

C mmo Space
Com on Sp ce
ommo Spac
Co mon S ace
C mmon Sp ce
C mmo pace
Common Space
Com on S ace
Commo Spac
C mmon S ace
Common p ce
Com on Spa e
C mmo Spac
Common Sp ce
Common Space

In Common

The architects of our lives are divided. There are those who insist that there is still no alternative to neoliberalism. Despite the many crises it has provoked, they continue to push for competition in every sphere of life, to widen the wealth gap, to ignore climate change and to pursue the steady dispossession of our rights and commonwealth.

Then there are those advocating change, those who seek to persuade us that capitalism can be saved from itself. They conceal capitalism behind a human face. They tell us that environmental disaster can be averted through technological solutions. They say that deeply rooted social injustices can be cured with a little more economic growth. That we'll be safer with more police on our streets.

And yet, we know that capitalism is dying, that its lies have been unmasked, that its grip on our world and our lives is maintained only through expropriations, dependency and commodified desire. *In Common* is a collection of works that see an end to capitalism without apocalypse. It provides us with techniques for building another world, and it narrates practices of alternatives and theories of hope. It is a glimpse into our shared present, for a future in common.

In Common is published by Zed Books, under the creative commons license. You are free to share this material, transform and build upon it for non-commercial purposes.

Series editor: Massimo De Angelis

About the author

Stavros Stavrides is an architect, activist and associate professor at the School of Architecture, National Technical University of Athens, where he teaches courses on social housing design, as well as a postgraduate course on the social meaning and significations of metropolitan experience. His publications on spatial theory include *The Symbolic Relation to Space* (1990); *Advertising and the Meaning of Space* (1996); *The Texture of Things* (with E. Cotsou, 1996); *From the City-Screen to the City-Stage* (2002, National Book Award), *Suspended Spaces of Alterity* (2010) and *Towards the City Thresholds* (2010).

Common Space

The City as Commons

Stavros Stavrides



Zed Books
London

www.zedbooks.co.uk

Copyright © Stavros Stavrides 2016

The right of Stavros Stavrides to be identified as the author of this work have been asserted by him in accordance with the Copyright Designs and Patents Act, 1988



This book is licensed under the Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0. International Creative Commons license (CC BY-NC 4.0).

Typeset in Minion by Sandra Friesen

Index by Rohan Bolton

Cover designed by Dougal Burgess

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior permission of Zed Books Ltd.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-78360-328-2 hb

ISBN 978-1-78360-327-5 pb

ISBN 978-1-78360-329-9 pdf

ISBN 978-1-78360-330-5 epub

ISBN 978-1-78360-331-2 mobi

Contents

Acknowledgements

Foreword

Introduction

PART ONE Commoning space

- 1 An urban archipelago of enclosures
- 2 Expanding commoning: in, against and beyond capitalism?

PART TWO Inhabited common spaces

- 3 Shared heterotopias: learning from the history of a social housing complex in Athens
- 4 Housing and urban commoning
- 5 Metropolitan streets as contested spaces
- 5 Occupied squares, societies in movement

PART THREE Envisaged common spaces

- 7 Practices of defacement: thresholds to rediscovered commons
- 3 Thought-images and representations of the city as commons
- 3 Representations of space and representations of emancipation

Conclusion: reinventing the city through commoning

Notes

Bibliography

Index

Acknowledgements

Chapter 2, ‘Expanding commoning: in, against and beyond capitalism?’, includes parts of the article ‘Common Space as Threshold Space: Urban Commoning in Struggles to Re-appropriate Public Space’, in *Footprint*, 16 (2015), 9–20, as well as parts of the article ‘Re-inventing Spaces: Commoning: Occupied Squares in Movement’, in *Quaderns-e* (Institut Català d’Antropologia), 18(2013): 40–52.

Chapter 3, ‘Shared heterotopias: learning from the history of a social housing complex in Athens’ is a developed version of the chapter ‘Heterotopias and the Experience of Porous Urban Space’, in M. Franck and Q. Stevens (eds.), *Loose Space: Possibility and Diversity in Urban Life*, London: Routledge (2007).

Chapter 4, ‘Housing and urban commoning’, includes a version of the article ‘Housing and the City: Re-inventing the Urban Commons’, in Binna Choi and Maiko Tana (eds.), *Grand Domestic Revolution Handbook*, Utrecht: CasCo Projects (2014).

Chapter 5, ‘Metropolitan streets as contested spaces’, is a reworked and extended version of the chapter published under the same title in Greek in K. Giannacopoulos and G. Giannitsiotis (eds.), *Contested City-Spaces*, Athens: Alexandria (2010).

Chapter 6, ‘Occupied squares, societies in movement’, is an extended and revised version of the article ‘Squares in Movement’, in *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 111/3 (Summer): 585–96. Some of the thoughts in this chapter were first formulated in a working paper titled ‘Communities of Crisis: Squares in Movement’ (2011), available at www.professionaldreamers.net/prowp/wp-content/uploads/Stavrides-Communities-of-crisis-fld.pdf.

Chapter 7, ‘Practices of defacement: thresholds to rediscovered commons’, is an extensive reworked version of the paper ‘Defacement and the alternative politics of urban memory’ presented at the ISA Forum of Sociology, Barcelona, in September 2008 (RC21: Rethinking Cities and Regions in a Troubled World, Session 3, New Urban Cultures: Public Space, Public Art, Performance and Popular Cultures).

Chapter 9, ‘Representations of space and representations of emancipation’, includes parts of the chapter ‘Espacialidades de emancipación y la “ciudad de umbrales”’ (in Spanish), in J. Holloway, M. Matamoros and S. Tischler (eds.), *Pensar a contrapelo. Movimientos sociales y reflexión crítica*, Buenos Aires: Herramienta Ediciones (2009).

Foreword

by Massimo De Angelis

The debate on commons and commoning has grown exponentially in the twenty-first century. In the 1990s it was virtually non-existent, apart from the neo-institutional contribution of Elinor Ostrom and her affiliates, which was nevertheless mostly unknown to radical scholars and activists. The contemporary radical literatures were just beginning to tackle new interpretations of the notion of original accumulation, enclosures and, later, accumulation by dispossession (to name different interpretative varieties), that is, the strategies used by capital and the state to destroy commons. At the same time, social movements in the global north were starting to wake up after the big defeats that accompanied the establishment of neoliberalism, and a new generation began to realize that the period of neoliberal TINA ('there is no alternative') was instead a period of TAMA ('there are many alternatives'), practised in full self-awareness by peasant and indigenous movements in the global south and by many other individuals and groupings in the global north.

Alter globalization movements coupled with the World Social Forums have further opened the cracks of hope first made unexpectedly for many of us by the unknown indigenous groups of the Zapatista Liberation Army, entering the world stage with their taking of San Cristobal de las Casas, Chiapas, southeast Mexico, on 1 January 1995, the day the North America Free Trade Agreement came into force, which, incidentally, proposed the privatization of the *ejidos*, the land held in common by Mexico's indigenous people.

Twenty years and several wars after those eye-opening events, we find ourselves with a burgeoning critical literature on commons and commoning, commonwealth and the common. Even the mere mention of these nowadays gives us a momentary break from the grip of fear and insecurity brought by our times of war and austerity. On Friday 13 November 2015, I was writing this foreword when news broke of the Paris attacks. These were perpetrated by youths from a forgotten banlieue, turned fanatics for lack of alternative practices of hope and 450 euros a month – by youths who killed mainly young people doing some very innocent socializing at restaurants, a football game and a gig. Daily life stuff for global middle-class citizens. The response from the socialist president of France was not a measured reflection on the previous reactions of the global north on similar occasions. No, it was the same as that of the neoconservative US president in Afghanistan and Iraq following the 11 September 2001 attacks, a response that escalated deaths by terrorist attacks in the global north and around the world by 4,500 per cent and caused hundreds of thousands of civilian deaths in US-led intervention. The French fries are thus back in US restaurants, and there is further bombing of Syria, murdering yet more civilians, while in Paris the state of emergency is intensified and the authorities are ready to close roads to demonstrators in view of the approaching climate change talks. Daily life space becomes a space of war and security.

The neoliberal state finds money to buy bombs and missiles, but it cuts money from everywhere that money is useful for social reproduction, in the attempt to intensify the conditions of competitiveness and of the rat race. Neoliberal capital always seems to reach a point of crisis, but then it re-emerges with new emergency laws. In 2008, neoliberal states used public funds to save the major banks which had speculated with mortgages and been hit by the bursting of the financial bubble.

Nowadays, the banks are playing instead with repackaged student loans or healthcare debt. Will the state save them again when the next financial bubble bursts, giving us another round of austerity? Greece perhaps epitomizes the case for the scenario of doom. After years of austerity imposed by the Troika (the European Union, the European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund), at the beginning of 2015 there seemed to be some hope with the election of the new Syriza government. That hope lasted about six months, until the Greek government was forced to accept continued draconian cuts and privatization. Daily life space here is a space of austerity and hopelessness.

However you look at it, whatever channel you choose, our current condition seems to be reproducing hopelessness and powerlessness, and it seems impossible to approach an egalitarian and socially just society, or even think about one. It is in this context that this first book of our new Common series, by Stavros Stavrides, is so important, in that it opens a space of hope where there seems to be none, a space in which the vicious circle of war and austerity is replaced by the relationship of diverse subjectivities in heterotopic spaces. Stavrides challenges our daily perception of space, and thereby makes us see opportunities for acting in common, for locating or producing threshold places that allow us to create the conditions of entry or exit into heterotopias of commoning practically everywhere: in roads and public spaces, in housing, occupied spaces, parks and other places.

This is the first theoretical book of its kind, the first book to problematize space as commons and not only as commodity or state-managed space or pure ruin brought about by war. It is a book on the best of the Lefebvrian tradition, but also engaging with contemporary social and political thought from Foucault, Turner, Bourdieu, Hardt and Negri, Zibechi, Holloway and others – all interlaced with rigorous observations on contemporary and older social movements, and on the intersection of 1930s architectural movements with contemporary square commons. What types of subjectivities could develop when we cross the thresholds separating alienated life with other spaces? What type of experience of emancipations will we live by leaving behind a practice measured by capital and the state and encountering others in heterotopias, other spaces where differences meet and establish a practice of doing in common or commoning? These are open questions that invite each of us to get involved and experiment. The threshold between hopelessness and hope, powerlessness and power is, after all, in our own hands and spirits.

Introduction

The contemporary urbanized world is a world predominantly ruled by interests organized around the economic extraction of profit. Urban environments, contemporary cities and especially metropolises are important shaping factors of ruling organized interests, whether they take the form of banks, corporations, state enterprises, industry complexes or trading companies. At the same time, a diverse geometry of hierarchical relations between such organized interests casts its shadow on metropolitan everydayness, dominating the city's spatiotemporal transformations.

Is it that contemporary cities have become merely the channels and the tools of such a dominating arrangement of power relations that focuses on extracting profit from each and every activity that unfolds in urban worlds? Is it that predatory capitalism in its contemporary neoliberal or even post-neoliberal phase exploits the cities and that city life merely reflects the process?

An attempt will be made in this book to explore the emerging potentialities of resistance and creative alternatives beyond contemporary forms of domination in today's cities. Whether commoning, this relatively new term, has a role to play in such a prospect is something that has to be explored: do contemporary city-dwellers discover in and often against current forms of urban order opportunities to appropriate their own city, to create or even reinvent shared spaces and inhabiting practices based on cooperation? Are the meanings, the stakes and the values of a possible urban civilization being questioned today in and through practices of commoning? Do people in many parts of the world fight against corrupt governments, unjust policies and everyday exploitation not only by demanding what they need but also by organizing their common life themselves?

This book attempts to study the meaning and production of spaces of commoning in the context of today's urbanized world. Understood as distinct from public as well as from private spaces, 'common spaces' emerge in the contemporary metropolis as sites open to public use in which, however, rules and forms of use do not depend upon and are not controlled by a prevailing authority. It is through practices of commoning, practices which define and produce goods and services to be shared, that certain city spaces are created as common spaces.

Commoning practices importantly produce new relations between people. They encourage creative encounters and negotiations through which forms of sharing are organized and common life takes shape. Commoning practices, thus, do not simply produce or distribute goods but essentially create new forms of social life, forms of life-in-common. That is why those practices may be projective (hinting towards possible forms of life-in-common), expressive (attempting to draw attention to the values shared by those who participate in the commoning processes) and exemplary (partial to establishing social relations that exceed the limits imposed by dominant models of sociality).

Common space is a set of spatial relations produced by commoning practices. There are, however, two distinct ways through which those relations are organized. They may either be organized as a closed system which explicitly defines shared space within a definite perimeter and which corresponds to a specific community of commoners, or they may take the form of an open network of passages through which emerging and always-open communities of commoners communicate and exchange goods and ideas.

Throughout this book an effort will be made to explicitly connect commoning with processes of opening: opening the community of those who share common worlds, opening the circles of sharing

include newcomers, opening the sharing relations to new possibilities through a rethinking of sharing rules and opening the boundaries that define the spaces of sharing. Opposed to such levels, practices and rules (or, more precisely, institutions) of sharing are the rules and practices of capitalist social organization which promotes and establishes a 'desocialization of the common' (Hardt and Negri 2009: 258). This is based not only on the appropriation of the products of commoning by capital (considered as a social relation and not simply as money) but also on an all-encompassing strategy that may be termed a strategy of enclosure (De Angelis 2004, Midnight Notes Collective 1990). The term evokes an image connected to the fencing of an area – a spatial image, no doubt. But the capitalist enclosure of the commons is not only a process of fencing in areas of production or the use of certain goods and resources but also a process of obstructing those commoning practices that tend towards an openness of sharing: self-managed cooperation which is open to newcomers, knowledge, 'production' which is not limited to those who understand it, create it or 'finance' it and festive and joyous events which do not separate consumers from artists, and so on.

What possibly justifies the theoretical adventure of this book in focusing on common space is that enclosure in this case retains both its literal as well as its metaphoric value. This is because, as we will see, space is not only a product and therefore a stake for commoning but a means of establishing and expanding commoning practices. In and through space, dominant strategies of capturing, limiting, commanding and appropriating commoning have to face the dispersed tactics of resistance which defy, destroy or challenge the limits of literal and metaphoric enclosures.

Commoning is a process that is shaped by social antagonism that often leads to historical contingent and ambiguous results: commoning may be fenced in within the limits of a specific community that explicitly tries to keep the commoning products and advantages for its members only. In this case we can say that commoning is enclosed, although the very clear distinction between enclosure and commoning as a clear-cut distinction between two opposed poles remains theoretically valid and important. This is why, as we shall see, enclosure through literal or symbolic barriers of a community's common space may signal the death of space-commoning (and commoning through space).

Common space, defined through acts of spatial enclosure, may end up either as 'collective-private' space (as, for example, the outdoor space of a gated community) or as 'public space' managed by authorities which act in the name of a community (as, for example, the space of a municipal park or a town square). Both these forms of closed common space tend to 'corrupt the common' and block the liberating potentialities of commoning practices.

Expanding or open common space explicitly expresses the power commoning has to create new forms of life-in-common and a culture of sharing. Threshold spatiality, a spatiality of passages which connect while separating and separate while connecting, will be shown to characterize such space produced in common and through commoning. Thresholds may appear as boundaries which separate an inside from an outside, as, for example, in the case of a door threshold, but this act of separation is always and simultaneously an act of connection. Thresholds create the conditions of entrance and exit, prolong, manipulate and give meaning to an act of passage. This is why thresholds have been marked in many societies by rituals which attempt to control the inherent potentialities of crossing. Guardian gods or spirits dwell in thresholds because the act of passage is already an act that brings in a potential connection an inside and an outside. Entering can be taken as an intrusion, and exiting can convey the stigma of ostracizing.

Considering common spaces as threshold spaces opens the possibility of studying practices of space-commoning that transcend enclosure and open towards new commoners. Exploring the idea

expanding commoning, this book is in search of examples of practices and experiences which may reveal the emancipating potentialities of commoning for, in and through space.

Collective inventiveness flourishes in the production and use of threshold spaces. Comparisons between emerging identities are made possible as people use those spaces through constant negotiations. Communities which inhabit them are thus always communities-in-the-making. Entering an important discussion on contemporary forms of political subjectivation, this book will attempt to show that commoning and the creation of common spaces involve subjectivation processes which do not produce closed collective identities. J. Holloway, M. Hardt and A. Negri, and J. Rancière all share in their theorizations on political subjectivation a common horizon: subjects of political action emerge today by threatening, upsetting or even dismantling dominant social taxonomies and their corresponding established identities. In this process, contemporary urban space, which necessarily expresses and reproduces these dominant taxonomies, can possibly be transformed through collective action. Threshold spatiality can insinuate itself into the dominant spatial order in the same way that emergent 'non-identities' (Holloway 2002), 'newcomers' (Rancière 2010) or inherently multiple 'singularities' (Hardt and Negri 2009) can insinuate themselves into the dominant social order.

The book explores the interconnections between processes of spatial transformation and processes of political subjectivation, focusing especially on socio spatial experiences which reveal the potentialities inherent in contemporary metropolitan life. Drawing from research focused on inhabited spaces (including social housing, everyday uses of metropolitan streets, and occupied squares), the book attempts to show that common space is produced through collective inventiveness, which is either triggered by everyday urgent needs or is unleashed in the effervescence of collective experiments: in the self-managed settlements of the homeless movements in Latin America and in the encampments of the occupied squares of the Arab Spring, in initiatives which reclaim and transform public space, in building squats and in the creation of open neighbourhood centres or in self-organized 'reclaim-the-city' events (often connected to anti-gentrification struggles).

Envisaged common spaces, spaces imagined or sought for through expressive gestures, play an important role in shaping practices of space-commoning. Possible spatialities of commoning emerge in the form of images which trigger thought. People develop ways through which they attempt to think about, imagine and express the characteristics of common space and by doing so they invent possible forms of space sharing and sharing-through-space. Can dissident politics escape the trap of the 'liberated enclave' imaginary and discover the power that the representations of common spaces-at-thresholds have for the pursuit of collective emancipation? Perhaps yes, if people attempt to think about the common through thought-images that do not trap the future in projected city-like utopias of social harmony or liberty.

Space-commoning is not, therefore, simply the sharing of space, considered as a resource or an asset, but a set of practices and inventive imaginaries which explore the emancipating potentialities of sharing. Common space is both a concrete product of collectively developed institutions of sharing and one of the crucial means through which these institutions take shape and shape those who shape them.

Experiences of space-commoning emerge latently or explosively in many places in the world. I wouldn't attempt to create a theoretical perspective on common space if I had not had the opportunity to share some of these experiences. I strongly believe that we must learn from these experiences and try carefully to develop out of them generalizations and theoretical proposals. Like every piece of research which is immersed in its subject and like every theory which is influenced by collective aspirations and enthusiasms, this book runs the risk of being more oriented towards the defence

people struggling than towards offering a distanced look at their struggles. I really don't know if I have managed to develop a strong enough critique of space-commoning in order to be able to show the important stakes involved. I do know, however, that the discussions and literature on commons and commoning definitely shape a contested area. One should take sides in these discussions, and one should realize that value choices and views about the future of societies are directly involved in them.

Learning from struggles and collective experiences means, I think, being able to dwell sometimes on a threshold: the threshold that separates and connects at the same time acts and criticism, practice and theory, experience and representation, and participation and distanciation. I am very thankful to those who gave me the opportunity to linger sometimes on such thresholds by realizing that this was my way of supporting our common aspirations and dreams. Active members of the Alexandria Prosfygika Inhabitants Coalition in Athens taught me how to remain an academic while being part of an urban struggle. People from Brazilian homeless movements and young activists in Buenos Aires *favelas* taught me how a feeling of solidarity and the sharing of common values may produce common ground for fruitful debates. In the Syntagma Square occupation in Athens I learned how important it is to participate in egalitarian cooperation, an experience that produces its own shared space. Maybe during the long night of *pasalo* in Barcelona I realized how people may almost instantly convert the city centre to common space. Maybe matatu drivers in Nairobi and immigrants and street traders in Athens showed me how important it is to observe space-commoning at the very molecular level of everydayness.

I don't know if my education as an architect and my affiliation to a School of Architecture have been the main reason for my interest in the spatial aspect of commoning. I believe, however, that space matters a lot for commoning and that studying cities through theories and research on commoning is as important as studying commoning through theories and research on cities. Perhaps I was able to understand and experience more deeply the Red Vienna pioneer architecture which concretizes a view on a collectively organized public culture through my research on common space. Maybe this research made it possible for me to draw comparisons between this kind of architecture and the architecture of social housing in Latin America as well as in Greece, architectures that I was able to observe and study.

My 'threshold' research would not have been possible, however, if my theoretical and political trajectory had not crossed the Zapatistas' road to autonomy and social emancipation. Their social and political experiences are perhaps the most important contribution to the search for connections between today's struggles and tomorrow's just society. Without the Zapatistas, discussions on the emancipating potentialities of commoning would be less equipped with examples, less developed concepts, less connected to the history and cultures of different communities, and probably less inspiring.

After I have said all that, maybe it is clear that thanking people and acknowledging their role in shaping this book cannot take the form of a catalogue of names. Most of those people already know that I owe a lot to them, my students at the National Technical University of Athens included. Mentioning a few by name, then, does not mean that I have forgotten all the others.

A great number of research exchanges and political discussions have influenced my exploration in space-commoning. To name some of those who offered me such opportunities: Andrea Brighenti, Xenia Chrysochoou, Massimo de Angelis, Ana Džokić, Michael Hardt, John Holloway, Michael Janoschka, Giannis Margaritis, Marc Neelen, Haris Tsavdaroglou, Carlos Vainer, Raul Zibechi and the members of the research group on Critical Research Methodology in Athens.

Zed Books is, I believe, one of the most appropriate publishing contexts for this book – being

workers' cooperative. Kika Sroka-Miller, my commissioning editor, has always been supportive and encouraging.

With Maria Kopanari I have been discussing matters connected to the ideas and observations presented in this text for many years now, sometimes fiercely debating but always probing and reflecting on the process of human emancipation. Evgenia Michalopoulou was always there: inspiring in her explosive temperament, active in establishing connections with movements and engaged thinkers, and always sharing dreams for a better world. I owe her a lot more, then, than many creative years of common life.

Zoe Michalopoulou Stavrides seems to be my most relentless critic but also one of the most inspiring people I know for younger generations to learn from. I only hope that she and Evgenia will once again forgive my dark moods in periods of disappointment or inefficient efforts at writing ...

Commoning space

An urban archipelago of enclosures

The contemporary metropolis and the normalization project

The contemporary metropolis appears as a chaotic agglomeration of urban environments and flows. Simmel's big city was already a real ordeal for the senses and a difficult place to live in, today metropolises seem to have evolved to a paroxysmal accentuation and disarticulation of conflicting and overlapping urban rhythms. And if in modernist art's imaginary the big city could have been envisaged as the possible locus of a city-symphony ([Stavrvides 2013: 35](#)), in today's metropolis only cacophony seems possible.

What appears as an incoherent and fragmented locus of human activities is characterized, however, by forms of spatiotemporal ordering that are meant to be compatible with each other. The city must be controlled and shaped by dominant power relations if it is to remain a crucial means for society's reproduction. True, the city is not simply the result of spatiotemporal ordering, in the same way as the society is not simply the result of social ordering. Order, social or urban, is a project rather than an accomplished state. It is, however, important that we locate the mechanisms through which the project of urban ordering is being shaped and implemented if we want to find out against which forces that resist or overspill this ordering such mechanisms were crafted. Ordering mechanisms, thus, do not simply execute certain programmed functions but constitute complicated self-regulating systems that interact with urban reality and 'learn' from their mistakes. Urban ordering, the metropolis itself, is a process, is contested, much in the same way that dominant social relations need to be reproduced every day. Capitalism itself is a process rather than a form of social organization that repeats itself throughout its micro-history and its macro-history ([Holloway 2002 and 2010](#)).

If urban ordering is an ongoing process, what is, then, the role of urban ordering mechanisms? And what exactly is urban order when we talk about the contemporary metropolis? We could say that urban order is the impossible limit towards which practices of spatial classification and hierarchization tend in order to ensure that the city produces those spatial relations that are necessary for capitalism's reproduction. It appears as obvious that ordering mechanisms are mechanisms of control: the city can indeed be depicted as a turmoil of activities and spaces that need to be controlled. Ordering mechanisms, however, are not meant only to tame a complicated and highly differentiated form of human *habitat* (perhaps the most complicated one in human history so far). A rhetoric that attempts to legitimize them presents them in this way. However, those mechanisms are, to use Foucault's bold term, mechanisms of social normalization. Foucault insists that normalization is not simply the result of the legal system: 'techniques of normalization develop from and below a system of law, in its margins and maybe even against it' ([Foucault 2009: 56](#)).

In terms of urban ordering, normalization includes attempts to establish spatial relations that will encourage social relations and forms of behaviour which will be repeatable, predictable and compatible with the taxonomy of the necessary social roles. Normalization shapes human behaviour and may use space (as well as other means) to do so.

Normalization is a project which is always explicitly or latently contested. It is not simply imposed, it has to infiltrate every capillary vein of society in order to be effective. It has to be connected to words and acts that mould everydayness but also to acts of dominant power that frame those everyday molecular practices. Normalization is undoubtedly a project of domination, a project that seeks to mould society's subjects. It thus has to be the result of a certain arrangement of power relations.

Exactly because a complete and unalterable urban order is an impossible fantasy of those who rule, a complete and total normality cannot be imposed. Normalization will always have to deal with deviations and exceptions. What is more important, normalization can treat exception as a propelling force. What will follow in this book will be an attempt to observe the mechanisms of urban ordering as they shape the project of normalization in a constant and complex interaction with mechanisms of exception.

There is a certain image that may prove useful to a project that attempts to discover the kind of order towards which the city is forced: the image of the archipelago. Today's metropolis appears to be shaped in the form of an urban archipelago. Urban space appears as a vast sea which surrounds urban islands of various sizes and forms. As with every analogy that supports a certain interpretative idea, this image needs to be treated with caution. We need to select metaphors carefully when we talk about space if we want to examine how space is always understood through socially inculcated ideas and concepts.

The image of the archipelago may better be considered not as an analogical representation of the city but as a thought-image, an image through which thoughts about the city can be moulded rather than simply illustrated (Stavrides 2014b, Richter 2007). Thus, the urban archipelago image can be used to conceptualize spatial order (or non-order) as well as to interpret it. An emphasis on the chaotic aspect of urban space may be taken to correspond to images of unexplored or, even, untamed sea. Urban islands, in such a perspective, would be enclaves of order in the middle of urban chaos. Interestingly, an almost opposite view can also be developed. In Koolhaas's essay 'City of the Captive Globe' (Koolhaas 1994: 296), a model city is projected onto Manhattan's spatial structure, which is called an archipelago: the urban grid corresponds to the archipelago's sea and the urban plots are taken as islands. As Aureli has observed, in this conception of the archipelago 'the more different the values celebrated by each island, the more united and total the grid or sea that surrounds them' (Aureli 2011: 24). In this understanding of the urban archipelago the sea is the organizing and ordering medium in which distinct enclaves of difference, 'cities within cities', are located.

Aureli's own positive conception of the archipelago is also characteristic of the polyvalence of the image. For him, architecture ('absolute architecture') can become the force to defy and criticize the all-encompassing 'extensive space of urbanization' (ibid.: 44) which engulfs the city. To 'exceed the sea ... from within' (ibid.), architecture has to mould the islands as separated fragments, 'absolute parts which reintroduce the necessary ingredient of confrontation and agonism, 'political separateness', against the homogenizing principle of the endless and always-expanding 'sea of urbanization' (ibid.: 45).

The image of the archipelago is obviously related to a contradistinction of order versus disorder in all of these interpretations. What this chapter will try to show is that this image can support the idea that urban ordering is a project that unfolds in different but complementary levels of urban space and that this project reveals at least three distinct mechanisms of power at work. The urban sea is being ordered in different ways than the urban islands, and parts of the archipelago (including delimited areas of urban sea and certain connected islands) are mainly ordered through a third kind

mechanism.

Michel Foucault has distinguished three distinct model-forms of power mechanisms in Western societies. The first one is described as the model of sovereignty, the second as the disciplinary model and the third as the security model (Foucault 2009). Although he convincingly presents these models as corresponding to successive periods in the West's history, he nevertheless insists that models coexist in contemporary society by having a different role and importance in the overall structure of power relations (ibid.: 8 and 107).

It is interesting that in some of Foucault's examples and remarks on the distinctive characteristics of power mechanisms, space plays an important role. One can even suppose that those mechanisms correspond to different ways of space ordering or, rather, to different normalization techniques that use space by regulating it. Thus, sovereignty is 'exercised over a territory' (ibid.: 15), 'capitalizes territory' (ibid.: 20) and corresponds to a 'feudal type of territoriality' (ibid.: 20), whereas disciplinary structures 'an empty and closed space within which artificial multiplicities are to be structured and organized' (ibid.: 19) and security 'tries to plan a milieu in terms of series of possible events' (ibid.: 47). Territory, empty space and milieu: different spatialities are being defined by the different mechanisms of normalization. Let us see how this differentiation may be projected to the thought image of the urban archipelago.

Sovereignty and discipline in urban *enclavism*

'We are witnessing ... a *resurgence* of a global gated urbanism' (Jeffrey et al. 2012: 1, 252–3). Urban enclaves are spaces in contemporary cities which are defined by specific recognizable boundaries within the city and are explicitly connected with specific protocols of use. Urban enclaves are the islands of the urban archipelago. Their perimeter is marked, and various forms of control are employed to ensure access to those who are qualified as 'inhabitants'. The logic of the enclave is to separate a spatial arrangement from the rest of the city and to enclose specific urban functions in the clearly demarcated area. Enclaves are much like territories defined by the application and enforcement of certain rules of use and behaviour.

In Foucault's reasoning, sovereign power is based on juridical mechanisms which regulate the behaviour of the specific community's members by explicitly excluding certain forms of social life and those who embody them. Thus, sovereignty creates, marks and eventually stigmatizes 'outsiders'.

Urban enclaves tend to be self-contained worlds in which specific forms of spatial ordering prevail. Ordering is guaranteed by rules that apply only inside each enclave. Thus, a peculiar site-specific sovereign power is established in urban enclaves in the form of an administrative apparatus that imposes obligations and patterns of behaviour and thus defines the characteristics of the enclave inhabitants (temporary or more permanent ones).

Specific rules are applied in the ordering of a large department store, upon entrance to a bank or corporate tower and in the layout and use of a shopping mall or a huge sports stadium. Urban islands can be huge building complexes, like the ones just described, but also closed neighbourhoods especially those defined as 'gated communities'. Spatial ordering is connected with behaviour normalization in all those cases. And this process of normalization is explicitly or implicitly performed through the enforcement of regulations, which often present themselves as pure and innocent management decisions. The contemporary metropolis is 'an archipelago of "normalized enclosures"' (Soja 2000: 299).

Some gated communities have taken the form of completely barricaded urban areas to which

public access is restricted. 'Legal agreements ... tie the residents to a common code of conduct and (usually) collective responsibility for management' ([Atkinson and Blandy 2005](#): 178). One can talk about a kind of 'private governance' whether or not those legal agreements are 'free' contractual choices or rules imposed in exchange for 'lifestyle preferences' (*ibid.*: 183).

Enclave-bound 'authorities' (such as, for example, a shopping mall's management or a gated neighbourhood's administration either elected or appointed by the corresponding corporation which constructed it) may assume responsibilities and control jurisdictions which used to belong to the state. They thus contribute to the strengthening of a localized 'post-political consensus' ([Swyngedouw 2011](#): 28). These forms of governance can be considered as arrangements of 'governance-beyond-the-state' ([Swyngedouw 2009](#)) and may even be shaped as 'privatized governance regimes' ([Graham and Marvin 2001](#): 271).

By employing Agamben's theorizations on the state of exception we could further discover an essential aspect of enclave-bound power arrangements. Rules that apply inside the enclaves are often exceptional when compared to the general legal framework that is effective in the corresponding society. This kind of spatial ordering is based on a peculiar state of exception. Not only are the inhabitants' obligations exceptional but the rules that define the enclave's relations to the rest of the city are exceptional too (for example rules regulating tax obligations, street maintenance conditions of public space use, etc.). Enclaves are spatial forms of a normalized state of exception ([Agamben 1998](#): 169; 2005: 86). To understand the implications of this paradoxical situation we need to trace the connection of normality to exception.

Schmitt has explicitly connected sovereign power to the right to suspend the law. For him, 'sovereign is he who decides on the [state of] exception' ([Schmitt 2005](#): 5). If sovereign power, like every power, is, according to Foucault, focused on sustaining normality, then the right to suspend the law must be proved compatible with this permanent orientation of power. Indeed, suspending the law is not supposed to destroy normality (although it obviously does) but to protect normality from a threat. No matter what threat sovereign power diagnoses, predicts or invents to excuse law suspension, this threat is meant to be confronted with means sovereign law normally does not permit in order to be eliminated. Inherent in the act of suspension is a kind of governing reason which is focused on efficiency rather than on rights.

Exception as a form of suspension of rights is acceptable to the enclave inhabitants, or even desirable, because it is presented as a 'naturalized', obviously effective, administrative procedure. 'Outsiders' are not allowed to pass a gated community's gate, people can be searched upon entry at an Olympic Games venue, shoppers at the mall have constantly to prove that they are not thieves as they pass through electronic scanning devices, and visitors (and those who work) in corporate towers as well as travellers in airports have to be subjected to various, often humiliating, controls in order to prove that they are not terrorists. And, of course, in periods in which a certain kind of pervasive threat is presented as imminent, relevant measures will escalate.

Administrative procedures which routinize these forms of everyday control tend to normalize the exceptional status. Normalized exception becomes the generator of habits and everyday act sequences which, by being repeated, produce a peculiar kind of normality. If a state of exception – no matter how convincingly legitimized – permits to those who experience it some kind of awareness that legal guarantees and rights are suspended, a state of normalized exception tends to become a new form of localized normality. Each enclave is 'normalized' through different sets of rules. Situated rights (and privileges) become concrete, whereas 'universal' or 'general' rights become vague and abstract. Enclave-bound citizens or enclave-frequenting users learn to adapt to concrete obligations and spac

bound habits without recourse to rights that unite them with the other inhabitants of the city. Urban enclaves shape a contemporary 'differentiated citizenship' (Holston 2008: 5) through localized states of normalized exception.

Disciplinary power is also present in the production and reproduction of enclave microcosms. According to Foucault, whereas sovereign power prohibits, disciplinary power surveys, classifies and tries to separate the normal from the abnormal not in terms of banishing the negative but in terms of carefully circumscribing and isolating the threatening 'other'. Disciplinary power prescribes rather than prohibits (Foucault 2009: 47).

In maintaining the order of the enclave, disciplinary power has to constitute it as a totally describable, totally knowable and totally organizable space (ibid.: 19). Surveillance is the most important of the disciplinary technologies imposed on the defined closed space of the enclave. And this technology treats the inhabitants as *quasi-citizens* 'by constituting and structuring perceptual grids and physical routines' (Lemke 2011: 36). Discipline for Foucault is not simply suppressive but actively contributes to the productive aspects of the human relations it shapes. The human body is made 'more obedient as it becomes more useful and conversely' (Foucault 1995: 138).

We could say that while sovereign power encloses and defines the boundaries of the enclave, disciplinary power works on defining the characteristics of the enclave users. Whereas sovereign power uses space to control those people whom power identifies as subjects of a situated set of rules, disciplinary power uses space to situate, classify and mould those subjects not simply as subjects of law (or 'subjected' to law) but as members of a specific social articulation that reproduces itself through everyday life activities.

The mechanism of exception plays an important role in shaping disciplinary power too. This role can be detected in the very example Foucault uses for explaining the logic of disciplinary power: the example of 'the plague stricken town' (Foucault 1995: 195–8). To control the plague the authorities had to separate the infected from those who were healthy, had constantly to control the status of the city's population and had to create mechanisms of surveillance which could locate and contain deviations from the normal city life. Disciplinary power, in other words, needs to know and classify (ibid.: 145) and needs to map and survey the city. The *Panopticon* is more than a spatial mechanism which supports surveillance by attributing to the surveyor's presence a status of 'undecidability'. It is a disciplining arrangement that distributes people in space in order to impose on them forms of behaviour. According to Deleuze's interpretation of Foucault's abstract machine of disciplinary power, this is a specific 'diagram ... a map, a cartography that is coextensive with the whole social field' (Deleuze 1988: 34). A form of totalizing cartography is imposed on the plague-stricken city 'where power controls the whole field' (ibid.)

In the exceptionality of the circumstances of plague an exceptional model of controlling and thus governing the city emerged. In the plague-stricken city 'the utopia of the perfectly governed city' (Foucault 1995: 198) took shape. This utopia persists in the processes of establishing and governing the urban enclaves.

After Foucault, Agamben too visited the image of the plague-infected city in a short article. He wrote on the 'red zones' which were defined in Genoa's centre during the G8 leaders' meeting in 2001. For him, authorities chose to confront massive demonstrations as if they were some kind of plague threatening the city. Police controls and the act of circumscribing the city centre with an impenetrable barrier created an urban state of exception. The urban centre was transformed during these days to a temporary urban enclave with very rigid borders: a contemporary 'forbidden city' (Agamben 2001).

The logic of 'red zones' has, as we know, spread all over the world. Especially since the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks, emergency circumstances are being diagnosed by the authorities during mega-events (Olympic Games, World Cups, etc.), in cases of state leaders' meetings, World Trade Organization or International Monetary Fund summits and public ceremonies, et cetera. Red zones are exemplary enclaves which may be produced under sovereign decisions to suspend the law in certain parts of the city but which effectively create paradigmatic acts of disciplining. Red zones contribute to an imposed and totalizing cartography of the city which classifies potential threats and thus categorizes behaviours especially by limiting access and by erecting sophisticated systems of entrance control. The utopia of a totally classifiable and transparent space is the inspiring principle of the surveillance systems that make red zones effective.

Red zones are spaces of exception and they usually last as long as the event which caused the security alarm lasts. They are, however, the very matrix of a normalized state of exception that urban enclaves concretize (Stavrides 2010b: 37–9). Learning to accept red zones means learning to inhabit exception. With one important difference: whereas in red zones law is explicitly suspended and prevailing urban normality is broken (allegedly in order to be protected), in established urban enclaves general laws may be suspended but site-specific laws and rules may replace them. From the outside the enclave is a space of exception. From inside, however, it looks like a complete law-abiding universe. Agamben is right in insisting that exception is neither inside nor outside the law. Exception is declared 'in the name of law', but order is broken in the name of order. Thus, although exception creates a zone of indistinction between law and anomie (Agamben 1998: 37 and 2005: 23), it cannot nevertheless be presented otherwise than as being an act of power. What makes enclave exceptional different is that in this case power simply presents itself as administration and the suspension of rights presents itself as efficient management of risks, and so exception is effectively presented as normality.

Discipline and security in the urban sea

Disciplinary power also tends to engulf parts of the urban sea which spreads between the enclave islands. As in the case of red zones, disciplinary power fences areas that normally are part of the city's public space. In contemporary metropolises the very tissue that gives the city a somewhat deceptive unity, the space of circulation flows and outdoor public spaces, seems to pose a threat to the dream of total control. The urban archipelago's sea, although it appears to be ordered through traffic rules and circulation planning, is inherently unpredictable and a threat to the urban ordering process much like the sea itself is unpredictable (although both the sea and the urban sea phenomena follow some traceable patterns).

Disciplinary power tries to conquer parts of this immense sea-milieu and to integrate them into its enclave policies. Gentrification projects certainly have such aspects because they plan to programme life and the practices of production and social reproduction by carefully bringing to view every hidden corner of the corresponding neighbourhoods: gentrified areas are ideally areas of total planning and surveillance (apart from being, of course, areas of capital investment and aggressive speculation). Grand projects (either connected to mega-events or to large-scale redevelopment interventions) are also acts of exemplary urban ordering through which parts of the urban sea are annexed to newly formed island enclaves. Resorts or prototype suburban neighbourhoods (like those, for example, planned by the pioneers of the so-called New Urbanism) equally represent acts of taming and appropriating the urban sea.

If the image of the urban archipelago is to remain useful, it is important to locate the limits of the comparison between a physical arrangement of places and a man-made production of spatial arrangements. Importantly and as opposed to geographical islands, urban islands are being created and can be destroyed (or can even be left for the urban sea to take over). The urban sea itself can even be converted to urban 'land': to space, that is, which becomes part of planned gigantic enclaves.

Urban sea, however, cannot be totally controlled. Urban sea poses problems to urban governance which escape any form of flows management. Urban sea is not simply what remains between urban islands in the form of spaces of circulation and open spaces of public use. Dominant enclavism tends to absorb parts of these sea-spaces and to convert them to urban enclaves of controlled public use. Fenced parks are exemplary cases, as are gentrified areas which may also end up acquiring the characteristics of a public entertainment enclave.

The very process of delineating islands in the urban archipelago leaves the sea to contain various urban spaces that potentially escape total surveillance. If at one end of the spectrum we have the urban metro network as part of a tamed urban sea (which in many cities becomes a completely controlled world, though not in Mexico City, and not even perhaps in New York either), at the other end of the spectrum lie areas like those which surround *villas miserias* (slums) in Buenos Aires or *periferia* (slum areas around the city) in São Paulo: ambiguous zones of urban fabric in which acts are not easily predictable by authorities.

When dominant forms of urban governance fail to enclose and thus normalize patterns of urban life, they attempt to control space through recurrent but essentially temporary and metastatic interventions. Random identity control in the streets in search of 'illegal immigrants' (or those accused of illegal acts) may be considered as the emblematic act of authorities in this respect. It is a different form of power that concretizes in these acts. What Foucault terms the security mechanism is at the core of a politics of governing the city and especially the urban sea. It aims at studying, checking and interpreting a highly complicated (urban) reality in order to be able to predict and intercept unwanted acts and behaviours. Security tries 'to plan a milieu in terms of events or series of events or possible elements' (Foucault 2009: 21). Planning has always to readjust its ambitions, however, because reality often escapes models imposed on it. Urban governance focused on the most unpredictable and thus ungovernable parts of the urban sea has to be flexible, metastatic and always open to new knowledge concerning possible patterns of urban life in order to be able to intervene and regulate. Sampling is the form of research and action power takes when it deals with these problems. And it is through practices of sampling that security power attempts to control not individuals but populations, urban populations par excellence. Baudrillard's work on the importance of codes for the pre-normalizing of behaviour through normative simulation can be very useful in this context (1983: 115–22).

Foucault insists on the seriality of possible events that power tries to infer and thus control. Maybe it is better to talk about the imposition and the control of urban rhythms (Stavrides 2013). Normalization may be understood as the successful politics of rendering social life completely transparent: knowable and available to planning. Rhythmicity will be in such a context the essential characteristic of social life. Lefebvre's promising sketch of a possible 'rhythmanalysis' (Lefebvre 2004) shows us that rhythms can shape control mechanisms but can also give form to practices that exceed dominant rules. To borrow from De Certeau, power works through strategies that calculate space and time, whereas the 'weak' only use tactics: they are 'always on the watch for opportunities' (De Certeau 1984: xvii). However, both the strong and the weak actually attempt to navigate in and through urban rhythms. If dominant power was to become able to absolutely control rhythms then the

very mechanisms of domination would become pointless. Domination is a project. And social rhythms constitute a contested terrain.

Security power, thus, rather than prohibiting or prescribing, tries to calculate and include those very habits through which urban life manifests itself. That is why security mechanisms were supported by the advancing liberalist reasoning. A belief in the market's and, eventually, society's self-regulation through the coordination of the acts of free individuals is illustrated in the very practices of security power. What makes this kind of power effective is its very flexibility.

Take, for example, the problem of surveying the city as posed by nineteenth-century cartography. As Joyce shows us, the 'standardized map' reduced the city to a homogenizing 'clarity of the line' even though differences between different spaces were depicted, in terms of geometry, accurately (Joyce 2002: 105; see also Joyce 2003). This is indeed characteristic of the 'social imaginary of liberal democracy' (ibid.) in which the unity of society (and the city) is established through acts of power that present themselves as 'natural' (exactly in the way that the standardized map presents itself as objective). Security power is 'liberal' because it seems natural. However, security apparatuses activate the power models have in order not only to predict but also to mould behaviour. Security, thus, understands normalization as the 'plotting of the normal and the abnormal ... in different curves of normality' or, in other words, understands 'the norm as an interplay of differential normalities' (Foucault 2009: 63).

The problem of normalizing the urban sea is thus a problem of urban governance that requires new mechanisms of power. A power that calculates and constructs models has to work with mechanisms of discipline and sovereignty, as we have seen. But this kind of power coordination has to deal in a different way with exception. Exception may become a propelling rather than a paralysing force in the enactment of security power. The security mechanism's flexibility above all is based on its ability to learn from exception, to incorporate exception and to use exception in order to readjust models and predictions. Let us remember that Foucault uses the project of smallpox epidemics' control as an example of this advancing form of normalizing power during the nineteenth century. Smallpox was to be studied through the statistics of the disease and the rate of deaths, et cetera. If the normal was taken to coincide with the healthy and the abnormal with the pathological (the sick), then sickness was to be studied as a recurrent exception. Anthropology is actually full of observations on how different societies treat a potential disaster by using rituals that try to avert it. Scientific knowledge has supposedly managed to go well beyond such 'prejudices' and has offered to societies the power to control the unpredictable by calculating possibilities and constructing models. For those in power, the will to normalize and thus to control the society is often projected on the reassuring certainties of models that come from science (although those certainties are contested in those very sciences too).

Thus, a complicated but also value-connected reasoning is developed in the policies of security power. Exception cannot be eliminated and urban rhythms are permeated by unavoidable 'cacophonies', but the urban sea itself must be tamed. Exception thus becomes a mechanism that establishes the ground of new potential rules. An example comes from the contemporary Brazilian metropolis São Paulo. A peculiar collective habit has been developed recently by the city's youth. They organize ad hoc feasts in front of large shopping centres which they call *rolezinho* (roughly translated as 'little excursions' or 'outing'). Do these young people, who mostly come from the peripheries, threaten the city's normality as they bring the *periferia* culture in front of the city's emblematic spaces of security and consumption? Or do they simply construct popular hymns to capitalism, as some analysts reassuringly have declared? Exceptional behaviour poses problems for authorities: metastatic control has to face metastatic resistance, or what may potentially evolve in

sample content of Common Space: The City as Commons (In Common)

- [read Cinefex, Issue 87 \(October 2001\)](#)
- [Baghdad: City of Peace, City of Blood--A History in Thirteen Centuries pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub, doc, mobi](#)
- [Last and First Men pdf](#)
- [Forces of Production: A Social History of Industrial Automation pdf, azw \(kindle\)](#)
- [Assata: An Autobiography book](#)

- <http://berttrotman.com/library/Cinefex--Issue-87--October-2001-.pdf>
- <http://fortune-touko.com/library/Baghdad--City-of-Peace--City-of-Blood--A-History-in-Thirteen-Centuries.pdf>
- <http://bestarthritiscare.com/library/A-Buzz-in-the-Meadow--The-Natural-History-of-a-French-Farm.pdf>
- <http://weddingcellist.com/lib/Maya-Python-for-Games-and-Film--A-Complete-Reference-for-Maya-Python-and-the-Maya-Python-API.pdf>
- <http://wind-in-herleshausen.de/?freebooks/Outlaw.pdf>