ID 1565 | CRITITQUE OF EVERYDAY LIFE AND POST-POSITIVIST PLANNNING

Sabine Knierbein[1]
[1]Interdisciplinary Centre for Urban Culture and Public Space, TU Wien, Austria
knierbein@skuor.tuwien.ac.at

1 EVERYDAY LIFE RESEARCH, UNSETTLED ROUTINES, AND PLANNING

Lefebvre´s books on the 'Production of Space', 'The Right to the City' and the 'Urban Revolution'have been widely discussed in planning theory, and are constantly referred to in (scholarly-activist) planningpractice, e.g. in the urban protests against massive gentrification and in recent solidary struggles against postpoliticalregimes heralding austerity policies. However, Lefebvre´s (2014) century-long oeuvre on the 'Critiqueof Everyday Life' spanning from (1) his analysis and observations of rising fascism in the 1920s/1930s; (2)the post-WWII urban modernization and the 'internal colonization' of everyday life routines in France andEurope in the 1940s/1950s; and (3) the advent of paradigmatic shifts between production and consumptionin the city in the 1960s/1970s towards the era of global urbanization; has received few attention in the realmof urban studies, and even less so in planning. This is remarkable, as this three-volume work conveys severalinsights on un- and resettlement of urban routines useful to understand present changes mediated throughevery day life in contemporary cities.

In a context of a felt unsettling of urban and national routines, particularly marked by the years2011 and 2016, this paper pays tribute to Lefebvre´s complex spatial understanding of the critique ofeveryday life as an analytical perspective to detect, identify and qualitatively understand changes on the micro-, meso- and macro-levels of society. Then, focus will be set on the time span since the early 1980s to highlightcontributions from social, political and cultural theory that have engaged with a more contemporary (spatial)critique of everyday life. These shifts in theorizing the city are connected to the contemporary critique of theearlier generation of post-positivist planning accounts and pave the way to (loosely) start thinking aboutconceptualizing a more recent generation of planning theories much more interested in affective, agonistic, performative, insurgent, relational and counter planning approaches, and thus, in the nitty-gritty political,cultural and social nuances of an updated spatial critique of everyday life.

2 THE CRITIQUE OF EVERYDAY LIFE

One of global capitalisms' most powerful modes of expansion is urbanization (Lefebvre, 2003(1970)), implying an understanding of cities and urban space as key sites that catalyse growth, competitionand individual freedom (Molotch, 1976). It is the ambivalent nature of processes of urbanization, and theuneven interplay between nation states and cities, that make the city a key field to understand, analyse andinterpret different formants of capitalism, its inherent contestations, pitfalls and collapse (Schmid, 2005).Cracks, fractures, ruptures and the perpetuated crises at the heart of the current flexible capitalism get firstvisible in cities, mediated through processes of urbanization, yet contested through acts of urban resistance(Lehtovuori, 2010; Mayer, 2013).

While developing and following academic training schemes that would often deal with abstractspace, the spatial arts have tended to neglect an understanding of the city as lived space (Tornaghi andKnierbein, 2015). Lived space is a contested and yet hopeful space characterized as much by affect,experience and sets of values, as by rational decisions and interest based struggles. But what exactly is thiseveryday life about, and how does it spatially manifest? How can the city as lived space be connected to astudy of changing everyday life patterns? What can planners learn from scrutinizing everyday life? Livedspaces in the city are those places, where everyday life routines unfold and where new patterns and ways ofliving gain momentum. The minutiae of everyday life, however, are understood as a messy field, as there areeveryday conflicts (e.g. exclusion, segregation and discrimination). Empirically speaking, spatial patterns ofeveryday routines become fundamentally unsettled (e.g. through everyday contestations) even beforeparadigmatic socio-political shifts gain momentum, when emancipatory movements grow and politicalmobilization starts to unfold out of unbearable everyday life conditions (Goonewardena et al., 2008).

Schmid (2005, p. 10f.) locates the emergence of critical urban studies with the rise of the crisis ofthe city in the 1960s which signified a loss of everyday qualities of life caused by massive Fordist urbanexpansion schemes (based on street infrastructure construction and related suburbanization as a spatial modelto sustain the dominant expansion of car producing industries). Lefebvre has detected this crisis somewhatearlier, by studying the emerging industrialization-urbanization of France before and after the Second WorldWar, where cities were organized as a type of 'new colonies', with those colonized living a commodified lifein the banlieue, and those colonizing occupying cities' social and material centralities.

The city and the urban thus can be analysed as a palimpsest of constant crises of capitalism and ofdiverse attempts to overcome these crises through collective forms of self-organization. This new type ofurban crises peaked at a moment when the impacts of capitalisms' changing strategies were increasingly felt ineveryday life, culminating in the wide social mobilization and urban resistance movements of the late 1960s,and the related global movement of the New Left. Some critics argue that the global social movements of2011, the "year of dreaming dangerously" (Žižek, 2012), can be interpreted in a similar way, as nowneoliberalization's impacts on contemporary everyday life routines had become unbearable in the directaftermath of the global financial crisis of 2008 (Kaika and Karaliotas, 2017). The seismic precursors of thesetypes of general paradigmatic shifts and civic upheavals (as in 1968, 2011) can be detected through a constantempirical monitoring of changing patterns of urban lived space, and often happen with a relevant delay afterthe introduction of new modes of urban restructuring (e.g. in France after the Marshall plan restructuring in1950s/60s; worldwide after the introduction of neoliberal ways of urban policy making in the 1970s/80s).

An important point here is to stress that these types of more paradigmatic 'urban crises' rathermark an understanding of the urban as (1) a social, political and cultural culmination point of crises atdifferent scales and in different fields and as (2) crisis machine in which modes of de-and reterritorializationare ventured as constantly changing, adapted, invented or renewed modes of (flexible) capitalism'saccumulation strategies inscribed into spaces, societies, ecologies and cultures through an effort of seizing,capturing and high-jacking the meaningful patterns and practices of everyday life, and as (3) a catalyst forsocial self-organization to overcome the constant pitfalls, aporia and fragmentations inherent in flexiblecapitalism, taking forms of response, resistance, struggle, detour, and counter cultures in the city.

Following changing urban patterns, phenomena and practices through the lens of everydaynessthus is a key entry point not just to understand urban life, but also to retrace how we gain knowledge abouturban change and transitions, and how the social urban world is constituted: "Everyday life may be familiar tous, but this does not mean that it is understood. Analysing the everyday may bring out the extraordinary inthe ordinary (…)" (Elden, 2004, p. 111).

2.1 LEFEBVRE'S CENTURY-LONG OEUVRE (UNTIL 1991)

The lived urban spaces of the city are key lenses to develop such a dynamic understanding, as herethe socio-material impact of structural changes, but also the acts of resistance and of new paths of action getvisible. However, some linguistic nuances need to be acknowledged, as Lefebvre (1988, p. 78) has delineated:"The word everyday [quotidien] designates the entry of daily life [vie quotidienne] into modernity (…) theconcept of 'everydayness' [quotidienneté] stresses the homogeneous, the repetitive, the fragmentary in everydaylife". Shields works with Lefebvre's distinction and explains that there is a notion of the banal, trivial andrepetitive quality of social life under capitalism in which "these terms were … used to refer to theuncatalogued, habitual and routine nature of day-to-day living rather than used critically to refer to thealienated, dry "everydayness" of daily life" (Shields, 1999, p. 66). In the lived spaces of the city, everyday life(now reinterpreted as a theoretical tool of critique as it bears the dialectic of the ordinary and the alienated)inscribes itself into the material arrangements of the urban fabric. Any attempt to intervene into the urbanfabric (e.g. through planning, design), vice versa, means to unsettle urban everyday routines and practices, andthus, everyday life. Through spatial interventions proponents of the spatial arts may shape new chances andopportunities and an enhanced quality of life; yet their spatial interventions may also tend to contribute toaccelerating processes of spatial alienation, for instance through paving spatial strategies for gentrification,displacement and dispossession. This way, on the contrary, quality of life is further diminished for those whohave fewer resources (money, power, voice, networks, etc.) at their disposal. This way, planners may sharpenthe social divide, by contributing to the uneven development

inherent in capitalist urbanization patterns.Smith's (2010 (1984)), uneven development has been an important concept as regards, as it is based on aconception of deep space which refers to "(…) the space of everyday life in all its scales from the global to thelocal and the architectural, in which (…) different layers of life and social landscape are sedimented onto andinto each other. Deep space is quintessentially social space: it is physical extent fused through with socialintent" (ibid., p. 214). Any study of everyday life draws near to acknowledging the uneven distribution ofaccess and resources to pursue a decent everyday life that is visible not just with regard to unevendevelopment between global North and South, between European North and South, between nation's mayorcities and their hinterlands, but first and foremost – as Lefebvre has it – between the urban centre and a city'speriphery, a process of urbanization that Lefebvre referred to as the internal colonization.

As follows, main arguments that have characterized the scientific reflection of everyday life inrelation to uneven development of urban space, will be gathered. Limits of such an endeavour issue a doubton "the uniqueness of urban milieus for studying everyday life", as this has been "sociologically challenged"(Kalekin-Fishman, 2013, p. 721) e.g. by everyday life studies in rural areas. While acknowledging that everydaylife and lived spaces are not limited to the study of the city, this research focuses on urbanization as 'thick'empirical source of possibilities to study deep space and to engage with everyday life (as both an investigation ofthe ordinary and of alienation). Yet the spatiality of everyday life has often only been randomly treated as aproblematique in urban studies and planning theory accounts, in order to understand the everyday life not as itappears (on the surface, as visual reality), but in a more 'geological' way of approaching social theory:Everyday life forms the social magma that is both producing material surfaces and their slow, but continuouschange, and from time to time, visible material and embodied eruptive moments (and rapidly changing urbanlandscapes) of social transformation.

Lefebvre has not developed a philosophy of everyday life, but a social theory of the critique ofeveryday life, by promoting a critical spatial understanding of the changing social world under capitalism. Theearly parts of his overall oeuvre focused on everyday life, a threat that would run through all different aspectsof his work, sometimes implicitly, sometimes more explicitly. Lefebvre's oeuvre on everyday life was initiatedin the 1920s/1930s when he started to prepare the first out of three volumes of "Critique of Everyday Life"1946, to be followed by vol. II (1961) and vol. III (1981) (Lefebvre, 2014). While France entered a phase ofrapid modernization after the Second World War, "Lefebvre progressively recoded his initial concept of'everyday life' into a range of spatial and urban categories" (Ross, 1995, p. 150, cited by Shields, 1999, p. 39).

In the post-Second World War phase, it was seemingly accompanied by Lefebvre's utopian vision that (French) society would reconstruct a better (socialist) future (overcoming pitfalls of capitalist organization),whereas his later works concentrated on the analysis why and how capitalism was able to survive. At thatpoint, Lefebvre did not go along with Marx' understanding that capitalism would die any more, rather theopposite: Following Rosa Luxemburg's early enquiry of why and how the capitalist mode of production wasable to continue, Lefebvre (1988, p. 80) attempted "to answer not only how capitalism survives, but also howit is able to grow: (…) it could integrate an industry. It integrated agriculture, it integrated the .. city, itintegrated space; and it produced what I call la vie quotidienne".

With the increasing urbanization of ways of living, "a realm that is essential to everybody butbecomes increasingly deficient for its users as social space is integrated ever more directly into processes ofcapital valorization" (Ronneberger, 2008, p. 135). These findings marked a key shift in Marxist approaches tounderstand space and the city: "Whereas the economic had long played an overarching role under capitalism,the everyday was now acquiring the same significance" (ibid.), thus opening critical spatial inquiry to a rangeof disciplinary and cross-disciplinary endeavours ever since. Soja states that "what Lefebvre was doing wassubstituting everyday life for the workplace as the primary locus of exploitation, domination and struggle; andredefining social transformation and revolution as intrinsically more socio-cultural (and less economistic)"(ibid., 1996, p. 41). He "envisioned the emergence of a new revolutionary subject that would revolt not onlyagainst the exploitation of labour-power, but against the destruction of its entire living environment", statesRonneberger (2008, p. 135). In this sense, "urban struggle, not class struggle" became "the motor of history,urban praxis and not industrial praxis, the new local of revolt" (Merrifield, 2002, p. 117). By the late 1980sand shortly before his death, Lefebvre adds another level of interpretation as "it is at this moment thattechnical revolution substitutes itself for social and political revolution, while capitalism seizes the groundthat had escaped it in large part until then: everyday life"

(Lefebvre, 1988, p. 79), thus shedding light on theemergence of the dominance of technocratic thought over social and political concerns.

2.2 CRITIQUE OF EVERYDAY LIFE (AFTER 1991)

While Lefebvre's project remains one of the most important "diagnosis of modern everyday lifeand a reclamation of its critical potential" (Highmore 2002, p. 225), many traces in his work have beenreferenced and used by feminists, post-colonialists, art historians, aesthetic theorists, architects, humangeographers, urban planners, urban activists over the last couple of decades (Shields, 1999). During the late1980s and 1990s, however, research on everyday life started to fade. Yet, in the new millennium, publicationssuch as "The Everyday Life Reader" (Highmore, 2002), "Philosophizing Everyday Life" (Roberts, 2006),"Space, Difference, Everyday Life" (Goonewardena et al., 2008), the "Sociology of Everyday life" (Kalekin-Fisherman, 2013) and the first one-volume edition of Lefebvre's threefold critique of everyday life (ibid.2014) mark a renewed attention for de-everydaying the familiar, and connecting it to space. Highmore's(2002) work offers a potential to bridge the emerging gap of understanding and theorizing the everyday thatLefebvre's death in 1991 has left. Another vanguard contribution that actively revisits the notion of theeveryday by launching a critique of the modernist and Western version of social theory based on bigcollective organization and grand-scheme revolution is Bayat's (2010, p. 11) work "Life As Politics: HowOrdinary People Change the Middle East". His considerations raise a fundamental critique to the Westernconcept of 'public space' (as a modernist institution to which only a few have institutional access), while hisintellectual focus remains on the spatial praxis and lived spaces of ordinary people.

2.3 TOWARDS A CONTEMPORARY CRITIQUE OF EVERYDAY LIFE

The most ambitious part of everyday life research is to overcome attempts of banalization whichstate that everyday life is all and nothing. Highmore (2002, p. 4) emphasizes that "the problem with theeveryday is that its contours might be so vague as to encompass almost anything (or certain aspects ofeverything)", and continues to shed light on this challenge: "taken as an amorphous whole, work on everydaylife might suggest that any fixing (especially in time and space) of the everyday is going to hamper discussionand perhaps limit the productivity of enquiry" (ibid., p. 37). To set up and offer a dynamic frame for situatingscientific attention back on everyday life studies in the spatial arts, as follows, six aspects of everyday lifeenquiry have been synthesized to allow for a more in-depth understanding of contemporary globalurbanization processes under capitalism, and its implications for planning: (A) Everyday life's uncannycharacter; (B) Everyday life as colonization, (C) Feminist perspectives on space beyonddomination/marginalization, (D) Post-colonial everyday life research (E) Urban resistance as 'quietencroachment of the ordinary' and (F) Everyday life as spatial praxis and social action.

(A) Everyday life's uncanny character: Lived space analysis involves an understanding of "the everydayas a problematic, a contested and opaque terrain, where meanings are not to be found ready-made"(Highmore, 2002, p. 1). A wider conception would start from an understanding of the ambiguous, ambivalentand antagonistic character of everyday social relations and their spatial manifestations, because "the everydaydoes not supply happy endings or even happy beginnings" (ibid., p. 8) This points to the messy minutiae ofeverydayness: ordinary urban life bears certain uncanny and scary features that prevent any delving inromantic ideas of the ordinary as a field of urban enquiry. In "attempting to reveal the unconscious or nonapparentstructures of everyday life" deep aspects can be uncovered "that are relentlessly gothic in theirdimensions" (ibid.): For Freud it is the almost inevitable tragedy of loss, forbidden love and death anxiety,which lurks bubbling under the everyday. For Marx, everyday capitalism is a catastrophic engine devouringmaterial and human resources and structured across class antagonisms" (cf. ibid.).

(B) Everyday life as colonization: A study of new forms of colonialisms can be facilitated through thestudy of fetish and colonial relations in everyday practice and objects. Another aspect strongly related tounderstanding everyday life as a fetishized form of how capitalism was able to spatially grow and expand, is tolink everyday life research to a spatial investigation of power relations. Effective power relations occupy theterrains of everyday life, resulting in the finding that "ideologies reside in precisely those places where they arenot perceived to be (or perceived at all)" (Highmore, 2002, p. 7), for instance, in the ordinary act of shoppinggroceries. Lefebvre considers the relation between power and the ordinary

not just at different scales, butwith emphasis on their mutual entanglements. In this sense, the study of spatial patterns of urban everydaylife is a useful resource to potentially identify structural aspects through (1) the study of fetishized forms ofdomination visible in public and private ways of living (e.g. as commodification of public space; or as regardsthe introduction of new products that transform everyday life, e.g. smart phones); (2) analysing practices ofcolonization that materially sediment as contested spatial relations between (social, physical, geographical,cultural, political) peripheries and centres; (3) an enquiry into power relations which structure urbanizationprocesses and urban development policies, while studying those spatial contestations which bear the capacityto transgress (e.g. action-based) practices of resistance towards continuous achievements of emancipation.

(C) Feminist Perspectives on Space Beyond Domination: Feminist spatial debates have encouraged a wideractivation of urban research perspectives in a threefold way: (1) to recognize, relocate and re-centre spacesand groups at the margin as agents for resistance and radical change; (2) to develop new subject-objectrelations as regards how researchers study urban everyday life thus articulating the social relations betweenresearchers, and between researchers and those researched; and (3) to emphasize the role of the body in theproduction of space, thus linking to cognate emphasis on non-representational theory, performativity,passions, and embodied space. Yet it needs to be acknowledged, that in the study of social difference in thecity, “everyday life can both hide and make vivid a range of social differences” (Highmore, 2002, p. 2).

(D) Post-Colonial Everyday Life Research: Particularly post-colonial accounts rooted in cultural studieshave added more dimensions to a renewed critique of everyday life: (1) the dialectics of difference andcommonality as an inseparable relation in lived space (Highmore 2002); (2) the radical change of positionalityto choose marginality as a position to start research from (Soja 1996) and (3) the chronopolitical focus on ‘the‘art of practicing the now’ (Thrift, 2008). Present forms of emancipation and empowerment are performed bythose social movements studied by activist-scholars interested in how everyday life patterns become unsettledand resettled in historical moments. These may relate to the emerging moments in which a European-centricmodel of exclusive urban modernity is deconstructed through a post-colonial critique to shape a path forwardtowards a worlded theory of urbanization, thus showing a changed understanding of global issues of publicconcern. However, it is not enough to develop postcolonial theories from the standpoint of the Westernscholarly tradition and focus on neo-colonial patterns in Western societies. Western scholars also need toradically learn from cities and colleagues from other urban and world regions both as regards the way howthe spatial analysis is framed, and as well regarding the empirical phenomena at hand and respectivetheorizations for the fields of urban studies and planning theory.

(E) Resistance as ‘Quiet Encroachment of the Ordinary’: What happens when everyday life is conceivedfrom non-Western theories and empirical findings? Bayat’s work focusing on everyday life basedtheorizations combines an empirical contribution relating to the micro-scale of urban research claiming toanalytically expand the notion of everyday forms of urban resistance with a fundamental critique of themodern conception of Western ‘social movements’ and of public space as an institution of (Western) bourgeois modernity which many of the urban subaltern – especially in contexts of authoritarian state rule –seek to avoid or circumvent. Empirical research from Middle Eastern cities has shown that new global urbanrestructuring is affecting these places and has pushed people living in informality further towards the margins.

Neoliberal modernity and its pace of global restructuring has brought (additional) masses of people into newsocio-spatial peripheries from which they now take (mass) action to improve their lives on their own. Tostudy neoliberal modernity through the prisms of social non-movements, as Bayat (2010) has it, has reaffirmed theneed for a politicization of registering the everyday: “the insistence that non-Western lives impact at the levelof everyday life in the West is an important aspect of many recent forms of political culture (…) whathappens at the level of micro-culture also reverberates at a more global level” (Highmore, 2002, p. 18).(E) Everyday Life as Action: One of the key sources to acknowledge Lefebvre’s critique of theprevailing abstract philosophies in the 20th century has been an understanding of everyday life as a philosophy ofpraxis, in which praxis can be considered to be a vehicle to embed conceptions of (present) time(s) intospatial analysis of changing patterns of lived space. Space, in this sense, needs to be understood as “anensemble of a plethora of societal actions” (Schmid, 2005, p. 300) mediated through both individual andcollective (everyday) social relations that are in a constant interplay in the self-creation of human beings. Butwhich relevance then has the study of everyday life and lived space, if all niches can

be fruitful? The study ofchanging everyday life would cut across all these three fields, as (a) a study of action and praxis of the worldman has shaped; (b) a study of the experience, affect and altering potential of the lived social space; and (c) asa critique of abstract philosophy. Because “to study philosophy as an indirect criticism of life” as Lefebvre (2014, p. 272) put it “is to perceive (everyday) life as direct critique of philosophy.” But why, Shields asks, didLefebvre opt into an investigation of life becoming seemingly boring under capitalism? Shields (1999, p. 67)emphasizes that such a scrutiny “indicates a domination of areas of human activity and relationships whoserichness, if revealed, could become the basis for a reconstruction of human society”. This way, lived spacesbecomes an intriguing subject allowing for constant crossovers for (ex-post oriented) social, cultural andpolitical research in connection to (ex-ante oriented) perspectives into future planning praxis and theories, asit includes both the analysis of structural conditions and the impetus to sketch ways of action forward.

3 A NEW GENERATION OF POST-POSITIVIST PLANNING THEORIES?

As follows, an initial attempt to loosely rethink selected contemporary planning approaches will bepresented, that stems from empirical public space research and the renewed critique of everyday life assketched in rough contours above. Social change of the past 50 years, but also of the past decade, their spatialcauses, side-effects and implications indicate a need to connect planning endeavours again to much morebasic questions about whether, if and how planners intervene in everyday life conditions, and how planningcontributes to a (re)production of everyday life patterns (seen as ordinary-alienated dialectics). As many urbansocieties are increasingly characterized by uneven development patterns, and the general level of socioeconomicwell-being for bigger parts of the urban population has been constantly eroded, times for keepingplanning in the safe-haven of apolitical thought have long passed by. But what is the societal role thatplanners can fill in order to address these pressing challenges? Many would argue that these are structuralproblems that planners are unable to address as this is out of their field of expertise. Others would suggestthat planning should focus on a more liberal tradition to spatially promote growth and help the state toorganize the conditions for that growth in order to provide prosperity and progress. Others would contest,that more of the same will only enlarge the divides and reproduce structural constraints based on thedisruption of equity, equality and emancipation. In the light of the current increase in de-democratization ofpolitical ways of decision-making (post-political condition); new nationalisms and xenophobia visible throughantagonistic public space contestations (anti-pluralist condition) and an increased financial capitalism thatdisempowers and dispossesses (commodification-through-crisis condition)—all transitions that constantlyproduce severe restrictions on the ability to access everyday life’s opportunities—planners cannot shy awayfrom their responsibility to think about how they (re)organize space and thus power relations, and how theyframe their own positionality in a spatial field characterized by constant struggles between politics and thepolitical. With communities evicted and displaced, jobs lost, pensions evaporated, cost of living rising,citizens harassed and killed by the police, and with no effective or available democratic process to hold backand reverse these trends, planners often have to refocus on a task that has been deemed forgotten: to providemore basic and decent human living conditions, to propose alternative ways of urbanization and developmentthat politically intervene into the cracks and crises of the current capitalist model and to propose spatialentries into how democracies can be constantly renewed.

Critique of Everyday Life	Urban Studies	Political Science	Planning Theory
3.1. *Public space under siege. On urban restructuring.*	postFordism, birth of neoliberal urban policies, social inequality	governmentality, neoliberalization and postFordism	Planning as governmentality
3.2. *The body under pressure. On politics of affect.*	embodied space: role of body politics, embodied space occupations	politics of affect, non-representational theory, performativity	Performative planning
3.3. *Contested modern public space. On everyday mass action.*	everyday urbanism, ordinary city, critique of modern Everyday Life	postcolonial accounts: social non-movements, everyday mass action	Insurgent Planning
3.4. *Lived space dialectics. On combined activism.*	emancipation, housing and public space: anti-eviction and de-commodification action	right to the city, feminist, Marxist and postmodern critique of everyday life	Relational planning
3.5. *Urban resistance. On increasing social inequality.*	struggles against de-politicisation of public space, weakness of representative democracy	presentist democracy, dissent vs. consent, marginalization vs marginal positions	Counter hegemonic planning

3.6. *Urban emancipation. On consent and dissent.*	the post-political and its discontents, struggles against disenfranchisement	post-foundational thought, politics of dissent, passion and politics	Agonistic planning

Table 1 – Transfers between Urban Studies, Political Theory and Planning Theory

From this perspective, urban studies may serve as a field bridging empirical insights from publicspace research based on an (empirical, detailed, precise) critique of everyday life to the fields of socio-politicaland socio-cultural theory, from which many planning theorists draw their insights. This concluding part,therefore, does not offer a systematic reading of all post-positivist accounts in the Anglo-Saxon world, it israther a plea to (re)connect the field of planning to a deep reflection about those recent approaches inplanning that seek to render a relation between planning, everyday life and lived space, and thus preciselyaddress the respective societal, cultural and political context of a given planning situation. Some of potentialapproaches have been gathered in table 1 and will be briefly sketched as follows.

3.1 PUBLIC SPACE UNDER SIEGE. ON URBAN RESTRUCTURING.

This section combines three parts which (1) address different interpretations of patterns of urbanrestructuring (e.g. postfordist, neoliberal), (2) offer a political science-inspired reading of Foucault's theory ofgovernmentality as an explanatory frame for a historical analysis of urban restructuring and neoliberalization,and (3) establish a connection to understanding planning as gouvernmentality. Critique of everyday life isaddressed here with a focus on power relations and on an understanding of planning as governmentality:practices shaping the actions of others and strategies for the management of a population with the aim toshow the unwitting effects of these regimes of practices on everyday life, yet to break free of the commonsenseacceptance of categories such as the ordinary, to open up ways of thinking differently (compare Huxley,2002, pp. 145-146). Hence, although power is an omnipresent dimension in human relations, and thus, inspace, power in a society is never a spatially fixed and closed regime, but rather an endless and open set ofsocial relations. The governmentality focus helps to explain how actually existing neoliberal urbanizationcame into being initially as a way of thinking in economics, and later as a practice of governing throughplanning which managed to literally transform the experience of societies, mediated through everyday life.

3.2 THE BODY UNDER PRESSURE. ON POLITICS OF AFFECT.

This second approach offers (1) an entry perspective into conceptions of space that discuss socialrelations through aspects of body, performance and action, thus promoting an understanding of embodiedprotest as an affective form of staging dissent and thereby shaping 'the political' in the city. It furtherconnects (2) 'the political' to considerations of the role and meaning of 'affect' to access a wider strand of(feminist) thought in political theory. Theories of affect address the minds' power to think (reason) and thebody's power to act (passion) (Hardt, 2007). They force us constantly to pose the problem of the relationshipbetween mind and body with the assumption that their powers constantly correspond in some ways (cf. ibid.,7). In this vein, affection assigns a relational moment, through which the capacity to act is decreased orincreased through the encounters between bodies, affected or/and affecting each other. Non-representationaltheory (Thrift, 2008) includes much of the non-intentional and non-discursive aspects of everyday life into anunderstanding of space and links this to the way politics and the political work beyond reason, using acombination of reason and passion, of thinking and acting. Thrift used the concept of "performance" tounderstand "the art of producing the now", the urban present conditions of everyday life (Dirksmeier andHelbrecht, 2010). Finally, (3) a transfer will be established between considerations linking embodied spaceconceptions, politics of affect and a more recent strand in planning theory, that is, performative planning.Recalling on Lefebvre's urge to centre praxis as any point of departure for further theoretical reflection,performative planning reconstitutes public space as a realm where praxis and theory meet. It thus meansmore than physical design; it is also concerned with social settings and activities (Altrock and Huning, 2015).

3.3 CONTESTED EVERYDAY SPACE. ON EVERYDAY MASS ACTION.

In the past decades, alternative urbanisms have enriched the spectrum of public-space-focusedplanning interventions (e.g. everyday urbanism, ordinary city, insurgent planning, insurgent public space,guerrilla urbanism, etc.). Many of these contributions stress the relevance of lived space dimensions forplanning, albeit in nuanced ways. While (1) urban studies scrutinize approaches to adopt, appropriate and act(in) public space through changing everyday practices, (2) political scientists are currently discussing thetheory of “social non-movements” (Bayat, 2010), as sketched above. Planning theorists link Bayat’s positionto (3) insurgent planning with a post-colonial focus on the everyday dimension of urban space. Miraftab (2009)has revised Western notions of radical planning by elaborating this concept: Practicing insurgent planningacknowledges what the hegemonic drive of neoliberal capitalism tries to obscure: the oppositional andtransformative practices that citizens and marginalized populations invent day-by-day outside globalcapitalism’s definition of inclusion. Insurgent planning approaches strip ‘democracy’ and ‘inclusion’ of theirformalistic elements, recognizing the ability of counter-hegemonic movements to choose own ways ofconstituting their collectivities and their participation.

3.4 LIVED SPACE DIALECTICS. ON COMBINED ACTIVISM.

In the context of the introduction of neoliberal urban policies in very different urban contexts,many cities around the world witness an increase in urban inequalities which is visible and can be analysed atthe interface of public space and housing research. As a case study, struggles and resistances to push for theright to housing and for public space to reinstitute democratic decision making in praxis have beensuccessfully intertwined. Housing rights movements have brought silences and absences that exist in theprivate realm into the public debate, and have simultaneously re-framed what was considered as individualand personal failure a structural problem of public concern (Garcia-Lamarca 2017). These empirical findingsecho (2) the feminist critique that public space debates often do not include the fates of the so-called urbansubaltern, the marginalized and disenfranchised urban populations for whom to become public wouldpotentially pose a threat: this relates for example to a whole range of professions working in grey legal andlabour conditions, such as nannies, housekeepers, gardeners, etc (visible in the private households). Thiscritique sheds a light on the private-public relation vice versa, as it criticizes the silences and absences inpublic space that get visible once we carefully realize an ethnography of the living and working conditions ofun(der)paid labour and its reproduction in the private realm. These considerations are linked (3) to theconcept of relational planning which stems from the family of approaches that coin public space as relational(Tornaghi and Knierbein, 2015), where feminist approaches need to be integrated into planning for relationalpublic space. These approaches include (a) transdisciplinary approaches to city making; (b) context-specific,people-centred urban development tactics; (c) social space based conceptions of public space and urbancultures to conceptually recover the lived spaces in the city; (d) a focus rather on ‘inclusion through action’(performative, material) then on ‘participation through discourse‘ (communicative, symbolic); (e) alternativedevelopment paths beyond top-down modes of territorial urban restructuring.

3.5 URBAN RESISTANCE. ON INCREASING SOCIAL INEQUALITY.

This section is an attempt to better understand that the current waves of urban protests areinherently linked to rapidly changing structural conditions and the decline of (national) democracies. It offers(1) an insight into youth’s struggles in public space against a new tech- and expert-led gentrification and tracesof a qualitatively new contestation unfolding around the use of public sports grounds. In San Francisco, techworkersfrom the Silicon Valley and related IT areas are not just the new gentry to habit the houses whereformer communities of colour (Afro-American and Hispanic-Americans) have been displaced throughmassive gentrification along the google bus routes, but the city authority also facilitates that new IT relateddwellers (particularly young white affluent men) are offered to ‘hire’ a sports pitch for money, a public spacewhich is already a lived space for young people who grew up using the pitch in an manner inclusive tonewcomers (Maharawal, 2017). This empirical case is (2) discussed against theories that point to the currentconjuncture of post-politics in seemingly democratic societies while emphasizing the omnipresent democraticdeficits of state governance: Rancière (2010, p. 60) states that democracy (…) is the constituent power of“those who have no part – which does not mean the ‘excluded’ but anyone whoever”. Lorey (2014) expandson this thought as a critique of representative democracy as a form of

bourgeois democracy by developingthe concept of ‘presentist democracy’ which she claims has been globally practiced through the principle ofhorizontality in the recent civic uprisings. For her, the modern promise of coming democracy has remainedunfulfilled, as the political democracy remains separated from an achievement of claims of social equality.This debate is transferred (3) to the planning field by elaborating on what Purcell denominates as counterhegemonic planning, by asking: How planners can best resist neoliberalization? For Purcell (2009, p. 141)“democratic resistance to neoliberalism must explicitly and directly challenge the foundations of theneoliberal project”. Purcell (2009) concludes that planners must learn from counter-hegemonic movements’struggles, and must make it their business to actively nurture them, for they offer a way out of the wildernessof neoliberalism: “Reclaiming power through political mobilization is our best hope for creating moredemocratic, more just, and more civilized cities.“ (ibid., p. 160)

3.6 URBAN EMANCIPATION. ON CONSENT AND DISSENT.

This last part connects (1) post-foundational thought in urban and planning theory (Wilson andSwyngedouw (2015, p.6): “in post-politics, political contradictions are reduced to policy problems to bemanaged by experts and legitimated through participatory processes in which the scope of possible outcomesis narrowly defined in advance.” Post-foundational thought characterizes processes of post-politicization withthe following aspects: (a) depoliticization; (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 containmentof different political-economic models (ibid). To keep liberal democracy alive—Mouffe (2013) states—,dissent needs to be cultivated within agonistic struggles (by adversaries), to prevent that political passions aremisguided into extremist political forms of agonistic struggles (between enemies). Agonistic struggles are thuspart of the constant renewal of the balance between equality and freedom, whereas antagonisms prioritizefreedom over equality. Current modes of post-positivist planning (3), however, are heavily consensus-based,while dissent is not actively cultivated in planning schools (Purcell 2009). Formal participatory modes ofcommunicative and collaborative planning tend to use consensus-building and majority-decisions, while(in)advertently flattening the contradictory voices of minority or marginalized groups. This situation calls fora more radical and egalitarian democratic thought in planning. Consensus-based liberal planning approacheshave been criticized for they may silence out citizens and leave reasoning about decisions to managers,politicians and experts in processes of multilevel governance. Hillier (2002) has thus been advocating adissent-based conception of agonistic planning, and has simultaneously asked what Mouffe’s agonisticdemocracy would look like at an urban scale of decision-making. Yet while agonistic planning has beenintroduced, the power of public space research to understand the link between politics and passions inplanning, that is a key aspect linking to current everyday life transitions, still remains to be explored in depth.Albeit not new, the claim for a re-democratization of planning as spatial praxis seems all to urgent, as in timesof increasing everyday life restrictions and threats to democratic ways of living “it is a question of a slow, butprofound modification of the everyday—of a new usage of the body, of time and space; of sociability;something that implies a social and political project; more enhanced forms of democracy, such as directdemocracy in cities” (Lefebvre 1988, pp. 86f) that planners do need to engage with. This concerns as wellinnovative ideas about a “definition of a new citizenship; decentralization; participatory self-management(…)—that is, a project for society that is at the same time cultural, social and political” (ibid.).

If there is a new generation of post-positivist planning accounts that actively makes use of arenewed critique of everyday life, then this critique must work to reconnect political, social and culturaltheory to planning praxis, with a strict focus on the ambivalent dialectics inherent in lived space.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

Altrock, U., & Huning, S. (2015). Cultural interventions in urban public spaces and performative planning: Insights from shrinking cities in Eastern Germany. In C. Tornaghi & S. Knierbein (Eds.), Public Space and Relational Perspectives. New Challenges for Architecture and Planning. London, England: Routledge.

Bayat, A. (2010). Life as Politics: How Ordinary People Change the Middle East. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Dirksmeier, P., & Helbrecht, I. (2010). Intercultural interaction and "situational places": a perspective for urban cultural geography within and beyond the performative turn. Social Geography, 5, 39-48.

Elden, S. (2004). Understanding Henri Lefebvre. Theory and the Possible. New York, NY: Continuum.

García-Lamarca, M. (2017). Recuperating the Public Through Housing Rights Struggles in Spain. In J. Hou & S. Knierbein (Eds.), City Unsilenced. Public Space and Urban Resistance in the Age of Shrinking Democracy (pp. 44-55). London, England: Routledge.

Goonewardena, K., Kipfer, S., Milgrom, R., & Schmid, C. (2008). Space. Difference. Everyday Life. Reading Henri Lefebvre. London, England: Routledge.

Hardt, M. (2007). Foreword. What Affects Are Good For. In P.T. Clough & J. Halley (Eds.), The Affective Turn. Theorizing the Social (pp. ix-xiii). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Highmore, B. (2002). The everyday life reader. London, England: Routledge.

Hillier, J. (2002). Direct action and agonism in democratic planning practice. In P. Allmendinger & M. Tewdwr-Jones (Eds.), Planning Futures. New Directions for Planning Theory (pp. 110-135). London: Routledge.

Huxley, M. (2002). Governmentality, Gender, Planning. A Foucauldian Perspective. In P. Allmendinger & M. Tewdwr-Jones (Eds.), Planning Futures. New Directions for Planning Theory (pp. 136-154). London, England: Routledge.

Kaika, M., & Karaliotas, L. (2017). Athens' Syntagma Square Reloaded: From Staging Disagreement Towards Instituting Democratic Spaces. In J. Hou & S. Knierbein (Eds.), City Unsilenced. Public Space and Urban Resistance in the Age of Shrinking Democracy (pp. 121-132). London, England: Routledge.

Kalekin-Fishman, D. (2013). Sociology of everyday life. Current Sociology 61(5-6), 714-732. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0011392113482112

Lefebvre, H. (1988). Towards a leftist cultural politics. In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.) Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Lefebvre, H. (2003 (1970)). The Urban Revolution. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Lefebvre, H. (2014). Critique of Everyday Life – The one volume edition. London, England: Verso.

Lehtovuori, P (2010) Experience and Conflict: The Production of Urban Space. Farnham, Ashgate.

Lorey, I. (2014). The 2011 Occupy Movements: Rancière and the Crisis of Democracy. Theory, Culture & Society, 31(7-8), 43-65.

Maharawal, M. M. (2017, in press). San Francisco's Tech-led Gentrification: Public Space, Protest, and the Urban Commons. In J. Hou & S. Knierbein (Eds.), City Unsilenced. Public Space and Urban Resistance in the Age of Shrinking Democracy (pp. 30-43). New York, NY: Routledge.

Mayer, M. (2013). First world urban activism: Beyond austerity urbanism and creative city politics. City, 17(1), 5-19.

Merrifield, A. (2002). Metromarxism. A Marxist Tale of the City. New York, NY: Routledge.

Miraftab, F. (2009). Insurgent Planning: Situating Radical Planning in the Global South. Planning Theory, 8(1), 32-50.

Molotch, H. (1976). The city as a growth machine. Toward a political economy of place. American Journal of Sociology, 82(2), 309-332.

Mouffe, C. (2013). Agonistics. Thinking the world politically. London, England: Verso.

Purcell, M. (2009). Resisting Neoliberalization: Communicative Planning or Counter-Hegemonic Movements? Planning Theory, 8(2), 140-165.

Rancière, J. (2010). Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics. London, England: Continuum.

Roberts, J. (2006). Philosophizing the Everyday: Revolutionary Praxis and the Fate of Cultural Theory. London, England: Pluto Press.

Ronneberger, K. (2008). Henry Lefebvre and Urban Everyday Life. In Search of the Possible. In K. Goonewardena, S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom & C. Schmid (Eds.) Space, Difference, Everyday Life. Reading Henri Lefebvre. (pp. 134-146.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ross, K (1995) Fast cars, clean bodies. Decolonization and the reordering of French culture. Cambrigde, Mass., MIT Press

Schmid, C. (2005). Stadt, Raum, Gesellschaft. Henry Lefebvre und die Theorie der Produktion des Raumes. Munich, Bavaria: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Shields, R. (1999). Lefebvre, Love and Struggle. Spatial Dialectics. London, England: Routledge.

Smith, N. (2010 (1984)). Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space (4th ed.). London, England: Verso.

Soja, E. (1996). Thirdspace. Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places. Cambridge, England: Blackwell.

Thrift, N. (2008). Non-Representational Theory: Space. Politics. Affect. London, England: Routledge. Tornaghi, C., & Knierbein, S. (2015). Public Space and Relational Perspectives. New Challenges for Architecture and Planning. London, England: Routledge.

Wilson, J., & Swyngedouw, E. (2015). The Post-Political and its Discontents: Spaces of Depoliticisation, Spectres of Radical Politics. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.

Žižek, S. (2012). The Year of Dreaming Dangerously. London, England: Verso.

ID 1571 | SYSTEMATIC SHARING OF EXPERIENCES AND KNOWLEDGE OBTAINED IN PILOT PROJECTS

Elena Gilcher[1]; Gerhard Steinebach[1]
[1]Chair of Town Planning, Faculty of Spatial and Environmental Planning, University of Kaiserslautern
elena.Gilcher@ru.uni-kl.de; gerhard.Steinebach@ru.uni-kl.de

ABSTRACT: Pilot projects are implemented in order to obtain knowledge and experiences that can be reused lateron – either in other pilot projects, in large-scale projects or even in the legislature. In this paper, we address the question of efficient and effective distribution of insights between pilot projects. We present detailed considerations on the required structures to share the experiences and knowledge obtained by evaluations of the stages of a pilot project. Foremost, a systematic interaction between project participants and a central collection of experience is required. The collection should be publicly and freely available. By establishing such structures, the reuse of existing knowledge and experiences is significantly simplified. A common structure for pilot projects, for example, allows for information sharing between equal stages of pilot projects. Given that the obtained knowledge and experiences of these individual stages are easily accessible, the hampering need to review a comprehensive final project report is eliminated. For future pilot projects as well as large-scale projects, the cost associated with reusing existing experiences and knowledge is reduced and the cost-benefit ratio improves. We exemplify this by investigating systematic information sharing between equally structured pilot projects. To that end, we present the relevant background on knowledge management as well as project structuring – two complementary parts for the success of pilot projects – and contribute their systematic linkage for an efficient and effective reuse of knowledge and experiences.

1 INTRODUCTION

Spatial planning often has to deal with novel challenges where no experiences or knowledge pre-exist – neither specific nor general. In such scenarios, it is common scientific practice to create a model and test a hypothesis on it. Models reduce the complexity of reality and are simplified projections of real systems or issues they help to understand. Simplification is characterized by illustration, reduction and pragmatism. If a developed model turns out to be too simplistic with respect to a specific aspect, e.g. because it abstracts certain aspects too much, it is usually refined. Afterwards, examination is repeated on the more elaborate model that, in turn, might reveal decisive weaknesses in a different aspect. Then, the process is repeated. After the model's accuracy was assessed positively and if obtained results are promising, real-world tests are conducted.

In spatial planning, however, this approach is usually destined to fail as the model cannot be refined to a level that allows for sufficient certainty. Spatial planning activities are always embedded into a socio-cultural environment. They involve many participants that are linked by complex structures. Neither the participants nor the structures can be captured appropriately in a simplifying model. Therefore, spatial planning implements pilot projects – small-scale, short-term real-world studies. They constitute the preferred instrument approach for novel challenges in spatial planning.