

- Guggenheim, M. (2010). The long history of prototypes. *Limn 01: Prototyping Prototyping*, Madrid. , 1(1) 51-57.
- Habraken, J. N. (1988). The uses of levels. Paper presented at the UNESCO Regional Seminar on Shelter for the Homeless, Seoul. Retrieved from http://www.habraken.com/html/downloads/the_uses_of_levels.pdf
- Habraken, J. N. (1999). In Teicher J. (Ed.), *Supports: An alternative to mass housing* (2nd ed.). UK: Urban International Press.
- Habraken, J. N. (2006, reprint of the 2003 publication). Questions that will not go away: Some remarks on long-term trends in architecture and their impact on architectural education. *Open House International*, 31(2), 12-19.
- Jiménez, A. C. (2013). The prototype: More than many and less than one. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 4(7 (Special Issue, Prototyping cultures: art, science and politics in beta)), 381-398.
- Latour, B. (2007). *Reassembling the social, an introduction to actor-network-theory* (1st ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Latour, B. (2011). From multiculturalism to multinaturalism: What rules of method for the new socio-scientific experiments? *Nature & Culture*, 6(1), 1-17. doi:10.3167/nc.2011.060101
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The savage mind [La pensée sauvage]* (G. Weidenfield, Nicholson Ltd Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Scalbert, I. (2011). The architect as bricoleur. [Der Architekt als Bricoleur] *Candide. Journal for Architectural Knowledge*, 07/2011(04), 69-88. Retrieved from http://www.candidejournal.net/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/08/CAN04_Essay_Scalbert.pdf
- Star Leigh, S., & Griesemer, J. R. (1989). Institutional ecology, 'translations' and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in berkeley's museum of vertebrate zoology, 1907-39. *Social Studies of Science*, 19(3), 387-420.
- Teerds, H., & Havik, K. (2011). Define and let go/ an interview with john habraken. *OASE, Productive Uncertainty*(85), 8-16.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1958). In Anscombe G. E. M., Rhees R. and Von Wright G. H. (Eds.), *Philosophical investigations* (G. E. M. Anscombe Trans.). (Second ed.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

ID 1721 | GLOBAL SOUTH PLANNING: FROM WAR TO WARS

Frederico Canuto¹

¹Federal University of Minas Gerais

fredcanuto@gmail.com

1 INTRODUCTION

Not because of the various number of armed conflicts that are happening in Brazil related to land distribution, indigenous rights, social justice or many others issues, nor because European refugees, financial and democratic crisis nor because USA intervention on Middle East and north american racial struggles that created the Black Lives Matters Movement nor because another similar issues in countries around the world, nor even because protests in city streets in Cairo, Athens, Madrid, etc since 2008 financial crisis; war is the politics that became the paradigm of internal and external relations by nation states around the globe because war is a modus operandi that always has been used as a politic since the beginning of the foundations of these very own nations and states. Disguised and/or underestimated by media and even theoretical and political thought as just "conflicts", what is visible is that a war keeps continuing as the exercise of politics. And when this concept of war and politics is thought in an urban planning context, it serves to maintain the political dimension of everyday life impenetrable to disruptive and constitutional forces.

But if war is thought not as a colonization force as it is considered in history produced inside Europe and from Europe to the rest of the world, the perspective changes and the idea of war and how it can be a disruptive force to the creation of life arises. In a Global South context characterized by the emergence of others forms of experience the world, narrate the world and produce even new worlds like

Brazilian anthropologist Eduardo Viveiros de Castro discusses when asked about the relationship between nature and culture, a decolonizing energy surges and open imaginaries regarding war as a positive and immanent force of life. Understanding the conflicts, collectives and multitudes forces through the prism of war and disputed space in 2008-2016 conflicts, occupations and manifestations in Middle East, Spain and specially in Brazil, and relating it to historical urban uprisings, modes of organization in a economical and political sphere and aesthetical affects, a war engaged and capable of create new forms of urban planning, one between top-bottom and bottom-up perspectives, surges. In this paper, after a discussion on how western thought thinks war as a political paradigm, it will be presented how the french anthropologist Pierre Clastres interpretations of conflict and wars in Amerindian societies will be used to open that perspective about war as a vital force to renew and create new people, producing new spatialities and a specific manner to think and act, serving as basis to an urban planning interest in produce difference and multiply worlds.

2 WAR AND POLITICS: CONTEXTS

In political studies, the theme of war gained central place on discussion since at the seventies the French philosopher Michel Foucault brought back the axiom of General Carl Von Clausewitz made in XIXth century and put it in the political arena: the war is the continuation of politics by others means (CLAUSEWITZ, 2014).

If Clausewitz discuss the relationship between war and politics in a rapid manner in his work *On War*, it is not coincidence. For him war is another state of things, opposed to Politics. It has consequences on politics but it is not related to it in an intense and imbricated manner. War in the Nineteenth century was not a political force, but an option that wipe out politics. In a century where new lands are not just discovered but colonized as well, and Nation States were created by unification disregarding race or ethnics questions, war is an instrument of conquer and pacification to install politics, inside and outside, transforming everything in inside.

Foucault brought the theme of War back due its relation to another key concept in his discourse that is Power. To the French philosopher, it is the inverse: Politics is the continuation of war by others means. And when he said that, it is not metaphor or a connection that has no ties. Continuation because thenationalists wars – 1st and 2nd world war among other colonizing ones – unfold themselves into bureaucracy and institutionalization. So, politics is the continuation of war because war is reshaped and reintroduced into State as politics. Power is exercised by the state as politics and war in a complex and intricated manner.

Two courses given in College de France transformed into books – *Society must be defended* (1997) and *Security, Territory and Population* (2007) – affirms the intense relation between Power, Force and Rationality. War is appropriated by the State and transformed into politics by rationality (biopower), by management of risks, by the introduction of population as a key concept to understand the masses and territory.

From the politics of silence – biopower and disciplinary power – to the politics of noise – using police as an instrument of coercion – what Foucault realized was the state transform the sensibility employed in war in a disorganized, violent, caotic and, specially, visible manner, producing traumas and psychological traces of anxiety into a rationalized machine of indifference and boredom.

It is not new such assertions by Foucault if we look back to Kracauer, Benjamin or many other writings regarding the relationship between the city and the sensitivity produced in its dwellers. But what is new it is Foucault desire to expose from the state point of view how the war is produced and how the state created its own form of politics from war. Moreover, what the French philosopher presents to political and social studies is an intelligibility scheme of how state politics is exercised in an everyday life but according to a war agenda.

If war is a key concept to understand the colonization of bodies and the formation of state apparatus, such concept is used in countries and cities all over the world. It is not a political frame that was used only in colonization periods or in a certain time, but that is continued used creating centers and an hegemonical thread in all urbanized territory.

Anderson (2006) in his 1983 book *Imagined Communities*, when analyzing how European countries during colonization of countries in South Asia implanted the idea of nationality, despite read or not Foucault, impressively used a very similar foucaultian approach to understand how war became politics. In order to conquer territories (to absorb them and create one nation), destroy singularities (or the adversary, transforming it into national diversity) and erase a prior history – all main objectives of any war – the english author analyse how three mechanisms created a basis for political institutions on Modernity and colonization of these territories as well. A basis that builds up new images of itself, a colonized itself. Using the MAPS, the MUSEUM and CENSUS as state mechanisms of produced a nation, what Anderson showed is how it is formed images of a nation and its border, its history, its people. And that images and imaginaries constructed in that period were destroyed in a very minimum scale and reorganized in a very and disproportional large scale beginning in 2008.

Despite Anderson use such apparatus to discuss colonization methods in colonizing times, it is sure that this same frame is used inside central countries. It is not a question of which country was colonized by another one, but a political geography that creates centers and peripheries inside and outside itself.

3 2008-2016

The relation between politics and war gains visibility and is brought back to the central discussion after the end of Cold War in the new century after a peace period.

After 1989, all urban and not urban conflicts (a softer word to describe a War) disappeared of the News. Such peace is celebrated as the end of conflicts but it is the end of politics as well, since Socialism lost as an alternative to Capitalism. All questions and wars caused by ethnic differences, or due ideological colonization or pure colonization are indifferent to the occidental peace of mind, and specially to the Liberal Agenda that takes over. Rather than peace, it was and it has been a repression state, like Foucault argues about the Disciplinary Power in Modernity, But since 2000 with the emergence of a new cycle of global struggles against globalization initiating in Seattle, such war gained another dimension. And the disruptive power liberated since 2008 with the financial crisis and its diverse and at the same time, similar, consequences to nations, people and the idea of state. It is not like before such struggle cycles never existed. They did in almost every country. What is different is that it has never been so worldly connected, exposing similarities.

Since 2008, in Spain, Egypt, Brazil and other countries and cities around the world, the paradigm of Capitalism as the only logical possibility of live since socialism fail is redimensioned. Protests in city streets put in discussion not only economical and financial management of 2008 crisis, but the western democratic modern political system and a mode of social life. Protests against dictatorship in Egypt, against austerity management in Spain and Greece, against democratic representation in all cities gained visibility in social networks and then, in streets, live. The unifying MAPS of a united world based in the idea of humanity where destroyed by dissensus and the remembrance of what French-argelian philosopher Jacques Derrida stated as the not-human. The MUSEUM that points out history always as a movement ahead like an arrow, promising development and growth to all, curved that same arrow to affirms the history as repetition. The pretentious indifference among individuals certified in CENSUS were erased by the diversity of people that went to the streets, putting in check identities and old forms of understand population, masses and specially the people.

In Brazil, such protests were impulsionated by the realization of Confederation Cup in 2013 in a time when a new progressist economical cycle that started in 2003 and continued until 2013 by Lula and Dilma presidency collapsed. Violent collisions between multitudinary forces and police due 20 cents regarding bus transportation ticket transformed into a questioning about democracy, corruption and other themes regarding a new image of what is Brazil, putting in question the Brazil and its unity into discussion. During the month of June of 2013, initially the streets of Brazil biggest city, São Paulo were invaded by people mobilized by Social Movements like MPL (Movimento Passe Livre) in order to reclaim the cancellation of the 20 cents raise of tickets transportation. With the negative response by the mayor and government of the city and state, the pressure on streets just raised and became a movement not just related to ticket transportation. People from others places of the city gather around, first, due the tickets issues, and then others agendas like corruption, environment, economical discontent and many others.

From this first multitudinal invasion of public space in June, another big and medium cities like Campinas, Belo Horizonte and Rio de Janeiro, for example, had their streets occupied too. Using cardboard with phrases regarding a serious question related to political issues, people invaded representative spaces like Belo Horizonte Town Hall, occupied streets near houses of mayor, like in Rio de Janeiro. And beyond June, four months later, garbage collectors of Rio de Janeiro went on a strike, against the mayor and syndicate advices and threats (MARICATO et al, 2013).

But more than the occupation itself, what was being inaugurated by these social movements not just on Brazil but around the globe is the opening and remembrance of new ways of doing politics.

4 POLITICS AND POLITICAL = MOVEMENT AND POSITION: MOUFFE AND GRAMSCI TO LEFEBVRE

The Belgian political scientist Chantal Mouffe makes a distinction between politics and political that is very necessary for the present argument. To her, politics "(...) would be characterized by a set of practices and discourses that seek, on an institutional level, to establish a certain order and organize human coexistence (MOUFFE 2005)" This means that politics tends to maintain a certain consensus produced in a contingency context by the state. Politics is a constituent exercise. Politics is an exercise performed by representatives in spaces of representation like congresses, presidents, law makers and others. The political is not related with representations, but with direct action. The political emerges to put in discussion such representations and their limits through appropriation and use directly in space. The democratic paradox is that politics and political are not contradictory terms, in which one (politics) excludes another (political), but paradoxical because they are exercised together and the relationship between protests on streets and the necessity of occupy by agreements and arrangements prove that.

The potential constituent power of the political is the desire to be a new kind of politics: the power capable to produce a context in which arrangements and agreements are made in order to establish a (re)newed hegemony based in less representation and more direct action. The power to not only dismantle or deconstruct models and forms of state organization, but to create new social, political, cultural and economical forms of produce collectivities and to discuss dissent. Dissent here is the key word: democracy as an exercise of many others.

The French philosopher Jacques Rancière already discussed the question of dissent in terms very similar to Mouffe (1996), but in his book dedicated to democracy entitled *Hatred of Democracy* (2006) he discusses the model of democracy created in Greek society. The etymology of the word democracy is "government – cracy" of the "demon – people". So, democracy was born by the desire of give freedom to the people and not to the elected by the people. The election is a lottery process which anyone can be chosen to be elected. That kind of voting mechanism had the objective to keep politics an activity performed by nonprofessionals, which it guaranteed that the elected would do what people command and not what they think is the best. The power is not in the representation but in the people that elect such representation. Despite nowadays in which congress men have their own agenda, these representation in Greek terms according Rancière means that their agenda should be formed in assemblies and encounters with the people who vote.

Despite this lottery methodology, what is at stake in democracy is the possibility of the people rule the society through public assemblies and encounters. It is a democracy that is based in a very short institutional distance between the people and their representative and the fact that the very own democratic exercise is made not just by representation, but by direct action either.

Antonio Gramsci, Italian political scientist makes an interesting approach between war and politics/ political using the concepts of war of movement and war of position. Using the context of political struggles in Russia pre-1917 and post-1917 revolution, Gramsci tries to explain such revolution using these two concepts. The revolution, the struggle with firearms, the civil war he called war of movement (LIGUORI, VOZA, 2017) . So, this is the exercise of the political: the dispute to act, to have power to act. It is a struggle against old forms of regime and it is characterized by the fact that it is a passage from one mode of production to another. The war of position is another political struggle. If the first is to take state power, the second is once the state power was taken, it is the struggle to create and exercise democratic

forms of build a new democratic state (LIGUORI, VOZA, 2017). Such passage from movement to position is the very own relation between political to politics. They are two phases of the same movement: from the status quo to the protest and then, to the invention of a new manner to produce social relations in the production of space.

The French philosopher Henri Lefebvre in 1973 wrote an underestimated book that is central to understand a passage from politics to political and to politics again: *The Survival of Capitalism*. That book, that preceded *The Production of Space*, is central because it brings to the discussion the relation between the production of space and the political / politics question. According to the author, everyday life is the sphere where politics and the status quo are reinforced and reproduced endlessly. It is that cycle that makes possible to capitalism understood as a political, social, cultural and economical system to reproduce itself. But it is the political – and having in mind that this book was written after May of 1968, where French students went to street to reclaim a more meaningful life and strikes happened all over France, organized by French factory workers – that makes possible to envision new forms of space, new forms of produce social relations of space production (LEFEBVRE, 1976). If the space and its social content are inseparable (LEFEBVRE, 1991), the political puts a war movement inside the very own core of capitalism.

5 STASIS, THE POLITICAL AND A OTHER WAR

Giorgio Agamben – reader of Michel Foucault – in *Stasis. Civil War as a Political Paradigm* discusses the relationship between civil war and citizenship in ancient Greek society. Citizenship is not a sentiment or a legal document that attests nationality. Citizenship is action, it is the individual that discusses and act thinking about the common good of the society, of what is public, instead of keeping at its individual residence.

Citizenship relates to a responsibility regarding the public and the exercise of the Mouffe's political. It is a war of movements. "Not taking part in the civil war amounts to being expelled from the polis and confined to the oikos, to lose citizenship by being reduced to the unpolitical condition of a private person" (AGAMBEN, 2015, 13).

So, to the Italian philosopher, between the family (more of the same, oikós) and the city (the others, polis), what is formed is a movement between politics and political. And that movement of differentiation is the war: "(...) politics as a field of forces (...) civil war marks the threshold through which the unpolitical in politicized and the political is 'economized'" (AGAMBEN, 2015, 17).

When a multitude of people invades the streets declaring war against state and its modus operandi, what is in dispute is the manners of how the state controls, manage, regulates and dominates population. In Brazil in 2013, when people went to the streets demanding the annulment of the 20 cents raise of ticket transportation, they were defying bus companies, transportation secretary BHTRANS, Townhall, democratically elected representatives. They were discussing an entire political, economical and social system. But it is not just a war of movement. There is inside such war a constituent component. However, such war seems to change from one hegemonic context to another.

In an urban planning sphere, such citizenship movements are autonomous cells that produce and discuss their own strategies and tactics regarding urban planning. As SOUZA (2006) states, urban planning is not an exclusive activity of any power, specially the State. Organized groups and social movements that occupy streets or empty buildings, for example, make their own urban planning. Urban planning is not an exclusive activity of the State, although the State has the power to make it in a more complex and broader scope. This means that these other social-spatial actors act as urban planners, but they are not interested in constitute a central power. They battle for spaces, for representation, for inches in streets but they are not interested in replace the state. So, they are another kind of war.

6 THE AMERINDIAN WAR AND THE MULTITUDE: FRACTALIZATION OF URBAN PLANNING

The French anthropologist Pierre Clastres gives images of what war can produce in terms of life. While he was studying amerindian societies in Latin America, they noticed that the traces of violence repeatedly considered by others anthropologists as a traces of primitivism and savagery were not that at all. Putting into scrutiny anthropological analysis of the violence of these societies, he realized that they were always considered as traces of peoples who are not capable of live together. Even more, the violence were considered as a distinctive trace of a immanent incapacity to be civilized (naturalist discourse), or result of the fight among tribes for the resources in nature (economist discourse), or as a intrinsic part of commercial activities that can not be resolved in a pacific manner (commercial discourse) (CLASTRES, 2011).

Instead of viewing such violence as a trace of anti-social behavior because different from the white man manners, he saw as a trace of a very specific social relationship. He understood that such behavior was not anti-social, but the amerindian societies manner to maintain a sociability. Violence is a sociability mediation between themselves (CLASTRES, 2011).

The war among tribes was a sociological mechanism, according Clastres, to maintain an identity through a differentiation from the others. Indigenous from different places fight in order to differentiate themselves from the other tribes. Violence is a mechanism that prevent one to become the other. Tribes make agreements and alliances that lasts just until it is necessary. They are not made to last because if one tribes gets to close to another, a tendency to fusion has to be denied and it is done by war. Delleuze and Guattari understanding of war machines as a productivity movement of differentiation (2004) came from Clastres perception of Amerindian societies.

If the western war is a war to dominate and eliminate the adversary in order to conquer the other and annulate him as such, the Amerindian war is a sociological mechanism that guarantees difference. It is not interesting to eliminate the other because it is its existence that affirms itself.

When we transfer such diverse rationality to the description of social movements, urban planning, participation and so on, it seems disconnected from western reality. However the protests from 2008 until now are all manifestations against homogenization, against the prevalence of the idea of one nation, one people, one identity. Such protest and the movements created due it are formation and affirmation of new identities – economical, cultural, gender and/or social ones. The Amerindian war is a war against the one in favor of the many, so the protest.

One can say that good practices of urban planning are agreements made among many socio-spatial agents – alliance – regarding an issue and not the disagreement or a war. But what was the positive and disruptive force that came from the protest if not a desire to agree that everybody disagree. On many streets around the globe, there was not a phrase or a word that could resume all the reinvidications made by the people. The words were many, so the people were many.

And after the disruptive force liberated on streets, what followed were alliances among new political forces and social movements together with the hope of many voters: in Spain, municipalist candidatures to cities town hall incredulously won the election; in Greece, Syriza reached the presidency; in Island, the people voted against austerity and in favor of a new constitution that limits the market forces (CAVA, BELTRAN, 2015). But others multiplicities arised too: in Brazil, the movements presented in 2013's streets of the big and medium cities transformed into new movements (Free Pass Movement in São Paulo are now in others cities, for example), occupations broke out all over brazilian schools, citizens movements disputing city elections. A hole new panorama never seen in Brazil emerged – to the left and to the right – and are repeating old forms of make politics instead of the political.

7 A PROPOSAL: GLOBAL SOUTH PLANNING

It has been presented here two kinds of war: one that is related to the dispute of the cultural hegemony and other, related to the production of new forms of life endlessly. A Global South Planning that is discussed here is not just a strategy or a tactical manner to absorb minorities and transform them into a new majority. And it is not just the understanding of war processes inside the society as a dispute over the production of

a new or renewed hegemony. It is not a question of dispute the State and its hegemonical power, but to dispute the power to act despite the state, with the State or against the State.

Such Global South urban planning should consider that are other ways of doing politics and exercise power, considering the political as an instance of negotiation and alliances that does not reduce multitude to the will of occupy the State. It does not mean the occupy the State is not an objective: it is. But occupy it should not mean just to replace one group for another. The question is how to occupy the State and organize it in such a manner in which others forms of democracy can appear not as adversaries, but as other kinds of Urban Planning. It means reduce the power of the State in order to give it to the people. It is to occupy the State not to make it into a liberal one, but reinforce it by making it more anarchic. It is necessary to give force to the State in order to be repassed to people.

So, the theme of war, when discussed not as an extent of politics as Foucault read it, but of political, opens possibilities of emergence of new strategies of planning and manage social spaces.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- AGAMBEN, Giorgio. (2015). *Stasis. Civil War as a Political Paradigm*. Edinburgh: University Press.
- ANDERSON, Benedict. (2006). *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the origin and spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- CAVA, Bruno, BELTRAN, Sandra Arencón. (2015). *Podemos e Siryza. Experimentações Políticas e Democracia no século 21*. São Paulo: Annablume.
- CLASTRES, Pierre. (2011). *A Guerra nas Sociedades Primitivas In: Arqueologia da Violencia. Pesquisas de Antropologia Política*. São Paulo: Cosac Naify.
- CLASTRES, Pierre. (2003). *A Sociedade contra o Estado. In: Sociedade contra o Estado. Pesquisas de Antropologia Política*. São Paulo: Cosac Naify.
- CLAUSEWITZ, Carl Von. (2014). *Da Guerra*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- DELEUZE, Gilles, GUATTARI, Felix. (2004). *Mil Planaltos. Capitalismo e Esquizofrenia 02*. Lisboa; Assirio Alvim
- FOUCAULT, Michel. (1997). *Society must be defended. Lectures at the College de France. 1975-1976*. New York: Picador
- FOUCAULT, Michel (2007). *Security, Territory, Population. Lectures at the College de France. 1977-1978*. New York: Picador
- LEFEBVRE, Henri. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- LEFEBVRE, Henri. (1976). *The Survival of Capitalism. Reproduction of the Relations of Production*. New York: St Martin Press.
- LIGUORI, Guido, VOZA, Pasquale. (2017). *Dicionário Gramsciano*. São Paulo: Boitempo.
- MARICATO, Erminia et al. *Cidades Rebeldes. Passe Livre e as Manifestações que tomaram as ruas do Brasil*. São Paulo: Boitempo, Carta Maior.
- MOUFFE, Chantal. (2000). *The Democratic Paradox*. New York: Verso.
- RANCIERE, Jacques. (2006). *Hatred of Democracy*. New York: Verso.
- RANCIERE, Jacques. (1996). *O Desentendimento. Política e Filosofia*. São Paulo: Ed34.
- SOUZA, Marcelo Lopes. (2006). *A Prisão e a Agora. Reflexões em torno da Democratização do Planejamento Urbano e da Gestão das Cidades*. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand do Brasil.