
AMPS PROCEEDINGS SERIES 40.2

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya | AMPS
15-17 July, 2024

Urban Futures - Cultural Pasts Sustainable Cities, Cultures & Crafts

Volume 2: Social & Cultural Questions

ARCHITECTURE_MEDIA_POLITICS_SOCIETY
Amps

EDITORS & ORGANISERS:

Racel Isaac-Menard, Graham Cairns, Pere Fuertes, Jere Kuzmanic, Fabian López, Torsten Masseck, Mariana Palumbo, Marta Serra, Adolf Sotoca.

EXECUTIVE PRODUCTION EDITOR:

Amany Marey

© AMPS

AMPS PROCEEDINGS SERIES 40. ISSN 2398-9467

LOSS OF FREE CITIZENSHIP?

Authors:

ANDREAS SIESS, ULRICH GEHMANN

Affiliation:

HOCHSCHULE BONN-RHEIN-SIEG UNIVERSITY OF APPLIED SCIENCES, GERMANY.
IDEAL SPACES WORKING GROUP FOUNDATION, GERMANY

INTRODUCTION

Today, we are in the danger to lose a crucial cultural value that originated in European cities: the idea and concept of free citizenship, the base of democracy. Free citizenship has been connected to the notion of the city as such, originating from the Greek Polis and kept alive since then, in many different versions. In historical terms, no other culture than Europe has developed the concept of a free citizen, actively participating in the political, social, and architectural shape of the city. Both as an ideal and a political guideline, that concept has been adopted worldwide and is closely related to human rights, democracy, and human dignity.

STATUS QUO

Free citizenship includes spaces where the citizens could meet, spaces originally designed as communal, or public spaces designed as *places*. In contemporary cities, the relationship between public spaces and the citizenship is increasingly neglected, as we observe a noticeable decline in the availability of public spaces where individuals can congregate and linger without the explicit intent to consume. Instead, developments under the so called concept of ‘defensive architecture’¹ are being advanced, explicitly designed to actively prevent ‘undesirable’ (i.e. non-consuming) behaviors. A striking example of this trend can be seen in park benches engineered to be unsuitable for lying down in order to nudge low-income citizens to abandon certain areas. While this example is undoubtedly provocative and deliberately pointed, we nonetheless wish to pose the question of whether it is truly prudent to construct *antagonistic architectures*, or if a more appropriate approach might be to pursue urban planning that can be characterized as *resilient architecture*² —namely, architecture that emerges from democratic principles (i.e., the concept and *eidōs* of free citizenship) and that may also be capable of resisting capitalist driven forces.

We observe that many social practices that were once typically ‘public’ are increasingly being transferred to virtual/digital spaces. This includes activities such as meeting new people, dating, socializing, forming opinions, exchanging information, and particularly exerting political influence. In this globalized and virtual world, we are witnessing a redefinition of the concept of ‘home’.³ With respect to the vast user bases of platforms like Instagram or LinkedIn, the world’s largest metropolises are no longer physical ‘cities’ but have become virtual *platforms*. The pointed saying “Home is where wifi connects automatically” appears to have become a reality in contemporary life.⁴ Although this trend certainly warrants critical examination, we would nonetheless like to emphasize that the social practices— which are rooted in the continuity of free citizenship—have not lost their relevance. A

significant portion of the population remains interested in these practices; however, they no longer engage in them within regional and physical spaces, but instead shift these activities into the digital realm. The issue with this shift is twofold: on the one hand, digital platforms are centrally controlled and must subordinate themselves to the social and cultural pressures of their financial backers (i.e., the advertising industry), which significantly constrains the freedom and potential for interaction among individual users. On the other hand, physical cities continue to provide a substantial portion of the necessities for daily life. As a result, when the populace confines its engagement to digital spaces, a power vacuum emerges in local areas, leaving decisions about the physical environment to be made by a small group of decision- and policymakers “as the sole agents responsible for managing land and urban development”.⁵

The ‘generic city’

The underlying cause of this ‘shift into the virtual’ is not the advent of digital possibilities, but rather the deliberate effort to reduce cities to mere infrastructure or consumer objects that are treated as investment and speculation assets, optimized solely for their marketable qualities. Consequently, cities are no longer perceived as social and political networks but are transformed into ‘generic cities’ functioning uniformly across the globe—Koolhaas compares this form of urbanism to an “airport”, suggesting that the city lacks identity and character, serving merely as an infrastructure provider for its *paying* residents and users.⁶ A city (or an urban situation) historically fulfilled two fundamental social functions: on one hand, it was the locus where essential needs (such as security, infrastructure, and shelter) could be met, while on the other, it served as the fertile ground for the development of human (self-)consciousness, both at the individual and collective levels.⁷ It is to be assumed that, particularly, the second aspect of the city has significantly diminished in relevance.

The fabric of space: hyperrealities vs. narratives

This trend has been recognized and addressed by decision-makers and urban planners through initiatives aimed at enhancing the distinctive character of cities. However, the challenge lies in the fact that the *atmosphere* or *genius loci*⁸ of a place cannot be artificially or deliberately created through planning.⁹ As a result, these planning efforts often produce mere imitations of ‘functioning’ urban situations, comparable to the hyperreal but ultimately superficial space such as a theme park.¹⁰ “We are the only species that lives in zoos of our own design.”¹¹ writes Christopher Ryan—therefore these planned places should therefore be viewed as simulations,¹² as *replicas* of a space. In a pointed critique, gardens are replaced by parks and forums by malls, resulting in a hyperreality¹³ that mimics a genuine environment.

This observation warrants a theoretical consideration of spaces by first examining the distinction between a place and a space, and then exploring the transformative process of this place into a space. While the phrase ‘place’ denotes a topographical-geometrical entity (Greek ‘*topos*’) it must be distinguished from the concept of space (‘*spatium*’), which emerges as a network of meanings within the individual—and therefore always subjective—imagination.¹⁴ Given that space is thus formed intrasubjectively, it becomes evident that the actual possibilities of intervention by the planner (i.e. the architect) are significantly limited. Rather, it is the *narratives*, the ascriptions to the place,¹⁵ that transform it into a space.¹⁶ For instance, an abandoned industrial site may be perceived merely as a physical location with no inherent meaning. However, when artists and community groups begin to use this site for cultural events, it gradually gains a new narrative that is created by the users of this space. It becomes a space where creativity and community engagement thrive, shifting from a mere geographical location to a space rich with cultural significance and social interaction. Thus, narratives that emerge organically by the citizens interacting with a place are crucial, as they transform this

topos into a *spatium*. This phenomenon is also a key reason why, on a large scale, many planned cities fail,¹⁷ and on a smaller scale, why numerous local projects aimed at improving the quality of public spaces do not achieve the desired outcomes.¹⁸ This occurs either because the narrative aspect is entirely neglected in the planning process, or because the narrative is imposed upon the space and its users by decision-makers as a form of PR strategy. It is therefore crucial to emphasize once again that narratives must emerge organically from the population itself and, depending on the context, should draw upon a historicity that cannot be created artificially.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION—A MITIGATION STRATEGY?

Broadly speaking people resist externally imposed paradigms, which is an inherent feature, not a bug, of democracy—a phenomenon that is also true in regard to urban planning. Instead of presenting the inhabitants and future users with a *fait accompli* many planners and decision-makers created initiatives that aim to involve the broad public in the decision and planning process.¹⁹ While many of these approaches seem to be promising, they nevertheless present a multitude of problems.²⁰ It has become apparent that many social milieus do not participate, or do so only to a very limited extent, in this democratic process, despite being future users of the space or infrastructure. The reasons for this are varied, including lack of information, lack of perceived self-efficacy, lack of perceived representation, linguistic or cultural barriers, etc.

While it is beneficial to open the planning process and bring as many diverse stakeholders to the table as possible, this approach is equally problematic for several reasons. Firstly, it is observed that many planners engage in public inclusion only on a superficial level solely due to external pressures and, therefore, aim to minimize actual involvement. This results in a process that is not genuinely democratic but rather opaque and bureaucratic, driven by committee and panel decisions, inherently designed to preserve existing power and influence structures. Secondly, the very concept of involving the public in the *planning* process is inherently problematic because its potential for intervention and change exists only within the confines of this conceptional stage and does not extend to the actual stage when the architecture is actually used.

Again, it must be emphasized that places can only be transformed into spaces through narratives and *interaction*.²¹ This means that a place requires an inherent potential for change and (co-)creation even *after* the planning stage. Spaces must therefore be constructed in such a way that they can not only be utilized but also dynamically shaped by the citizens, meaning they must possess the potential for change, allowing for different actualizations to emerge according to need. This can only be partially achieved through planning; fundamentally, it is a deeply political decision. The goal is not to create a place that can adapt to several *predefined* usage scenarios, but rather to create a place whose individual design and narrative can be defined by the inhabitants themselves. This implies that designers and decision-makers must relinquish a significant portion of their control and power of definition.

Interestingly, similar discourses were already being conducted around 1800, not in urban planning or architecture, but in literature. At that time, the question arose whether an author (analogous to the architect in our context) could relinquish control over the interpretation of their work. By 1800, this discourse had evolved to the point where readers were considered the true authors by actualizing a text into a genuine message through interpretation. This meaning is always tied to the subject, resulting in a plurality of meanings that emerge from a text—a finding encapsulated in the pointed statement that ‘the author is dead’.²² The task of an author, then, is merely to create the framework for actualization, meaning to write a text in which the potential for change is inherent. Before we address the question of whether a similar development can also occur in architecture, we would like to introduce a brief digression: As we outlined at the beginning of our essay, significant practices that

typically took place in public spaces have shifted to the virtual realm. The allure of these digital realities may be so strong precisely because they embody the *narrative* of changeability. Etymologically, ‘the virtual’ can be translated as the potential/the power for change.²³ Even though the actual scope for action on major virtual platforms is limited, they still *convey the narrative* that each user has the ability and freedom to shape, contribute to, modify, adapt, and rethink the given space.

This means that urban spaces must also be evaluated based on the narratives they convey. It is crucial to remember that a place can only transform into a meaningful space when the *topos* is actualized into a network of meanings by the users. Just as readers in the 1800s inscribed meaning into a text, users of urban architecture must ‘inscribe’ meaning into the place.

‘EIDOS’ AND ‘ALLMENDE’

Once such clear scope for action and design competence is entrusted to the users, it is essential that these possibilities are also communicated to them. Therefore, *ideas* are needed on how to create public spaces that possess and *articulate* these inherent self-dynamics. We deliberately use the term ‘idea’ here because we want to emphasize that we are not referring to theoretical and conceptual planning, but rather to a culturally embedded notion (‘meme’) that can be understood through the symbolic²⁴ concept of ‘eidos’. We interpret the concept of an idea as a bilateral process: on the one hand, within the context of creativity and creation; on the other hand, as an articulation pattern (i.e. the *eidos*) that arises as a product of imagination. This means that an idea can originate either in the realm of design or in the realm of situational evaluation by users, who develop a conception of how a place can be engaged with. This bilateral process, therefore, suggests that users and designers converge in their interaction practices, meaning that users themselves become effective actors. According to Richard Dawkins, ‘memes’ can be interpreted as culture-specific patterns of information that operate within a symbolic paradigm.²⁵ In our specific context, it is necessary to develop a pattern of information that, through a systemic integration of vision, idea, and self-efficacy, constitutes genuine agency among the populace, thereby aiming at actual interactivity of the place. While meme theory is grounded in anthropology, the concept of ‘patterns’ can also be applied to architectural theory. Specifically, we wish to draw on Christopher Alexander's work, *A Pattern Language*, to argue that architectural theory has already established the ‘idea’ that aim at fostering genuine agency among all stakeholders. It is therefore essential to develop a Pattern Language that, through genuine interactivity, seeks to elevate residents to the status of citizens. *A Pattern Language* also makes clear that the idea of citizenship (‘civitas’) is characterized not only by rights but also by the duty to participate actively.²⁶ Thus, there must be areas within a city that not only allow for such participatory work but rather shift the notion of participation from solely engaging in the decision-making to the actual creation of space.

We want to emphasize that this is by no means a novel idea—concepts such as the commons (better framed by the old German term ‘*Allmende*’) or communes were widespread in Europe until the early 20th century.²⁷ The commons, in particular, which refers to areas of a settlement that could be used and shaped by all residents equally, has a long cultural history; evidence of the commons can even be found in the Old Testament (cf. Ezekiel 48,14–17). The commons clearly illustrate how societal and spatial-political phenomena synchronize, as demonstrated by the following example: The commons of a European village typically included the village pond, which was used not only for communal fish farming but also as a firefighting reservoir. The maintenance of the pond was the responsibility of all villagers, just as was the service in the fire brigade. Thus, the commons is not a phenomenon created as a pedagogical tool for the population by decree or out of pure idealism; rather, the intrinsic nature of the space demands the active involvement of each individual within the community.

Gentrification as ‘diagnostic tool’

Certainly, this type of commons can only be established within manageable sizes of local communities. To avoid steering our essay too much into a historicizing discussion, we would like to focus on current developments in urban planning within a globalized reality not structured by local micro-communities. Specifically, we aim to explore whether such spaces can be planned and conceptually created, particularly within the modality of *eidos* outlined above, or whether they must rather emerge ‘organically’ in the sense of an “informal”²⁸ grassroots development.

To address this question, the phenomenon of gentrification presents itself as a pertinent case, which, we argue, exposes the central characteristics of urban spaces to a significant extent.²⁹ While it is undeniable that gentrification is a symptom of a ‘sick’ urban situation,³⁰ the genesis (i.e., the emergence) of this symptom points to aspects worthy of examination. It is observed that gentrification occurs in places that were previously ‘failed’ in terms of urban policy, yet it is precisely through this failure that they gained an autodynamic potential. Suddenly, in these places, genuine creation became possible due to the absence of commercial interest and the devolution of local political stakeholders.³¹

The metaphor of the grassroots movement, which we wish to employ here, suggests the functional principle by which this urban wasteland was newly developed. The redevelopment occurred ‘from the bottom up’, attracting typical socio-cultural milieus who pioneered the re-purposing of this wasteland: students, artists, low-income individuals, but those with strong social structures and agency, who endowed these places with narratives through *cultural work* (Greek *cultura* = development, processing, ordering, maintenance), thus transforming them into spaces. It is notable that these newly emerging attributions to these places were either never planned or their original ‘inscribed’ meaning was overwritten by new narratives. These attributions are in constant flux, meaning they do not aim for coherence but are rather characterized by their pluralistic nature that is distinctly dynamic. Therefore, the space does not possess a single narrative but is continuously ‘rethought’, ‘reinvented’ and ‘reinterpreted’ i.e., *actualized* by its inhabitants/users in an ongoing process.

The issue is that, beyond a certain point of development, a tipping point is reached where the atmosphere of the place exerts such an attraction that it becomes commercially exploitable. The ensuing gentrification gradually replaces/displaces the organically evolved and perpetually self-updating narratives with *static*, artificial ascriptions. From this tipping point, as these spaces are ‘enhanced’ by external capital, a narrative decay sets in, particularly evident in the significant reduction of the individual residents’ scope for creativity and agency. This narrative decline is also evident in the phenomenon that historic buildings and structures, unless explicitly protected under heritage conservation laws, are disappearing.³² However, a historic cityscape is more than merely a collection of listed monuments; it also encompasses a multitude of architectural works that, while seemingly lacking individual historical significance—and therefore not adequately protected or entirely overlooked by heritage preservation measures—nonetheless contribute to a coherent and authentic urban landscape when considered as part of the ensemble. We wish to emphasize that the transformation of a ‘functional’ public *space* into a gentrified *place* is a narrative process, one that also manifests itself through changes in the architecture. The drive of gentrification to ‘remediate’ these places results in a hyperreality, akin to the aforementioned ‘theme park’, where the spatial and social structures merely serve as a backdrop for commerce, and the original pioneers are forced to move on due to economic pressures. One might argue that this constant oscillation between construction and decline, renewal and tradition, is a fundamental characteristic of the city, akin to a natural law. But what happens when no free spaces can be established because the financial value of real estate remains so high even in ‘failed’ neighborhoods that even vacant spaces are profitable investments so no pioneering culture can develop?

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our paper highlights the crucial transformation and potential loss of the concept of free citizenship, a cornerstone of democracy rooted deeply in European history and urban life. The analysis underscores the troubling trend of diminishing public spaces and the rise of political and architectural decisions, which collectively restrict citizens' engagement in public life and challenge the essence of cities as social and political networks. The shift towards virtual spaces for social and political activities further exacerbates this issue, as the physical spaces seemingly lose their roles in fostering community and civic identity.

On the one hand the concept of the 'generic city' and the transformation of urban areas into mere infrastructure or consumer objects strip cities of their unique identities and reduce them to uniform, characterless entities. On the other hand, characteristic areas of a city are transformed into hyperreal backdrops due to gentrification and financial pressure, displacing the original residents, their social culture, and the *atmosphere* they created, stripping the place from any symbolic meaning (i.e. its *eidos*) and reducing it to its marketable attributes. This reductionist view contrasts sharply with the historical role of cities in meeting essential needs and nurturing human consciousness. Efforts by urban planners to artificially recreate the *atmosphere* or *genius loci* of cities therefore often result in superficial spaces that fail to resonate with the authentic narratives and interaction patterns of their inhabitants.

Mitigation strategies involving public participation in the planning process offer some promise but face significant challenges. Superficial involvement due to external pressures, limited genuine democratic processes, and the restricted scope for public intervention during actual use of spaces are key issues. We suggest that places must be designed with inherent potential for change and co-creation, allowing residents to shape and redefine spaces dynamically. This approach demands a relinquishing of control by designers and decision-makers, akin to the concept derived from literature studies where readers, not authors, actualize texts into genuine messages. Therefore, an architectural paradigm is needed that enables the inhabitants to actualize places into *their* spaces.

NOTES

- ¹ Naomi Smith and Peter Walters, “Desire Lines and Defensive Architecture in Modern Urban Environments,” *Urban Studies* 55, no. 13 (October 2018): 2980, doi: 10.1177/0042098017732690.
- ² Ulrich Gehmann, Michael Johansson, and Andreas Siess, “Abstraction and Resilience: Symbolics and Space,” in *Representation in Architectural, Landscape and Urban Design* (Athens: ATINER, 2022), 3.
- ³ Richard Pieper, *Soziologie Im Städtebau: Eine Einführung Für Architekten, Stadtplaner Und Sozialwissenschaftler*, Flexibles Taschenbuch SOZ (Stuttgart: Enke, 1979), 51.
- ⁴ Andreas Siess and Matthias Wölfel, “Genius Loci in the Virtual – How to Make Virtual Places Unique & Special,” in *The Idea of Place: 20th Anniversary Conference of Space and Culture Journal* (Edmonton, Canada, 2017), 1.
- ⁵ Vanessa Watson, “‘The Planned City Sweeps the Poor Away...’: Urban Planning and 21st Century Urbanisation,” *Progress in Planning* 72, no. 3 (October 2009): 158, doi: j.progress.2009.06.002.
- ⁶ Rem Koolhaas, “The Generic City,” in *Small, Medium, Large, Extra-Large: Office for Metropolitan Architecture, Rem Koolhaas, and Bruce Mau*, 2d ed (New York, N.Y: Monacelli Press, 1998), 1248.
- ⁷ Alexander Mitscherlich, *Die Unwirtlichkeit Unserer Städte. Anstiftung Zum Unfrieden*, vol. 123, Edition Suhrkamp (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1992), 14.
- ⁸ Jan Pieper, “Ort, Erinnerung, Architektur,” *Kunstforum International*, no. 69 (January 1, 1984): 26.
- ⁹ Gernot Böhme, “Atmosphere as the Fundamental Concept of a New Aesthetics,” *Thesis Eleven* 36, no. 1 (January 1, 1993): 113–126, doi: 10.1177/072551369303600107.
- ¹⁰ Umberto Eco, *Travels in Hyperreality*, A Helen and Kurt Wolff Book (San Diego: Harvest Book Harcourt, 1986).
- ¹¹ Christopher Ryan, *Civilized to Death: The Price of Progress* (New York: Avid Reader Press, 2019), 12.
- ¹² Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation*, The Body, in Theory (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994), 2.
- ¹³ Eco, *Travels in Hyperreality*.
- ¹⁴ Stephan Günzel, “Physik Und Metaphysik Des Raums – Einleitung,” in *Raumtheorie: Grundlagentexte Aus Philosophie Und Kulturwissenschaften*, ed. Jörg Dünne and Stephan Günzel, 8th ed., vol. 1800, Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2015), 20.
- ¹⁵ Johann Gottfried Herder, *Verstand Und Erfahrung: Eine Metakritik Zur Kritik Der Reinen Vernunft* (Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1799), 62.
- ¹⁶ Michel Certeau, “Praktiken Im Raum,” in *Raumtheorie: Grundlagentexte Aus Philosophie Und Kulturwissenschaften*, ed. Jörg Dünne and Stephan Günzel, 8th ed., vol. 1800, Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2015), 346.
- ¹⁷ Raymond A. Mohl and Neil Betten, “The Failure Of Industrial City Planning: Gary, Indiana, 1906–1910,” *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 38, no. 4 (July 1972): 203, doi: 10.1080/01944367208977611; Femke Van Noorloos, Diky Avianto, and Romanus Otieno Opiyo, “New Master-Planned Cities and Local Land Rights: The Case of Konza Techno City, Kenya,” *Built Environment* 44, no. 4 (January 1, 2019): 420, doi: 10.2148/benv.44.4.420.
- ¹⁸ Meg Holden, Andy Scerri, and Azadeh Hadizadeh Esfahani, “Justifying Redevelopment ‘Failures’ Within Urban ‘Success Stories’: Dispute, Compromise, and a New Test of Urbanity,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39, no. 3 (May 2015): 451, doi: 10.1111/1468-2427.12182.
- ¹⁹ Diana Mitlin, “Editorial: Citizen Participation in Planning: From the Neighbourhood to the City,” *Environment and Urbanization* 33, no. 2 (October 2021): 295, doi: 10.1177/09562478211035608.
- ²⁰ Joachim Åström, “Participatory Urban Planning: What Would Make Planners Trust the Citizens?,” *Urban Planning* 5, no. 2 (June 26, 2020): 86, doi: 10.17645/up.v5i2.3021.
- ²¹ Certeau, “Praktiken Im Raum,” 346.
- ²² Roland Barthes, “The Death of the Author”, in *Image, Music, Text: Essays*, 13th ed. (London: Fontana, 1977), 148.
- ²³ Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz, *Monadologie: Mit Einer Abhandlung Über Leibnitz’ Und Herbart’s Theorieen Des Wirklichen Geschehens*, ed. Robert Zimmermann (Wien: Braumüller und Seidel, 1847), 50.
- ²⁴ Pieper, *Soziologie Im Städtebau: Eine Einführung Für Architekten, Stadtplaner Und Sozialwissenschaftler*, 52.
- ²⁵ Richard Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*, New ed, Oxford Paperbacks (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1989), 368.
- ²⁶ Christopher Alexander, *A Pattern Language: Towns, Buildings, Construction*, vol. 2, Center for Environmental Structure Series (New York, NY: Oxford Univ. Press, 1977), 3.
- ²⁷ Bernd Marquardt, “Gemeineigentum und Einhegungen - Zur Geschichte der Allmende in Mitteleuropa,” in *Schwerpunkte: Allmende, Wasser, Globalisierung, Naturschutzgeschichte*, ed. Bayerische Akademie für Naturschutz und Landschaftspflege, Berichte der ANL 26 (Laufen: ANL, 2002), 14.

- ²⁸ Van Noorloos, Avianto, and Opiyo, “New Master-Planned Cities and Local Land Rights,” 420.
- ²⁹ Tim Butler, “For Gentrification?,” *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 39, no. 1 (January 2007): 163, doi: 10.1068/a38472.
- ³⁰ Kate Shaw, “Gentrification: What It Is, Why It Is, and What Can Be Done about It,” *Geography Compass* 2, no. 5 (September 2008): 1698, doi: 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2008.00156.x.
- ³¹ Jason Hackworth and Neil Smith, “The Changing State of Gentrification,” *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie* 92, no. 4 (November 2001): 464, doi: 10.1111/1467-9663.00172.
- ³² Ted Grevstad-Nordbrock and Igor Vojnovic, “An Analysis of Diverse Gentrification Processes and Their Relationship to Historic Preservation Activity in Chicago,” *Urban Geography*, June 25, 2024, 22, doi: 10.1080/02723638.2024.2354669.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Christopher. *A Pattern Language: Towns, Buildings, Construction*. Vol. 2. Center for Environmental Structure Series. New York, NY: Oxford Univ. Press, 1977.
- Åström, Joachim. “Participatory Urban Planning: What Would Make Planners Trust the Citizens?” *Urban Planning* 5, no. 2 (June 26, 2020): 84–93, doi: 10.17645/up.v5i2.3021.
- Barthes, Roland. “The Death of the Author.” In *Image, Music, Text: Essays*, 13th ed. London: Fontana, 1977.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. The Body, in Theory. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.
- Böhme, Gernot. “Atmosphere as the Fundamental Concept of a New Aesthetics.” *Thesis Eleven* 36, no. 1 (January 1, 1993): 113–126, doi: 10.1177/072551369303600107.
- Butler, Tim. “For Gentrification?” *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 39, no. 1 (January 2007): 162–181, doi: 10.1068/a38472.
- Certeau, Michel. “Praktiken Im Raum.” In *Raumtheorie: Grundlagentexte Aus Philosophie Und Kulturwissenschaften*, edited by Jörg Dünne and Stephan Günzel, 8th ed., 1800: 343–353. Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2015.
- Dawkins, Richard. *The Selfish Gene*. New ed. Oxford Paperbacks. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1989.
- Eco, Umberto. *Travels in Hyperreality*. A Helen and Kurt Wolff Book. San Diego: Harvest Book Harcourt, 1986.
- Gehmann, Ulrich, Michael Johansson, and Andreas Siess. “Abstraction and Resilience: Symbolics and Space.” In *Representation in Architectural, Landscape and Urban Design*, 103–18. Athens: ATINER, 2022.
- Grevstad-Nordbrock, Ted, and Igor Vojnovic. “An Analysis of Diverse Gentrification Processes and Their Relationship to Historic Preservation Activity in Chicago.” *Urban Geography*, June 25, 2024, 1–39, doi: 10.1080/02723638.2024.2354669.
- Günzel, Stephan. “Physik Und Metaphysik Des Raums – Einleitung.” In *Raumtheorie: Grundlagentexte Aus Philosophie Und Kulturwissenschaften*, edited by Jörg Dünne and Stephan Günzel, 8th ed., 1800:19–43. Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2015.
- Hackworth, Jason, and Neil Smith. “The Changing State of Gentrification.” *Tijdschrift Voor Economische En Sociale Geografie* 92, no. 4 (November 2001): 464–477, doi: 10.1111/1467-9663.00172.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried. *Verstand Und Erfahrung: Eine Metakritik Zur Kritik Der Reinen Vernunft*. Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1799.
- Holden, Meg, Andy Scerri, and Azadeh Hadizadeh Esfahani. “Justifying Redevelopment ‘Failures’ Within Urban ‘Success Stories’: Dispute, Compromise, and a New Test of Urbanity.” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39, no. 3 (May 2015): 451–470, doi: 10.1111/1468-2427.12182.
- Koolhaas, Rem. “The Generic City.” In *Small, Medium, Large, Extra-Large: Office for Metropolitan Architecture, Rem Koolhaas, and Bruce Mau*, 2d ed., 1248–1264. New York, N.Y.: Monacelli Press, 1998.
- Leibnitz, Gottfried Wilhelm. *Monadologie: Mit Einer Abhandlung Über Leibnitz’ Und Herbart’s Theorieen Des Wirklichen Geschehens*. Edited by Robert Zimmermann. Wien: Braumüller und Seidel, 1847.
- Marquardt, Bernd. “Gemeineigentum und Einhegungen - Zur Geschichte der Allmende in Mitteleuropa.” In *Schwerpunkte: Allmende, Wasser, Globalisierung, Naturschutzgeschichte*, edited by Bayerische Akademie für Naturschutz und Landschaftspflege, 14–23. Berichte der ANL 26. Laufen: ANL, 2002.
- Mitlin, Diana. “Editorial: Citizen Participation in Planning: From the Neighbourhood to the City.” *Environment and Urbanization* 33, no. 2 (October 2021): 295–309, doi: 10.1177/09562478211035608.

- Mitscherlich, Alexander. *Die Unwirtlichkeit Unserer Städte. Anstiftung Zum Unfrieden*. Vol. 123. Edition Suhrkamp. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1992.
- Mohl, Raymond A., and Neil Betten. "The Failure Of Industrial City Planning: Gary, Indiana, 1906–1910." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 38, no. 4 (July 1972): 203–214, doi: 10.1080/01944367208977611.
- Pieper, Jan. "Ort, Erinnerung, Architektur." *Kunstforum International*, no. 69 (January 1, 1984): 26–27.
- Pieper, Richard. *Soziologie Im Städtebau: Eine Einführung Für Architekten, Stadtplaner Und Sozialwissenschaftler*. Flexibles Taschenbuch SOZ. Stuttgart: Enke, 1979.
- Ryan, Christopher. *Civilized to Death: The Price of Progress*. New York: Avid Reader Press, 2019.
- Shaw, Kate. "Gentrification: What It Is, Why It Is, and What Can Be Done about It." *Geography Compass* 2, no. 5 (September 2008): 1697–1728, doi: 10.1111/j.1749-8198.2008.00156.x.
- Siess, Andreas, and Matthias Wölfel. "Genius Loci in the Virtual – How to Make Virtual Places Unique & Special." In *The Idea of Place: 20th Anniversary Conference of Space and Culture Journal*. Edmonton, Canada, 2017.
- Smith, Naomi, and Peter Walters. "Desire Lines and Defensive Architecture in Modern Urban Environments." *Urban Studies* 55, no. 13 (October 2018): 2980–2995, doi: 10.1177/0042098017732690.
- Van Noorloos, Femke, Diky Avianto, and Romanus Otieno Opiyo. "New Master-Planned Cities and Local Land Rights: The Case of Konza Techno City, Kenya." *Built Environment* 44, no. 4 (January 1, 2019): 420–437, doi: 10.2148/benv.44.4.420.
- Watson, Vanessa. "'The Planned City Sweeps the Poor Away...': Urban Planning and 21st Century Urbanisation." *Progress in Planning* 72, no. 3 (October 2009): 151–193, doi: 10.1016/j.progress.2009.06.002.