participants made in many cases to establish formal co-operatives, formalizing their previous structures but still staying beyond the formal economic structure of the state. Analyzing informal solidarity economy initiatives, Rakopoulos (2015:85) supports that there is a contradiction between informal and formalized economic activity, which is “demonstrated between the fluid features of ‘solidarity’ networks and the formalization proposed or imposed on them by state institutions”. As he emphasizes, “in Thessaloniki, the informal solidarity economy proves to be more efficient that the work of NGOs” (Rakopoulos, 2015:85).

In relation to the structures of solidarity economy, many social solidarity clinics have emerged in Greek cities during the last years. In particular, in Thessaloniki, a social solidarity clinic began operating in November 2011. The aim was to provide free primary health care to uninsured and unemployed locals and immigrants of the city. The initiative emerged in the face of the government’s decision to introduce a €5 fee for every visit to the hospital. Thessaloniki’s social clinic is self-organized and self-managed and its operation is based on the work of volunteer doctors from the city. All the decisions for the operation of the clinic are taken in its general assembly, with the equal participation of all the people that are involved.

This social solidarity clinic can be directly understood both as informal and embodied space. The social clinic is an informal structure that was created as a response to the state’s failure in providing basic healthcare to citizens. So, a direct relation is built between a formal system that produces inequalities and an informal system that directly challenges these inequalities and stage democratic politics. Moreover, Thessaloniki’s social clinic, by not resting on a type of protest or demonstration, manages to create a kind of alter politics of care. Specifically, in the midst of “a biopolitical situation in which diverse populations are increasingly subject to what is called ‘precarization’” (Butler, 2015:15), the body is extensively being attacked. These ‘attacks’ are enacted both directly (for instance through cuts in health care) or indirectly (something that is evident from the rising number of suicides as a result of the worsening living conditions) from the hegemonic processes of austerity. However, social clinics and other similar structures that embody a politics of care manages to develop a wide network of solidarity and support that questions directly the fear and insecurity through collective embodied practices.

Concluding remarks
As the above theoretical and empirical analysis demonstrated, when the concepts of informality, embodied protest and performativity are examined in parallel, a dynamic framework for the analysis of contemporary urban politics and lived spaces is developed.

Through the case of Greece in times of austerity, informality obtains a renewed significance. Besides, as Saskia Sassen (Sassen, 2005:83) points out informality is not a new process and should not only be connected with urbanization processes in cities of the Global South. On the contrary, it constitutes “a systematic feature of advanced capitalism”. Capitalist crisis, like the current crisis, “can act to dramatize and thereby make starkly visible forms of informal politics that characterise seemingly ‘formal’ spaces such as those of urban planning and development” (McFarlane, 2012:90). Moreover, the case of social solidarity initiatives manifested that informal urbanization “is [...] an important site for urban mobilisations, the politics and practices of self-help, and alternative urban designs” (Tonkiss, 2014: 111).

In parallel, during times of crisis and generalized precarization, bodies acquire a central role in staging dissent and performing a democratic politics in the here and now, enacting a claim to the political. The lived physical and material dimensions of protest coupled with a politics of care manage to enunciate an anti- but also (and most importantly) an alter-politics, that challenge existing power structures and inequalities.
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A comparative study between lecture unit 6 "The Body under pressure. Affect, politics and urbanismo afectivo" (Sabine Knierbein) and lecture unit 9 "Between infrastructural forms and informal actions" (Ed Wall).

I started with the concept of informality of Sassen (2005) and Tonkiss (2014) and the issues brought up around it (lecture unit 9). As it is argued that informality is very present in today's everyday life I assumed that these subjects also occur in the recommended texts of lecture unit 6. I tracked down those connection points and consequently linked the texts of lecture unit 6 and unit 9. Furthermore, I examined in which context informality was raised and to which topics or conclusions it lead to. The following Figure 1 Approach illustrates my concept for this essay. It shows how I connected the different topics raised by the given authors. I believe that depicting this structure will make it easier to comprehend the applied method.

As the analysed texts are quite different and concentrate on distinctive levels of research – some are rather theoretical (Wolfrum 2015, Hardt 2007), others are centred around a certain case study (Moore 2013) and again others are an analysis of complex issues trying to derive some general characteristics to explain them (Sassen 2005, Tonkiss 2014) – not all of them can equally contribute to the following essay. This is the reason why they are referred to in a varying extent.

1. The concept of Informality

Nowadays topographic maps tend to focus on dichotomies in space, e.g. poor and rich areas. As Sassen argues, this is a strong simplification imparting an insufficient view of the complex reality (2005: p. 83). In order to gain a more adequate picture of reality one should rather focus on the interconnections between those – only seemingly opposite, unconnected – realms.

The strengths of the proposed approach are as follows (ibid):
- It helps to understand not only today’s but also tomorrows cities.
- It provides a better understanding of their complexity.
- It serves to gain a more comprehensive view on reality as one focuses on the underlying connections, interactions and dependencies.

Sassen’s approach is to construct spaces of intersections, which she intentionally frames analytic boarderlands - not lines (2005: p. 83). This concept of circuits helps to trace economic activities besides the general mainstream perception. Those circuits can further be applied on different levels: Translocal circuits for example help to detect particular networks that connect specific activities in one city with certain activities of a branch of economy. The circuit approach – in contrast to a topographic one – recognizes and captures localized specialization of global economic circuits and does not obscure contestation, whereas a topographic approach only captures the physical features of poorer neighbourhoods, ignoring their inherent potential (Sassen, 2005: p. 84).

As illustrated in Figure 2 Interconnectivity on a translocal level, Sassen argues that global cities are new sites for new basic intermediate economy – this term means that some tasks of global economic sectors are fulfilled by actors of the informal economy (2005: p. 85). A growing sector leads to an increasing demand for informal economy; an unequal distribution of income changes the lifestyle and consumption patterns: those on the downside of this development are rather forced to offer their workforce in the informal working sector; those benefitting meet their demands on the informal sector (Sassen 2005: p. 86).

As already indicated mentioning the insufficiency of topographic maps, one of Sassen’s main points of critique is the opposite perception on issues of economic development which can be found both in the Global North and South (2005: p. 84): In the Global North there is a formation of
corporate complexes and immigrant communities noticeable. In the Global South the same process is taking place, although the immigrant communities are rather called informal cities. The main difference though is, that in the Global North this formation of immigrant communities is seen as imported from the Global South, whereas in the Global South it is perceived as a sign of underdevelopment. Sassen contradicts this, arguing that informality is actually a systemic feature of advanced capitalism (2005: p. 85). She argues that there is a strong interconnectivity between the different outcomes of informality, being at the very same time extremely segmented though – this segmentation is supported and enhanced by racism and discrimination (ibid.).

Figure 2 Interconnectivity on a translocal level
Own Visualization (Sassen, 2005: p. 83f.)

1.1 Ambiguity of Informality
In her text Sassen does not really define her understanding of informality. It is rather taken as a given term which does not need any further clarification. Nevertheless she already pointed to some ambiguity that is inherent in informality, as she criticises informality being perceived differently whether one is talking about phenomena of the Global North or Global South. Also Tonkiss is picking up on that point in her paper The Contradictions of Informality (2014). She does not limit her argumentation on the economic sphere but extends it, to also include the informal dimension of the physical shaping of the city and of its social organisation (2014: p. 93). She further stresses that informality is very present in today’s urban areas – or as Tonkiss puts it: informality is not only an ‘idiom of urbanization (Roy 2009: p. 9)’, but now its first language (Tonkiss, 2014, p. 97).

As she states – and also Sassen had a similar point (2005: p. 84) - developed countries are tended to be connected with formality, whereas developing countries are associated with informality. This perception does not hold true when being closer examined. There are informal activities occurring in each part of the world and carried out by every social group. Informality is not limited to developing countries and not only performed by the poorest members of society. Also the most powerful for example in London act informal, which becomes apparent when thinking of e.g. extra legal settlements, appropriations etc. (Tonkiss 2014: p. 99). In this context the term inequity planning is introduced, which describes the habit of disguising planning for the elites as formal neutrality (ibid.). Nevertheless it remains an open question why the informality of the rich is so often invisible, unrecognized and legitimized (Tonkiss, 2014: p. 96)? Further one should keep in mind that informality does not automatically mean a lack of rules as social practices always follow a social order (Tonkiss, 2014: p. 93).

Pointing out ambiguities around informality, Tonkiss demolishes the mainstream view towards informal acts. She followed the strategy of deconstructing supposedly opposed aspects, revealing their ambiguity (2014: p.102-110). In this context I do not intend to mention all her points but to briefly outline her first three pairs of ambiguity:

1. Organic settlement | Slum
This point addresses the fact that the UN definition of slums consists of five conditions that can also be found as common in wealthy cities (Tonkiss 2014: p. 103). This aims to reveal that the seemingly huge difference between slum areas and housing conditions in cities of the Global North is actually quite small - or rather in some aspects (insecure tenure, overcrowding, poor housing quality) they do not differ at all (ibid.).

2. Self-help | Abandonment
A lot of the economic activities in developing countries are done informally. They are furthermore strongly tied to the advanced economic sector, as many of its material needs are met through the informal sector, e. g. domestic labour (Tonkiss 2014: p. 104) – this point was also mentioned by Sassen (2005: p. 86). Especially disadvantaged groups (women, minorities) are affected by these precarious working conditions. Which is why there is also a tendency of these groups to self-help – the enterprise of exclusion (ibid.). Further there is a state of abandonment in terms of the distribution of welfare and economic resources noticeable (partly due to austerity policies, partly because states themselves act ineffectively). Informality can help people to regain access to resources (Tonkiss 2014: p. 105). Particularly as the state itself is often interwoven with informality, for example in terms of corruption (ibid.)

3. Social capital | Racketeering
In informal conditions, social ties are often used
for economic purposes – and this not only by the poor (Tonkiss 2014: p. 105). Due to increasing privatization people, especially the poorest and most dependent, rely more strongly on this sort of networks. This development comes along with exclusion, closure and so on, also known as the dark side of social capital (ibid.). On the other hand, this kind of everyday deal-making based on social ties mobilizes resources for the unprivileged, whether it is about being granted access to money, favours or goods (Tonkiss 2014: p. 106). One can even argue that this informality from below only mirrors the informality from above (ibid.).

Tonkiss shows three more levels of ambiguity (Temporary use & Insecurity, ‘Looseness’ & Disorder, Commonality & Invasive publicness) – mentioning all of them would exceed the framework of this essay though.

1.2 Causes for this development & possibilities to react

The reason for the growing informality is both the withdrawal of the state, especially after the financial crisis, and the very selective number of persons who benefit from privatizations (Tonkiss 2014: p. 111). As briefly outlined, Sassen (2005: p. 84) adds another interesting facet to this discussion, stating that informality and advanced economy are interdependent. Nevertheless todays urban dwellers struggle the most with uneven growth and the related spatial injustice as well as with the consequences of austerity measures (Knierbein, Krasny, Viderman, 2016: p. 17). This might be another cause for the growth of informal conditions, which leads to precarization of bodies, labour and space (Knierbein, Krasny, Viderman, 2016: p. 17). An example for the consequences are evictions in Spain.

Tonkiss pleads for measures that strengthen the position of those living/working in the informal sphere rather than excluding, marginalizing and criminalising them (2014: p. 112). Her main argument for this approach is the cost, as those soft measures are simply cheaper in both financial and social terms (Tonkiss 2014: p. 98). Krasny et al. add a more tangible facet to that, as for example being evicted and therefore pushed towards an informal housing condition comes with high social costs: traumata, social estrangement and so forth (Knierbein, Krasny, Viderman 2016: p. 17).

Urban planners, among others, are in the position of addressing issues of informality. Nevertheless they might need to change their set of tools or adopt them to the specific context in order to achieve a well-perceived result. One way this might be achieved is using – as Sandercock terms it – Radical planning (1998: p. 85f., 129. Cited from Knierbein, Krasny, Viderman 2016: p. 11).

This means using the knowledge of a certain community and acting within a different social position, no longer only loyal to the state.

2. The Formation of New Political Actors

Sassen concludes by mentioning the following development: the formation of new political actors, who are only apparently disconnected from their city politics (2005: p. 86f.). In this context one should keep in mind Ticktin’s distinction between politics and the political. The aim of politics is to maintain the order, the political on the contrary aims to do the exact opposite, namely disrupt the established order (2011: p. 251. Cited from Moore, 2013: p. 12). The power of those new political actors lies in their physical presence in the city. First being active or involved in so-called politics of the streets one is simply not so easy to oversee. It is easier to get involved in city level politics than at the national level. Second, the internet offers the opportunity to connect the local level with the global sphere (Sassen 2005: p. 87), making it easy to report to a broad audience about certain issues, learning from other street-level activists and exchange information.

The following two developments – the rise of the affective turn and affective labour and a new interpretation of occupation– might be understood as examples for Sassen’s formation of new political actors within the sphere of informality.

- Affective Turn

Spain for example is one of the countries which was heavily affected by the global financial crisis of 2008 and suffers from austerity measures ever since. As a consequence, people were pushed into the informal realm, suffering for instance from evictions. Apart from all the traumatic personal experiences there was the formation of a large number of public protests, collective resistance and solidarity noticeable (Knierbein, Krasny, Viderman 2016: p. 17). In this context Cvetkovich writes about the Affective Turn, which becomes evident for example when cultural memory and public cultures emerge in response to histories of traumata (2012: p. 3. Cited from Knierbein, Krasny, Viderman 2016: p. 18). One of the key elements of affect is the rediscovery of the human body. One might also refer to this development as politics of care (Knierbein, Krasny, Viderman 2016: p. 18).

The affective turn (Hardt, 2007: p. ix) focuses on both body and emotions – two realms we have become used to see divided from each other, maybe even opposing. To change this perception is actually one of the challenges regarding the affective turn (ibid.). According to Spinoza the strength of affects is firstly that body and mind
are understood to be equal, not one stronger than the other (Spinoza 1985: Cited from Hardt 2007: p. ix). Although autonomous from each other the mind’s power to think develops parallel to the body’s power to act (Hardt 2007: p. ix.). Second Hardt sees a connection between a person’s power to act and his or her power to be affected (2007: p. x). He claims the greater the ability to be affected, the greater the ability to act (ibid.).

This concept of affective turn can be practically used in the field of social sciences and humanity, e.g. when it comes to an analysis of labour systems. As Hardt (2007: p. xi) puts it, the term affective labour combines two dimensions in one: the first dimension has its origin in feminist studies, addressing gendered forms of labour, e.g. care or maternal work. Those are again examples for the informal economic sector; as those areas of profession happen to be located in the illicit sphere. The second dimension is related to high-level knowledge-based productive practices, also referred to as cognitive labour (ibid.). Health care workers can be categorized as an example for affective labour, combining an activity where body and mind are both engaged, intelligence and feeling both work together (ibid.).

Hardt concludes that there is an evident affective turn in the scientific community. There are essays published investigating the functions of affect, others rethink the connection between body, affect and technology and still others investigate the affect of traumata concerning migration (2007: p. xii).

• Occupation
Occupations are characterized by their unique form of persistence, which is both temporal and spatial, taking place in spaces occupants are forbidden to go to and are centred around the human body (Moore 2013: p. 6). Within the last decade they are mostly a result of austerity measures, which followed the financial crisis in 2008 (Moore 2013: p. 9). This connects them to the already introduced concepts of informality, which argue that increasing precarious living conditions force more and more people towards the realm of informality. Moore further states that a physical occupation enables people to make claims they are not able to articulate in a conventional discourse (2013: p. 14).

Moore (2013: p. 6) starts his line of argument with an example of an informal practice: the student occupation of the McGill University against increasing tuition fees in 2011, where they were blocking an entrance with their bodies. Those students called for the continuation to move beyond the liberal model of ‘discourse’ that has only served to maintain unjust power relations and control. Acting boldly and defying prescribed boundaries, we subvert the logic of submission (McGill Daily, 2011).

Moore picks up that point, arguing that those forms of protest could be seen as embodied and spatial practices rather than a solely political discourse (2013: p. 6f.). In this context he specifically focuses on the role of the body (2011: p. 15). If we follow his proposed point of view, one might discover further important dimensions of an occupation. According to Moore’s line of argument when seeing occupations only in a political discourse we miss the following:

• Firstly, the important dimensions of radical practice and
• Secondly, to balance the chosen tactic against the demands (2013: p. 12) – although for the participants the sole participation might be far more meaningful than the fulfilment of their claims.

Moore contextualizes occupation within the field of critical anthropology (2013: p. 11): citing Hage (2012: p. 290) he points out that there are certain social forces and potentials that are unnoticed, nevertheless there is the need to become aware of them and to animate them. Critical anthropology has the potential to help doing so.

Remembering Ticktin’s already mentioned definition of politics and political one can claim that it is the political dimension of performativity that shows the limits of politics (Moore 2013: p. 14). Blocking the university with the own body changes reality and therefore shows the limitations of set-up rules. As the occupants in the specific case had no demands, they opened up a room for opportunities as the occupied space could not function in the way it did before – but in any other way (Moore 2013: p. 13).

3. Conclusions
I believe that the main strength of Tonkiss’ essay is to raise awareness on how we perceive informality and how ambiguous we judge different types of informal behaviour. Reading this analysis one becomes aware of how this contrasting perception of processes of informality is already internalized, therefore not realized and not further questioned. Being aware of this issue, I could also find traces of informality in other texts – albeit they were not always explicitly mentioned as such.

That further illustrates how interconnected informality is with a lot of different subjects, concepts, approaches and so forth – and I did by far not mention all those interconnections but only a very selected and minor part of that network. Using this approach to the chosen texts
some examples for new political actors – that emerge with informality – became obvious: Firstly, we looked at the occupants of McGill University, using a performative approach by blocking the university building with their own bodies. Secondly it made apparent that the affective turn – especially the concept of affective labour – deals with levels of informality as well.

Most of the texts – except Wolfrum’s article which focused on defining terms – deal with some rather troubling phenomena which occur in today’s world and society. Nevertheless they all conclude with a positive, optimistic statement. They address, acknowledge and criticise current developments but at the same time offer different approaches, show ways how to address those problems and recognize potentials. Therefore their attitude is rather ‘alter’ than ‘anti’.

Tonkiss for example suggests how informality can be dealt with in a more socially sustainable way (2014: p. 112). She further argues that the vivid, inventive ways of informality might offer an alternative model for dead spaces in formal cities (Tonkiss 2014: p. 97). Moore emphasizes the unique role of the body when protesting or expressing opposing positions and illustrates how this is a way to open up political possibilities (Moore 2013: p. 16). Sassen reacts to the increasing sphere of informality, especially on the economic level. She argues that the rise of informal and precarious living and working conditions also enables and strengthens the formation of new political actors (Sassen: 2005: p. 87).
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Incomplete Cartographies

To contribute to the discourse on urban development in Vienna, this course employed dialogical cartographic approaches to produce open-ended, incremental map-based representations that blur the distinctions between research and proposals and between professional experience and site-specific knowledge. In 2005 the City of Vienna introduced the planning tool of “target areas”. As those areas were designated as important for the entire city and because of the complexity of their development, the city aims to coordinate and collaborate between different public and private interest groups. In light of this semester’s theme “urban equity and the global agenda” we focused on the target area Favoriten – Hauptbahnhof – Arsenal, where Vienna’s new central train station and the surrounding developments have been drivers of social and spatial changes.

To research and reimagine public spaces in this area we applied the method of ‘Incomplete Cartographies’ as it has been developed by Ed Wall since 2013 in recognition that landscapes tend to resist definition. The ephemeral and dynamic conditions of landscapes, as they change through time, counter attempts to representationally and spatially control them. The open-ended method of creating incomplete cartographies has been developed with the aim of understanding and designing with multiple, undetermined and site-specific narratives contrasting traditional top-down architectural techniques where designs and representations attempt to fix time and complete space. Incomplete cartographies explore the subjective readings, incomplete understandings, partial representations and what Massey terms ‘stories-so-far’ (2005:131) of our relations with the land. The approach entwines research-based mappings by designers with less accessible accounts, gathered from people who live in or have knowledge of an area. Opening up mapping to non-professionals and their everyday narratives and knowledge of places and landscapes we open up questions of control, authorship and ownership of urban research and design. The main aim of this mapping approach is to engage with difficult access knowledge of areas that are planned for redevelopment. Students direct mapping conversations that produce narratives, which reflect on past histories and incorporate future aspirations, that can inform the redevelopment process.

To contribute to the discourse on urban development in Vienna, this course employed dialogical cartographic approaches to produce open-ended, incremental map-based representations that blur the distinctions between research and proposals and between professional experience and site-specific knowledge. In 2005 the City of Vienna introduced the planning tool of “target areas”. As those areas were designated as important for the entire city and because of the complexity of their development, the city aims to coordinate and collaborate between different public and private interest groups. In light of this semester’s theme “urban equity and the global agenda” we focused on the target area Favoriten – Hauptbahnhof – Arsenal, where Vienna’s new central train station and the surrounding developments have been drivers of social and spatial changes.

To research and reimagine public spaces in this area we applied the method of ‘Incomplete Cartographies’ as it has been developed by Ed Wall since 2013 in recognition that landscapes tend to resist definition. The ephemeral and dynamic conditions of landscapes, as they change through time, counter attempts to representationally and spatially control them. The open-ended method of creating incomplete cartographies has been developed with the aim of understanding and designing with multiple, undetermined and site-specific narratives contrasting traditional top-down architectural techniques where designs and representations attempt to fix time and complete space. Incomplete cartographies explore the subjective readings, incomplete understandings, partial representations and what Massey terms ‘stories-so-far’ (2005:131) of our relations with the land. The approach entwines research-based mappings by designers with less accessible accounts, gathered from people who live in or have knowledge of an area. Opening up mapping to non-professionals and their everyday narratives and knowledge of places and landscapes we open up questions of control, authorship and ownership of urban research and design. The main aim of this mapping approach is to engage with difficult access knowledge of areas that are planned for redevelopment. Students direct mapping conversations that produce narratives, which reflect on past histories and incorporate future aspirations, that can inform the redevelopment process.

Composed by a diversity of authors, such as landscape architects, planners and community groups, the incomplete cartographies transgress constructed divisions between professional practices and less-skilled or untrained individuals. As maps are passed through the hands of multiple authors who iteratively add to and edit them, collective, dynamic and sometimes less-coherent mapped representations are formed. As ideas for future landscapes are added to the maps, overlapping evidence of existing conditions and historic narratives, the maps blur separations between studies of what is known and speculations for what is possible. The approach explores, what Jill Desimini and Charles Waldheim describe of mapping, as “a representational project that merges spatial precision and cultural imagination” (2016:9).

Between teams of designers and academic researchers, and across contrasting disciplinary terms, the approach questions prevailing project-focused architectural practices and their associated design representations.

In working with incomplete cartographies we ask questions by exposing gaps of information, highlighting specific accounts, and revealing juxtaposing narratives. In contrast to Lynch’s method that aimed to identify common public images (1960:7), incomplete cartographies explore and represent the persuasive potential of distinctive stories to redefine landscapes. As participants draw on the maps the incomplete cartographies become projective devices. Corner advocates that ‘Hybridized and composite diagram techniques will allow even further advances in landscape formation because of their inclusive and instrumental capacity’ (1999b:166). In our course we encouraged students to combine primary and secondary information on the same drawings in addition to mapping explicit proposals and less tangible dreams. The inclusion of multiple authors provided a way of working that opened up designs to lost histories and marginalised accounts. In accepting the subjective narratives of a small selection of authors, the incomplete cartographies reflect the conditions of the landscape and the limits of time and resources imposed on the designer. The projects repositioned the designers as directing the exploration and speculation of landscapes, and they emphasised their roles in mediating messy realities to creatively assemble, analyse, rework, represent and project future landscapes.
During the day, all kinds of people come to Favoritenstraße and its surrounding spaces, cross the area and spend time in the area to pursue different kinds of activities. We want to discover another side of the area by using the method of incomplete mapping to explore it by night. We mainly focus on individual experiences and paths as well as different uses and their locations during the night time. Different types of spaces and their attractiveness to nighttime users are also shown in the process, as there are areas people like to frequent and areas people try to avoid for different reasons. We defined “night time” as the period between 9pm and 5am, when daylight is gone, regular shops are closed and people have already returned home from passing through the area after work, school or other everyday daytime activities.

Existing narratives are a key feature when talking about the area at night. Most people bring up danger and fear, which heavily influence their individual behaviour in public space. The area is surprisingly calm at night, and activities mainly take place in bars or restaurants rather than on the streets or in the squares and parks.
For this project we examined the social integration and connectivity between a brown-field redevelopment area known as Sonnwendviertel and the adjacent 10th district built environment. We investigate physical and social connections between the old 10th district and Sonnwendviertel area through examining the daily routes, movements, interactions and behaviour of three co-authors. We contacted a resident from the older district, a professional working in the 10th district and lastly, a person residing in Sonnwendviertel to engage in the incomplete cartography mapping method. Semi-structured interviews were conducted for a minimum duration of one hour to collect qualitative information. Interviewees drew, marked or sketched their personal responses on the map. After each interview the maps were re-visualized by us before the next contribution was made. This process was repeated for each contribution. The end result is an incremental map based on collective qualitative information from these semi-structured interviews and our own conclusions. This mapping technique uncovered barriers, 'hot spots' or attractors as well as surprising connections between the two areas. In addition, through studying the respondents’ daily paths we could observe zones or common areas such as Favoritenstraße and Helmut-Zilk-Park.
Vienna as a dense European city is walkable and has very connected neighbourhoods, but the area of Arsenal feels completely different. Large scale structures, long roads and strong barriers shape the area: Train tracks, the motorway and the Gürtel seem to block the connections to the surrounding districts. We asked ourselves if that is only our personal impression or if we could find any evidence supporting or neglecting our theory. To get this information we chose an indirect way, asking people working in the area “Where do you eat lunch?”. For lunch breaks, people have various places they prefer for different reasons. Considering the time restraints, fast and direct routes are an important factor.

What we found out is that Arsenal is not one single island but it has various secluded subdivisions. On the one hand this occurs due to the many fences and property ownerships, on the other hand due to the lack of need to go anywhere else than the work place. In contrast to our expectation the Gürtel is very permeable and the northern part of the Arsenal is very linked to the 4th district. Also the main train station acts as a very important connection point between the surrounding districts and Arsenal. With the planned bridges the link between the areas will possibly be strengthened in the future.
Wiener Standln, food stalls, are very typical but also unique in Vienna’s streets. This is also true for the northern part of the district of Favoriten, where three clusters of kiosks were identified, especially around vivid streets or public transportation hubs. Apart from their spatial location those kiosks also differ according to the goods they are selling (flowers, kebab, ice cream, sausages). Regardless of the range of goods one might wonder why kiosks are that present in the public space? We wanted to find out if their popularity is just due to the goods they are selling.

In the course of the three conducted interviews, we found out that kiosks are a point of social interaction and they do not solely serve as a place for consumption: every kiosk has its own community and regular customers. Contrary to our expectations there is hardly any cooperation between the kiosk owners. To emphasize the particularities of the three different kiosks we added a timeline as well as drawings of the kiosk’s furniture and its surroundings.
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NEW PUBLIC SPACES

Luke O’Neill, Karolina Plásková

Our project concept is looking at newly developed – under 10 years old (semi-)public spaces and the forms of security and surveillance that influence the spaces and their users – with particular focus on areas of interaction and static activity as opposed to passers-by. By examining these factors, mapping and addressing them through observation and interviews, we map the influence security forms have on its various user groups’ behaviour and activity. By studying three different semi-public areas we hope to show a comparison between these and build a better understanding of the influence of varying factors of securitisation of semi-public space and its users layered upon one another.

We focus on the three semi-public urban spaces of the residential blocks at Sonnwendviertel, Hauptbahnhof, and Erste-Bank Campus. The security forms addressed are CCTV, social surveillance, security personnel, rules and regulations and social workers. Through the process, we discovered new aspects which we had not considered previously which are crucial to our project such as spatial boundaries, rules and passive security measures. We discovered that while surveillance and security had some effect on behaviour it became clear that users and activities had a greater influence on the security and surveillance.
INCOMPLETE CARTOGRAPHIES

Hauptbahnhof Shopping Center
Erste Bank Campus
Sonnwendviertel housing blocks
focus area
controlled access zones (shops, restaurants etc.)
built structure (outside area of study)
notable parks
accessible interior area
day center
perceived boundary
covered area
area under rules
social control
facade with windows
CCTV cameras
Mosquito alarm
private security's focus & base point
police's focus & police station
area covered by private security guards
area covered by police
social worker's focus & base point
area covered by social workers
social activities (loitering, talking, lunching, smoking, making noise, drinking)
physical activities (walking a dog, playing/rough-housing, cycling/skating/scooting, sporting, exercising)
leisure activities (smoking, chilling, dining, drinking, relaxing, sleeping, sitting)
practical activities (soliciting, begging, shopping, selling, waiting / using services, using toilet, trading)
social conflict
place of intervirew
rule break
The project focused on relations between housing and public space in “Transdanubia”, the designated “periphery” of Vienna.

During the course we worked in the context of a global political agenda, as developed by UN Habitat, which brings public spaces alongside housing to the forefront of urban development. The New Urban Agenda incorporates Global South and postcolonial perspectives into planning and design approaches while also including Lefebvre’s claim to “The Right to the City”, highlighting the importance of the everyday and lived dimension of urban space. Inspired by such a framework of thought and action (but nevertheless critical to its potential translation into local spatial praxis) we investigated “Transdanubia”. The aim was to de-colonise the bias inherent in the use of the concept of “Transdanubia” by investigating the multiple relations between home, dwelling and public space and recentering Vienna’s 22nd district, Donaustadt.

We investigated the physical and social associations between spaces and activities of dwelling/homes/housing and public spaces. In addition to understanding public spaces as sites of publicness we identified that public space is increasingly domesticated through daily actions, planning practices and perceptions. Vice versa, the home as the designated place of being-in-private increasingly bears more public activity evident in the use of digital social media at home. This course directed and supported students to investigate the dialectics between public spaces and housing activism, research and policy, inspired by discourses produced at the global level of UN Habitat, and sought to explore and establish a necessary dialogue between the local and the global.

The course investigated a series of relations that relate to home/housing and public spaces set in a broader dialogue between local framings and the global urban agenda (both as regards the bilateral relations between global and local, as well as on an operational level of enabling equity in urban development). Taking the ordinary and action-based function of public space as lived space as a basis for political engagement and opening up “private” issues of the home as social issues relevant for political debate we aimed at addressing questions of urban equity and inequity (Verteilungsgerechtigkeit/-ungerechtigkeit). Within the palimpsest of Donaustadt’s dwellings and public spaces and in dialogue with existing local initiatives we aimed to explore these private-public relations and develop ways of challenging these traditionally separated realms through research and action. Can homes become as global as public space has recently developed? Or are both rather very local and context-specific contexts in which the global only can interfere through general pleas to incorporate (Western) human rights perspectives, e.g. the right to decent housing and the right to free expression, as summed up in the right to the City?
As part of the project "Lost in "Transdanubia" our group decided to focus on social housing estates built after 1945. This report documents our approach to the topic and the process we undertook in developing and organising a walk through Rennbahnweg, which is also possible to relive using the internet or mobile apps. We wanted to create a sustainable path, which can be repeated by anyone at any time and that is open for future developments. The main purpose of this project was to discover more about social estates from the locals and not just through the stereotypes in media. Our target group are people interested in learning more about it and hearing first hand stories from local experts. Our methodology is based on the researches, on-site visiting and a lot of walks through different estates. The starting point was visiting some estates in Donaustadt after doing general research about social housings. Our research is based on the regulations for social housings in Austria, history, pop culture and the way it influences that kind of architecture and art. We also had first talks with possible partners. The second part of the research was all about the urban walks as we had read some theory about walking in urban planning, participated in walks organised by others and also organised the test walk by ourselves. First, we chose a larger area of four housing estates and did the test walk with our university colleagues. After we got the feedback, we decided to focus only on Rennbahnweg, because the path was too long and it turned out to be the most interesting estate. We also wanted to collect more information and share it in interactive ways, so it was better to choose a smaller area. As soon as we decided for Rennbahnweg as our final project location, we contacted local experts, working at Rennbahnweg. The organisations who were able to participate on such short notice were Nachbarschaftzentrum, Aktivspielplatz, Wohnpartner, Jugendzentrum and Casa Kagran. They all helped us with collecting the information for the final walk and some of them also participated in it. After all the researches and „test” walks, we created the webpage and did the map for the walk on Google maps. The webpage we created contains all the videos and interviews we made with local experts and residents. We also added information that we collected from our researches and by visiting the sites. Those were all the methods we used to create the project. The final walk gathered approximately fifteen people and had student colleagues, professors, inhabitants, interested people from “the outside” and local experts participating and lasted about three hours. The negative side was the cold weather and early darkness. The future of our project is to create mobile apps so it would be available to a larger population. We would like to make more interviews and videos to put on the map. Another idea is to organize a walk in springtime when the days are longer and the temperatures are more friendly. It would be interesting to see the difference between walks in winter and summer. With the help of local experts and inhabitants, our project can be extended to a larger amount of housing estates all over Vienna (even in the wider area). It would help people to discover new aspects of the place they are living in and interest other people in visiting these places. Through the project, we learned a lot about the participatory way of urban planning. We also encountered some problems while making the project, mostly related to weather, short time frames and some related to the language barrier. All in all, we think that we have produced an interesting walk and got positive feedbacks from our local experts who participated in it.

Our webpage: https://rennbahnweg788568652.wordpress.com
Hirschstetten pond („Badeteich Hirschstetten“) is one of the most frequently used public spaces in Hirschstetten, an old town center within the 22nd district of Vienna. Both the pond and its surrounding area offer a space for recreational activities and relaxation for local residents as well as visitors. City officials in charge of Hirschstetten pond however are concerned about the consequences that overuse of this environmentally sensitive public space poses to the quality of the water. Our project deals with the conflict that arises from these two very different demands on the pond, which we alleviate through an educational approach that incorporates a gaming aspect. In planning, using games (such as street theatres for example) as a method of getting locals to participate in the development of their neighborhood can be a useful tool.

To meet our goal of preserving the water quality and wildlife in and around the pond while not limiting access to it, we developed a card game. This card game consists of three categories (with eight cards each) that present different components of the pond and the surrounding park. These three categories are: animals and plants, locations around the pond and user groups.

All the cards contain a small task to be completed or a question to be answered. These are supposed to encourage the participants to further explore the pond or think about how this public space might develop in the future. In addition, the cards from the category on animals and plants contain a small bit of information on the featured animal or plant. Cards, which are related to the user groups category, animate participants to think of activities that these user groups may enjoy.

Our project plans for the cards to be placed around the pond on wooden boards, where they can be freely picked up by people. These boards are designed to draw users in and get them excited about collecting the cards and finishing the tasks posed on the back side. Through exploring the pond and thinking about its future development, participants are already in a mindset that is needed for the gaming aspect of the cards. They can be used to create scenarios on the desired or expected development of the pond and the park around it. These scenarios can be submitted through an online tool that complements the physical cards. Through a QR-Code printed on the back of the cards (or alternatively a link that can be used if participants do not know how to use the Code), a website can be called up, where the game is explained and scenarios can easily be submitted. This way, our project appeals to users both on a digital and an analog level.

The cards can be appealing to user groups ranging from pre-school-aged children to elders, our target group however are teenagers. This user group is hard to reach, but does have a lot of interest in how their neighborhood will develop in the future. This tool has the potential to be developed further to meet both the city officials’ and users’ needs more efficiently and appropriately. On the one hand expanding the digital aspect of the project opens up the opportunity for the city to make their already existing information more easily accessible. On the other hand, communication with our target group can be improved upon to reach a higher level of participation, where teenagers are actively invited to partake in our card game. To realize these improvements, support from local politicians and the city administration of Vienna is essential.

All the cards of our game can be downloaded here: https://drive.google.com/open?id=1cDXF_xuAV4xv-4kigyAG0Hh6HSltf9QF.

The website is reachable through the QR-Code or this Link: http://u5916914.viewer.maka.im/k/P6DZGTJM.
Transdanubia Transforming” is a research project undertaken in the course of the Master Project “Lost in Transdanubia” at the TU Vienna. It emerged from the intention to better understand Donaustadt, the biggest district of Vienna with the highest rate of growth, and its dynamics. The outcome is a booklet that tries to describe different developments or so-called transformations, that are going on in Donaustadt. It also shows different kinds of local action currently undertaken by initiatives in the part of Donaustadt around the U2. The area was chosen because of the recent enlarging of the U2, which brought and still is bringing a lot of change to the cadastrales. These two aspects are brought together, by looking at the work of the initiatives in context of the bigger dynamics in the district. In certain regards, their work can be seen as responses to the challenges the areas face because of the rapid transformations going on.

For the research about what bigger trends of development are going on in the 22nd district, we took typical sources like planning documents or statistics about Donaustadt into account as well as more qualitative resources, like the exchange in significant groups on Facebook or other medial representations, like songs and music videos of local performers about Donaustadt. Finally, six „Transformations” were identified, namely:

- Between Rural and Urban (The intense physical transformation of Donaustadt over the last decades, from a rural area towards an „urban” structure with huge interventions from the City. Three „Waves of Urbanization” are described.)
- Between Centers and Centrality (The shift from centers as the combination of centrality of the place and social relevance towards centralities as places with high frequency of passersby but onedimensional funcionality. This transformation is triggered by diverse trends, but mainly by new infrastructure for transportation as the new U2.)
- Between Villages and „Zwischenstadt“ (The merging of former separate villages into one mesh of urban sprawl. Borders and perception of the different neighbourhoods are therefore being redefined.)
- Between Mental Countryside and Urban Narratives (The change in (self)perception of Donaustadt and its inhabitants. The rapid growth transformed the physical and social structure of the cadastrals so fast, that different images of Donaustadt are existing parallel.)
- Between Physical and Digital Public Space (The decrease of the use of physical public space for interaction while simultaneously the importance of digital spaces like Facebook groups is growing.)
- Between „Gstettn” and Precious Resource (The decrease of underused green spaces due to the booming building industry. At the same time the appreciation for green spaces is growing because of the increasing pressure on them.)

As for the local partners we had the pleasure to conduct interviews with four groups from Essling, Hirschstetten and Stadlau. Precisely, they were held with Sabine Gstöttner from Treffpunkt Essling, Werner Schandl from Hirschstetten-retten, Julian Gredinger from Stadtteilnetzwerk Stadlau and Renate Biber from the Stadlauer Kaufleute. The groups are all concerned with improving their neighbourhood, either in a physical, social or both ways. Detailed portraits, which also reference back to the transformation processes explored, shall cast a light on their motivations, ways of working and visions for the future of the respective cadastral. Concluding, the comparison of the groups gives an idea of some major issues in Donaustadt from the local perspective but also reveals resemblances between the very diverse groups.

The booklet is of interest for everyone who wants to get an insight into the complexity of Donaustadt, and combine an analytical top-down view on the district with the bottom-up perspective of local actors.
This project deals with the use of public space, the rules that define the space and the mismatch between the use of space and the rules controlling it. Specifically, it looks at the user group of the youth. It deals with all the 'frames' that exist around these issues. To just name two, there are physical frames which define spaces or legal frames, like standards and laws that determine the design and use of spaces.

The project focuses on the ACTiN Park and the local youth center. Nevertheless, the project is relevant to public space in general. The project used the role of “Space Researchers and Space Experts”. Our role as space researchers is to understand the space and the actors by learning from the space experts, the youth. This approach lead us to develop a participative process. We developed and held workshops with the youth, which were key to the project development. Additionally, we talked to other involved actors and observed the space. Analyzing all the information obtained, we concluded that the ACTiN park is well used but does not fit the actual needs of the youth. There is a strong contradiction between the use of space here and the laws governing it. Because of this there are limited possibilities to be creative with the space, which leads to semi legal solutions in gray areas. Additionally, we found one area of the park, which is not used nor adapted. This space is 140m² big and located in the middle of the park. These findings lead us to develop new ‘frames’ for the park: a physical frame and a new legal frame. For the physical frame, we designed a new piece of equipment for the ACTiN park. Different to the existing fixed equipment, this is a frame like structure where the youth can attach their own equipment-modules and actively take part in changing the park to their needs. These modules can be pre- or self-constructed benches, swings, pull up bar, roofs etc. Implementing such a flexible structure, which can be adapted by the users, pushes against the boundaries of what is possible under the current legal framework. The technical standards as well as the issues of responsibility and liability are part of this framework. In our opinion the current legal regulations go far beyond their intended purpose of guaranteeing safety and security. While we do agree that safety is important, we do not agree with the current approach which severely limits the possibilities and qualities of public spaces and equipment. Our frame is therefore a step against this tendency towards overregulation. It creates a place where users are free to develop and implement new ideas about what a park should and can do. Still, more must be done to change this mindset and make creative and high quality spaces possible.

This project is not yet finished. Our booklet represents the current state of our work. It is a collection of everything we have accomplished and discovered until now and the steps we need to take to make this project real. Already we have had positive reactions from the youth center and various professionals who are interested in helping us makes this real. Despite the semester ending, we look forward to working further with the youth center and all those who along the way gave us their help.
In collaboration with the City of Vienna Visiting Professor Ed Wall the Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space organized an excursion to London (UK) from 5th to 9th February 2018. To close the City of Vienna Visiting Professorship of 2017/2018 the theme of Urban Equity and the Global Agenda was explored through various projects, streets and sites in London’s East.

In this (still designated) global city of finance capital, we continued the debate about the role of public space against the background of a global urban agenda that addresses fundamental issues of climate change, resource conservation, international migration and growing inequalities. When local sites of urban life, i.e. lived spaces, come under a growing pressure of global forces, principles of fair planning, design and construction are gaining, it seems, ever more relevance and need to become main constituents in the education of planners, designers and architects.

By undertaking various field visits to detect specific London problematics (e.g. dwelling crisis, squats in patios, insurgencies against developers projects, art and architectural intervention) we shifted between – and thus questioned conceptions of - centre and periphery, innovative projects/ buildings and neighbourhoods resisting gentrification, global developments and local initiatives. Together with local architects, planners and residents we explored Greenwich, Lewisham, Whitechapel, and the Isle of Dogs with their fascinating contrast of neighbourhoods, housing, public spaces and histories.

The excursion involved a seminal part where further UK based SkuOR Visiting Professors (Ali Madanipour, Sophie Watson and others) were invited to contribute perspectives on issues of localism, multiculturalism, food justice and political ecology. We thereby took the opportunity to discuss the spatial impacts and implications of BREXIT and changing geopolitical power relations through the lense of urban studies.

A digital version of the reader can be found here: https://skuor.tuwien.ac.at/wp-content/uploads/London-Excursion-Reader-2018_END.pdf