1.4 Discussion. Archi-events

Three events: Tahrir Square in Cairo, Occupy Wall Street in New York, and Gezi Park / Taksim Square in Istanbul, demonstrate that in the 21st century different fields are related in time and space (physical and virtual). Politics, history, social theory, economic, urban development, digital software, architecture, media and communication are part of this body that contains revolution and affection on new created spatialities. In the case of Tahrir Square, the roundabout with a circular form allows reversing the ‘square,’ from having static centripetal to a dynamic centrifugal force. In Zuccotti Park, the quadrangular form permits to have a more stable inner organization. The occupation is longer and less violent, includes an expanded energy and intensity, and as it is a POPS, it blurred the lines between public and private, and legal and illegal. Finally, in Gezi/Taksim, the occupation shares the former two spatial features, a circle and a quadrangular form, presenting different activities of the occupation allocated in both spaces in a simultaneous way, which leads to a temporal state in the roundabout, and a steady and permanent state in the park. Some notions and approximations of ‘radical architecture’ remain from the 50s, 60s, and 70s in contemporary occupations such as movement, defiant, dissident, contested, and challenging, and dynamic, converting the spatial experience into a shared spatiality.

Since 2011, the continuous struggle for the space appropriation has been intense, when a series of global demonstrations in public spaces show the necessity of people to be visible and to have a common space. However, different from previous occupations, these ones represent the inclusion of the virtual space into the physical one, forming one single space that is dynamic and borderless, inclusive and intermittent. Not only the organization but also the mediation, communication and synchronization of people and spaces are mainly developed in the virtual space, expanding the limits of both people and spaces and shrinking the time of activation and deactivation. Occupations in public spaces have become tools that confront conventional means of communication and the physical presence of people in the city, for what the materiality of squares and parks, and the corporeality of bodies, amplify the scope of the contemporary public sphere. The radicality of these events lay on the fact that they defy the roots and current state of an established infrastructure. Occupations are not limited to time or space, they challenge them, and through these events, they form new radical spaces. Therefore, for the purpose of this work, this situation is considered as architectural events – archievents.
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Space, difficult to define but crucial to understand in the 21st century. In the Bloomsbury Thesaurus Dictionary, space is defined in twenty-one different ways. It is firstly described as distance, length, measurement, depth, expansion, and quantity, all of them in terms of Cartesian space. Then, in astronomy it is explained as the outer space. The third definition is related to geographical space as location, followed by spaciousness in reference to voluminousness and immensity. The next meanings are related to perception and sensation such as reserved space, personal space, available space, range space, and intervening space. The fourth-dimension is space-time on Einstein's relativity theory, which includes time to its three dimensions, naming it as spatiotemporally. In this regard, spatiality is considered for the purpose of this research as the synchronicity of space [specific] and time [temporally]. In addition, real space depends upon what placemakers do in space, where several philosophers and physicists have largely tried to define it as the idea of ‘absolute space:’ i.e. space as sort of a container; the idea of ‘relational space;’ space as a matter of relationship between objects and without container (Bloomsbury 1997).

Moreover, Ali Madanipour1 indicates that space is something somehow socially produced (Madanipour 1996), and Otto Riewoldt, author of “Intelligent Spaces: architecture for the formation age,” relates digital technologies to the inclusion of a new dimension on architectural space. Although these technologies cannot redefine space’s fundamental character, “for architecture, utopia will continue to lie in the real world, not the virtual realm” (Riewoldt 1997).

This research adds other layers into the notion of space, going beyond the Cartesian space, one that is “accessible anywhere and located nowhere” (Riewoldt 1997). The inclusion of the virtual into the physical space blurs continuously their boundaries, until forming one only space. Here, movement is simultaneous in both spaces: i.e., a person walks on a street and posts a photo on Facebook using his/her mobile. The body’s movement is interconnected in the material and virtual space through a dispositive (mobile) while acting (walking), making to irradiate the body's radius of operability. This space is nowhere in particular but everywhere at once, as William Mitchell2 refers: “it is fundamentally and profoundly antispatial” (Mitchell 1995). But virtual space should not be confused with cyberspace. Cyberspace, at large, is described as a non-physical environment shaped by computer technology or an “infinite artificial world where humans navigate in information-based space” (Benedikt 1991). It presents different place-characteristics of network technologies: in the virtual space, some (more and more) human activities take place rather than at the level of pure body experience, while cyberspace is the environment where computer networks exist. In the
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1 Ali Madanipour, architect and professor of Urban Design at Newcastle University.
2 William J. T. Mitchell is a professor of English and Art History at the University of Chicago and has been editor of the Critical Inquiry since 1978.
virtual space, everywhere at once is possible, unlikely Genius Loci, which includes a sense of identity and belonging of a determined space. It striates the physical space because it could be created and accessed everywhere.

Places in the cyberspace of the Net are software constructions. Each piece of software running anywhere - on any machine or collection of machines in the Net - creates environments for interaction, virtual reams that you can potentially enter. The text window provided by a word processor is one such place... Like architectural and urban places, these have characteristic appearances, and the interactions that unfold within them are controlled (often very rigidly) by local rules. (Mitchell, City of Bits Space, Place, and the Infobahn 1995)

Bruno Latour relates space and time as a state within networks that recombines the world (Graham and Marvin 1996), while Mitchell adds that the architecture of the 21st Century cannot respond anymore to rigid programmes, it needs to be flexible, diverse, and respond to human and electronic nomadic occupations (Mitchell 2003). There are two states that compose this research in relation to space: ‘spatiality’ [space + time], and ‘contemporary public space’ [physical and virtual].

2.1. Virtual space in occupations

The network-based forms of social movements started in the late ’60s when they structured organization and communication without the need of being under vertical hierarchies (Melucci 1989) (Castells 1997). In 1989 in Tiananmen Square, the first student and then social protest was one of the pioneers on using electronic technologies, it organized and mobilized large groups of people in the urban space through email.3 Ten years later in Seattle, the “Independent Media Center” (IMC) and the “Bulletin Board System” (BBS), produced and managed by autonomous people around the world, planned general protests against the World Trade Organization convention. In 2011, the Arab Spring, the Occupy Movement, the Indignados, among others, used widely social networks like Facebook, Twitter, YouTube and SMS to organize protests, reason why the mass media referred to them, especially to the Arab Spring, as the “Facebook Revolution” (Baron 2012).

In the case of Tahrir Square, the government shutdown the Internet in the entire country three days after protests began, as a method of social blockade. Nevertheless, this control measure brought an unexpected reaction: more people gathered in streets to protest against the
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government. This action rose two situations: the first one was a significant increment of anger and rage among the population. Many people were following the protests on social networks, but when they were restrained from Internet, many decided to join the physical protests because they did not have ‘another place’ to be but the physical one, leading to the second situation, which made people to be more aware of their space. In order to avoid the only left space people had, clashes with the police were more frequent and violent in Tahrir area, continuing for the following days although the intensity varied. In this sense, social networks became major tools for broadcasting the social battle in Tahrir, but as days passed by, things calmed down and it started the physical occupation of the square. At this point, the virtual space was the platform for a dynamic capacity to exchange and shape opinions and ideas. Indeed, not only in Tahir Square but also in the Occupy Movement, Indignados, Gezi / Taksim, and so on, social networks were a ‘thing to have’ and was the major ‘meeting point’ of occupations. In Tahrir Square, occupiers built a media camp with two tents and five people working as an IT department that provided free and open Wi-Fi as well. This dual relationship transformed the square in the place where virtual networks were visible, materializing simultaneously posts, photos, videos, messages, tents, chants, and speeches in a physical collective body.

Tahrir Square visualized how social networking tools such as Twitter and Facebook transformed the way of appropriation public spaces. While in the ‘60s social movements like May 68 or the anti-Vietnam war, the graffiti was one of the most popular ways of messaging large groups of people, in 2011 occupations it was the hashtag [#]. It is called hashtag because the # symbol refers to hash, or ‘pound’ in some other places in the United States, and it is used to label or identify messages or comments on a specific topic. In addition, hashtags like #OccupyEverywhere, #tahrir or #OccupyGezi express literally the power of the physical space, including an action in a direct engagement with the physical body – in this case through the virtual space. In a study made by Zachary C. Steinert-Threlkeld et al., they tracked 13.8 million geo-located tweets and machine-coded data on protests from 16 countries during the Arab Spring, seeing that decentralized groups were coordinated online and organized offline (Figure 1). This social networking, as Steinert-Threlkeld indicates, “lowers the barriers required to coordinate, making it easier to know if others will protest and whether or not they are habitual protesters” (Steinert-Threlkeld et al. 2015). Social networking lets more people to create, produce and have access to information and having consequently an affective link among them. In this regard, individuals are more likely to protest when they know many others are protesting, and using few hashtags repeatedly is a signal that there is a latent demand to protest.

4 Zachary C Steinert-Threlkeld, Delia Mocanu, Alessandro Vespignani and James Fowler, “Online social networks and offline protest”. EPJ Data Science. 2015 4:19
The prevalence of hashtags in Egypt was more often used for coordinating according to the studio made by GDELT [Global Database of Events, Language and Tone], where they counted the hashtags used during the occupation. Before the occupation, the coordination was minimal; it served more to express personal opinions rather than organizing or managing protests. In fact, the hashtag #egypt was barely used, while the hashtag #jan25 was first launched on 19th January, and #tahrir on 25 January. During the 18 days of protest, #jan25 was predominant in social networks but during the last days, #tahrir became more popular (Figure 2). It was a virtual shift from time to space.

![Figure 1 Number of world protests by main grievance/demand between 2006-2013. Source: Zachary C Steinert-Threlkeld et al. "Online social networks and offline protest". EPJ Data Science. 2015 4:1](image1)

![Figure 2 Most frequent Twitter hashtags during the Tahrir Revolution in January-February 2011. The panel shows the percent of a day’s tweets which contain at least one of the hashtags indicated. Source: Zachary C Steinert-Threlkeld et al. “Online social networks](image2)

Different studies indicate that individuals are more likely to protest when friends and neighbours are protesting (Gould 1991), and also when they have prior experience in social movements. By exposing information, social media helps protestors to learn about tactics and strategies to act in the physical space. The logics of networking are shaped by particular cultural and political topics,
generally in a local context, challenging at the same time vertical practices. In this sense, contemporary revolutions emphasized physical occupations through virtual space, converging the notion of publicness into one single space through collective action [contemporary public space]. For instance, during the occupation of Zuccotti Park, the most important collective action in the physical space was the General Assembly. Debates and speeches took place in northeast side stairs of Zuccotti Park but also in virtual platforms like YouTube, Facebook and Twitter. The General Assembly acted in the contemporary public space, causing stronger engagements among participants. William Gamson and Gadi Wolfsfeld indicate that social movements are dependent on streaming media for three purposes: to mobilize political support, to increase the legitimation and validation of their demands, and to enable them to widen the scope of conflict beyond the likeminded (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993). The higher their influence and range in the virtual space, the stronger impact there is on the physical public space.

The use of social networks such as Facebook, YouTube and Twitter, has led to new patterns of spatial protest, producing a sense among online and offline protestors, of connectedness and co-presence in the space. These networks served with crucial “function as spheres of dissidence where collective critiques of the existing political and social order were articulated in the immediate pre-revolutionary period,” while “the way in which the Internet, especially Web 2.0 (user-generated and social network applications) became tools of revolution” (Aouragh and Alexander 2011). This state differentiates how protestors use the Internet during protests, not how Internet works during the protests. On one hand, the Internet, as a system, gave form and energy to these revolutions, it was used as a source of energy, information, organization and communication. On the other hand, social networks provided instant tools to react pre-on-post [before, during, after] the protests, especially when people were on their way to gather or already gathering in physical public spaces. Google Maps was an important digital platform used by protestors to make actions, events and performances visible in the space. When there were clashes with the police, protests in New York with OWS, in Cairo with Tahrir Square, and in Istanbul with Gezi/Taksim, demonstrators used Google Maps as a crowdsourcing platform that tracked the police (Img. 1). Though this method was first used in London during the 2011 riots, when students track riot vans and helicopters, supporting in real-time the reaction from protestors (Img. 2). In Gezi/Taksim, protestors were able to build barricades and block away vehicles, police and horses. In Google Maps platform, Taksim Square was represented with a green tent figure, road warnings in green to let people know which street was open and which one was blocked, pink tags to identify distinct protestors’ groups, light blue flags for police locations and movements, and occupation’s slogans and mottos were represented with a house symbol.

The distinction between producer and user, private and public, and self-mediation and co-production, was blurred during the development of these events. Social networks acted as
mediators in a three-part scheme of acting: Discursive opportunity structure, Networked opportunity structure, and Media opportunity structure (Cammaerts 2012). This scheme acted in a circular way as each part depended on each other, but it had also a dissident character because it altered the normal behaviour of the city and citizens by collective actions. It was transformed into what Ronnie Lipschutz calls “epistemic communities,” a state that transfers knowledge and influences to other movements through “movement spill over” (Lipschutz 1996).

The Arab Spring stated to be an epistemic community, in a big level because of constant actions in social networks besides the proximity of different countries’ location that formed the Arab Spring. Tahrir Square was the first collective and ‘long-term’ occupation in a public space experienced in the first years of the 21st Century, providing evidence that the physical urban space was crucial to the success and continuity of public protests. The virtual space endured the occupation to grow larger and made protesters to be more determined in engaging with the space of protest. For occupiers, Tahrir Square and the hashtag #tahrir was a truly public space, ensuring the power of the body occupying the contemporary public space, and when they acted in a dissident way, they explored and practiced by collective.

2.1.1. Digital patterns of occupations

In the eighteen-day-occupation in Cairo, there was an increment of social media users; i.e., in April 2010 Facebook had 14 million users in the region and by the beginning of 2011 it was around 21 million (Salem and Mourtada 2011). It boasted nearly 100% mobile phone saturation rate, comparing to the roughly 30% of daily Internet users (Social Bakers 2012). The iLike Facebook box was widely used in the digital community, which reflected a type of engagement with the movement in Tahrir. This clicktivism is significantly important because in a way, materializes the urban battle and helps to resonate it in the local and global scope, keeping it active, empowering protestors and striating the physical space.
The contemporary social revolutions were horizontal and non-hierarchical, but worked in an organization where individual potentialities acted as collective bodies according to different circumstances. They were not commanded; instead they were part of a big structure of processes in communication and common actions.

Image 3: The Egyptian Revolution on Twitter. Data collected with Gephi Graph Streaming. Hashtag #jan25 at February 11, 2011, at the time of the announcement of Mubarak’s resignation.


Manuel Castells indicates that the decentralized structure of digital networks reflected the horizontal structure of these movements, optimizing opportunities for wider participation and creating an endless rhizomatic borderless network: “a work with no centre, no gate keeper, no margins” (Jenkins and Thorburn 2004). The new forms of digital networks provided multiple forms of gestation and organization, making it easier for social movements to occupy urban spaces. In this regard, Christina Schachtner5 developed some digital patterns that relate to participants:

- Digital networks are characterized by low-threshold access facilitating participants access and sharing information and opinions.

5 Christina Schachtner, Professor of Media Studies at the University of Klagenfurt, Department of Media and Communication.
The network structure of the medium supports the generation of concern due to cross-links with images and videos. Castells points out the importance of YouTube as a catalyst for mobilization on political protests, making viewers to participate directly in what is going on in ‘the ground’.

- Virality relies on the transnational structure of networks in a borderless space connection.
- By using digital networks, there is a platform to exchange experiences, feelings, and thoughts resulting in the emergence of togetherness.
- The horizontality in these heterotopian spaces commands movements.
- Participants could alter the use of the digital platforms according to their needs.

These spatial features allow people not being any longer mere consumers and passive actors; instead they become active subjects, actors, creators, and producers of information and relationships. Castells calls this novelty space as “the construction of the new public sphere in the network society, proceeding by building protocols of communication between different communication processes” (Castells 2009). He also refers to the capacity of the location for being a dissent core, calling it as the ‘culture of autonomy,’ a balance of individuals in the society (Castells, Network of Outrage and Hope. Social Movements in the Internet Age 2012): “social networking sites have been used to facilitate social and sexual freedom in conservative societies” (T. F. Tierney 2015). The ‘culture of autonomy’ promotes individuation, not individualism that brings the cultural transformation of a space through the individuation, forming part of collectives. Digital platforms integrate tools that support various forms of sociality in one device, becoming tools of cognition, communication and co-operation pre-on-post occupations.

Manuel Castells considers that digital communication networks in social movements are “decisive tools for mobilizing, for organizing, for deliberating, and for coordinating” (Castells 2012). It is not one connected by a single all-encompassing network, but rather one connected by a series of networks communicating in common codes through multiple nodes, involving individuals and allowing them to share and store information in a decentralized way. The relationships between social media organize gatherings and communicate social and political issues, spatial practices in urban spaces, and expansion from local to global spaces. They rely on dynamics between digital platforms, urban protests, and media, to what Nazar AlSayyad and Muna Guvenc refers as a “the whole system [that] becomes greater than the sum of its parts” (AlSayyad and Guvenc 2015).

The connection between Tahrir Square, OWS and Gezi/Taksim is that they shared patterns of acting. The first similarity was the ‘identification’ from people that shared feelings about certain themes, producing deeper and closer links within them. In Tahrir Square, it was the youth the first social group that mobilized and claimed protests, in a sense thanks to their common use of social networks. Another factor was ‘brokerage,’ when different sites of contention connected to each
other in space and when temporal collectives generated multiple inter-personal contacts. Through this connection, it led to the third aspect, ‘diffusion,’ by flowing information, processing mobilization, organization and resonance commanding to frame bridging and helping to connect different sites of contention and horizontal consensus.

The Arab Spring, the Occupy Movement, the Spanish acampadas, and so on, formed a framework of collaborative action-research network recognized as the 2011 Global Revolution. For Adrià Rodriguez, it was a protest that produced geopolitical global shaking with common patterns, while nations and states were no longer the framework, and introduced the following concepts:

- **Technopolitics.** This state includes new ways of affection and communication such as Internet, social media, and social networks. Though, it is not only the use of digital networks and virtual space, but implies new and different paradigms of social organization, affection, communication and struggle through and within the net. The capacity to increase social engagement in a common purpose and make people going to the streets through the virtual space, empower hyper-connected multitudes offering capacities for collective work and affection.

- **Composition.** These movements were formed mainly by young people [commonly called as highly-educated generation] hyper- connected communities, crisis labour market, precariousness in jobs, debts, and such like.

- **Democracy as a failure system with generalized institutional crisis, corruption, and constitutional crisis.**

In contrast to the identification of these movements as horizontal and leaderless, there is implied a transversal, distributed, temporal, and choreographically organization and leadership. In addition, social media is not characterized by absolute horizontality, it is accompanied by a continuous rise of new forms of organization in which leadership (a term that is not comfortable to use within the movements) changes in form and location. Here, choreography adapts to its sense, it induces the idea that the time of digital network platforms when forming protests activities were not spontaneous or chaotic. Unlikely, contemporary digital protestors act by using digital platforms changing the focal point of protests to multiple active networks that serve in several phases; i.e. the physical occupation in Zuccotti Park during the first weeks was somehow controlled and enclosed by the police and by occupiers themselves. However, in the virtual space there was an effervescence activity that pushed the movement towards a global mechanism of spatial appropriation. In places like Shanghai or Bogota, people created digital platforms for crowdsourcing data that was distributed in Zuccotti Park, and in Copenhagen and Washington
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there were platforms that contributed to Zuccotti Park protestors to create their own, independent and free Wi-Fi device (Creativity 2013).

Nezar AlSayyad refers to these new forms of social networking as a collective work that explores cyclical and reciprocal relationship between social media, traditional media, and spaces of protest. The mutual constitutive relationship between the virtual and physical space, form one only space, the contemporary public space, when the collective takes action to produce spatial performances (AlSayyad and Guvenc 2015). Hence, there is a new repertoire that is radically changing and containing spatial performances that articulates socio-spatial dynamics. The open sequence of 2011, as a set of events that pushed interconnected occupations in places distant from each other as Chicago and Tunisia in 2011, or Istanbul and Brazil in 2013, opened a new space for collective self-organized behaviour. The patterns of virtual space in occupations evoked a behaviour that was developed alongside technology; it was a wireless space with wireless social networks.

The Img. 5 represents the Spanish acampadas: digital networks that are in the physical space. Castells highlights these common patterns as transformational social movements that swept the globe (Castells, Network of Outrage and Hope. Social Movements in the Internet Age 2012), and reveal the importance of shared communication and activism in the contemporary real space. Thus, the Arab Spring, the Spanish acampadas, and the Occupy Movement covered symbolic urban spaces, escaping from authorities in a form of self-managed body and acting dynamically between the virtual and the physical space. They were on-and-offline, viral, leaderless, autonomic and convivial, and reinforced conventional opportunities for political assembly in the physical and virtual public space, making a multidimensionality of occupying public spaces.
2.1.2 Physical movement within virtual movement

Not everyone in the world is in the Internet, but everyone in the Internet is in the world.

@Ciudadano_zero0

In the last decades, the Internet has shrunk time and distance, and is rapidly perceived as a vast space of interlocking networks of infinite variety: biological, productive, cybernetic, social and so on. Nonetheless, cities' physical space has done little to respond to these new dynamics, showing in many cases to be obsolete infrastructures. Thus, social movements rely on the virtual space, which works as an image of mediation between subject and object and their way to horizon of possibilities. This relationship follows Simondon’s “Imagination and Invention” (Simondon 2008), that combined to Bernard Stiegler terms, it raises the question: “how does the what of Facebook constitutes our who?” (Stiegler 1998). Manuel Castells indicates that technology does not determine society, it is society (Castells 2005). Here, society shapes technology according to its needs, values, and interests, while digital networks enable movements to overcome their predecessors and alter established limits and borders by being flexible and adaptable. They depend directly on where, for whom, and for what communication and information are used; though as Castells explains, these communication technologies emerged from the networked individualism. A self-selected communication network on-or-off depends on needs and moods of each individual: a network society and a society of networked individuals. ‘Communication constitutes public space,’ and when digital networks constitute one of the main platforms of communication, the virtual space forms the space of collective and politic behaviour. Still, the presence and absence of communication mechanisms in public spaces work as binary modes where processes are part of them but they are not necessarily visual or material. Melvin Webber in “Community without Propinquity” (Webber 1999) indicates that conceptions and transcendent spatial dispersion emphasize the importance of time-space, distancing from community and public sphere theories before the Internet, in which the network society existed as a rhizome. It maximizes the chances for fulfilling collective and individual projects, creating new processes and projects, and deploying a broader wired and wireless communication.

During 2011 revolutions, Twitter played an important role in the resistance of collectives, for permitting short and direct interaction messages, a quick way to communicate during protests. This platform is visible and reachable by anyone even those who do not have a Twitter account but a mobile phone and Internet access. In the study “The Digital Evolution of Occupy Wall Street” made by Michael Conover et al. (Conover, et al. 2013), they looked into 25,000 Occupy users and found that Twitter was the most used digital network. It evoked a highly-interconnected community of users in pre-existing interest, mainly in domestic politics and foreign social movements. Twitter contents 140-character messages [tweets] and there are two types of content streams: associated
accounts and topic-specific tokens [hashtags]. By following one or more accounts, a user creates a personalized platform that feeds her/his interests, linking content and users, and making public and visible. In this study, Conover et al. identify Occupy-related content with hashtags matching either #ows or #occupy, from 1st September 2011 to 31st August 2012, containing approximately 1.82 million tweets produced by 447,241 accounts (Ibid). In the Figure 3, the Occupy traffic closely mirrors activity in Zuccotti Park and other occupations and is characterized by peak-levels during the two-month occupation. In the following months, the activity related to the movement diminished significantly, decreasing 80% from the first six months. Thus, the virtual interaction is very intense during the occupation of Zuccotti Park, but it decreases significantly when the occupation is evicted.

For OWS, one of the most important objectives was to materialize virtual communities in physical public spaces. Occupations needed to show the power of former virtual networking and to experience spatial performances with direct impacts in the society as it occurred with the Arab Spring and the Spanish acampadas. During occupations of squares and park, they provided of drum circles and public jam sessions that contrasted to commercial spaces; i.e. the open kitchen faced directly the idea of paying for primary necessities of life, the people’s library represented the idea of free education for all, the General Assembly showed the equal opportunity to speak and be heard, and the technology area offered occupiers free internet access through the Freedom Towers created by Isaac Wilder7 and his team. These performances helped to run services to occupiers and to create communities and commons spaces. Zuccotti Park became a place where people went to meet others, to talk, to debate, to live together, producing feelings of transforming the physical space and at the same time potentiating the virtual space.

Figure 3 Total number of tweets related to Occupy Wall Street between September 2011 and September 2012.

The “Network Society” of Castells acts differently during occupations because spaces experienced extraordinary events. It is divided into “Network System” and “Network Movements:” the first one refers to a complex network with a multiplicity of nodes that is articulated organically and in an ever-changing way. The second one goes beyond the sociological platform of social movements until reaching an articulated network, involving large groups of people that are somehow related to
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7 Isaac Wilder, co-founder and Executive Director of the Free Network Foundation.
The movement (Hristova, Panzarasa and Mascolo 2015). There is a thin line that at first sight it divides networks, but it actually merges them as fluid strips. In the contemporary public space, there is a multiplied reality threaded in fictions, it is material and unstable, it is a plane of mixed signals that come up with noise in which reality has to fit. In this ever-changing spatiality of occupations, reality and fiction are placed on a mesh that evanescent territory and location; instead it fabricates fleeting configurations that induces the exploration of limits and capacities.

The geoterritory and cyberterritory created a symbiotic organism where multiple network activisms emerged as multilayer occupations. This multilayer occupation was formed primarily by a multilayer communication network that was given by a set of engaged individuals in multiple forms of communication, each one represented as a layer in the network (Kivela, et al. 2013). Individuals communicate and correspond to physical and located networks in which they are connected through online and offline meetings, like the General Assembly in Zuccotti Park that was on streaming ("in the General Assembly, everyone knows that everyone knows"). The multilayer networks represented multi-functional data with more than one type of connection pair nodes; i.e. the structures of online social network and geographic location network (physical network) are seen as single multilayer networks, where geographic and social layers are considered as autonomous networks that share same nodes. Nonetheless, during the occupations, these layers became multiple because they created a symbiotic core where the geolocation and digital platforms dissolved established structures, [Twitter and the hashtag #occupyeverywhere]. It led to an augmented event where physical occupation was seen and followed on screens and vice versa. When OWS reached a global scope, the spatiality of Zuccotti Park was also presented with the hashtag #occupywallstreet, striating an image and place to a global scope. Thus, Zuccotti Park needed to be identified as a virtual image (Figure 4), meaning to rethink the conceived assumptions of the space and its representation. The network movement acted as a hyper-social platform instead of a closed-local isolated society, in which the significant intervention and socio-spatial formation exists within a temporal frame of online and offline possession of spatial presence.

Figure 4 Network Systems - Network Movement
These relations relay on the prospective that came out to the front since January 2011, by being physically visible with an intense motto few years before they took place. The ability to mass-scale different concrete and collective social relationships into human experiences potentiated the ‘common’ citizen to experience her/his capacity to generate and concentrate information, altering their form from collaborators to actors. This praxis resulted in a micro-action forming a multiple-borderless global body, where individual activity converges into a social power mechanism that carry egalitarian physical and digital networking process [the 99% facing the 1%]. Although network movement tools allowed protestors to circulate rapidly information and coordinate the physical occupation, they showed that they were more effective when broadcasting information to large numbers of people. More than organizing social movements, they set up platforms to link and stitch together interpersonal networks, facilitating the physical assemblage within the same space and through viral communication flows. Thus, rather than mobilizing networks, Twitter and Facebook generated a multitude of individuals (Hardt and Negri 2004). Public spaces, network movements and communities were not separated and did not compete among each other. Instead, they bounded into a complex assemblage of human actions, digital platforms, and mobile devices. The contemporary public space produced insights that contributed to processes of publicness and spatial performance configurations.

2.2. Virtual alterations as architectural urban manifestations

The sphere of private people [coming] together as a public... the public sphere regulated from above against the public authorities themselves, to engage them in a debate over the general rules governing relations in the basically privatized but publicly relevant sphere of commodity exchange and social labour.

Jürgen Habermas, The structural transformation of the public sphere. 1962
The public sphere represents one of the most critical and debated topics in recent years. It includes the virtual space as it has turned into a place to discuss, plan, create, organize and represent actively the public realm. Thus, the public sphere is not anymore something only tangible but virtual, which by following Jürgen Habermas' understanding of public sphere, it is the representation of a "network for communicating information and points of view (Habermas 1962 [1991]). In the late 18th century, the public sphere was represented by the bourgeoisie society in in cafes [coffee houses], where they discussed public issues and formed opinions. While in the setting of public sphere, Lincoln Dahlberg identifies six different concepts on Habermas notions (Dahlberg 2001):

- **Autonomy.** Communication has to be truly free from state and economic control
- **Exchange.** Public sphere has to focus on rational-critical discourse to facilitate on-going exchange
- **Reflexivity.** It is the internal process of critically reflecting and adjusting one's position for building a better argument.
- **Ideal role-taking.** It involves people by putting themselves in others’ positions in order to be more respectful and comprehensive.
- **Sincerity.** To ensure the understanding of rational assessment of perspectives.
- **Discursive inclusion and equality.** It captures a wide range of perspectives from an established or given topic.

Dahlberg’s concepts evoke the importance of information exchange and critique for the public sphere, which emerges as a platform where people form the public, and by doing so, they create spatial domains of resistance. In addition, the printing press allowed increasing the expansion of public opinion and the possibility to extend the limits of public sphere from the bourgeoisie to the population at large. This interplay between media and public spaces, structured a platform in which both need each other in order to produce an impact. Public sphere works as a communication network where citizens interact and share information and opinions (Habermas 1996).

As virtual space enhances communication in the population, it forms an online public sphere that has capabilities for both discourse and dissemination. It presents a 'low barrier of entry,' a broad access and use, permitting people to produce content in a variety of ways. Therefore, this contemporary public space reflects Habermas’ narratives of public sphere as a rooted form in "networks for wild flows of messages: news and reports, commentaries and talks, scenes and images, and shows and movies with an informative, polemical, educational, or entertaining content" (Habermas 2006), which is an ideal space for political participation.

---

8 Lincoln Dahlberg is a professor and researcher at the Centre for Critical and Cultural Studies, University of Queensland.
Contrary to former occupations, contemporary ones used the virtual space not only to spread information, but also to generate debate, to create networks, to communicate real-time events, to manage tools, and so on. This was the point that initiated the contemporary public space, making possible the participation in a social and socialized productive process, where spatial practices involved political participation. From cafes, to printer media, to one-to-many forms of communication as traditional mass media, the many-to-many communication has wider implications of events and social engagement. The possibility of ‘many’ making spatial processes were done in first place in the virtual space, in a simultaneous three states: sender-maker-receptor. In "Network of Outrage and Hope. Social Movements in the Internet Age" (Castells 2012), Castells sets new forms of political participation of a ‘mediatized society,’ instead of dividing it into political groups. The contemporary public space could also benchmark Michel Foucault’s heterotopias as they enlighten the potential of new political arenas beyond the digital media, spaces that drawn into existing societies in which mechanisms of traditional cultures are represented and questioned at the same time (Foucault 1984 [1967]). This contemporary public space contains fluid boundaries that do not act only on political realms but move along different scopes, constraining the space of society. Castells sees digital platforms as communication networks for social movements and public participation, linking to Habermas conception of public sphere while discussion involves matters of common concern and action. Habermas’ conception of public sphere which is one single platform, is added to contemporary occupations in the sense that they shape multiple forms of relationships and implications within the public sphere through digital networks that work as Deleuze and Guattari’s ‘knots of arborescence.’

But physical experience is still the most important aspect in contemporary revolutions. Although OWS, Indignados, the Arab Spring, Gezi/Taksim, and so on, were germinated in the virtual space, all of them needed to be materialized in the physical public space. “In contrast with established forms of political participation, as developed in political parties, the new forms of political participations are not connected by programmes but by experiences” (Castells 2012), experiences that are shared in public spaces. Besides the immense reproduction in the virtual space of those images by ‘offline activists,’ it helped to enlarge the space-event in the physical space: “The Internet was used to disseminate news and to share experiences. Videos, photos, and statements of participants were immediately spread all over the world” (Radue 2012).

Contemporary occupations were globalized and digitalized, they did not stop at legal borders, that according to Yvonne Spielmann, this borderless spatiality arose out the fact that every bit of information is constantly “circulating in mobile, flexible combinations and not taking on a fixed position” (Spielmann 2013). The influence of these spatial practices extended far beyond the virtual space, because there was a permanent global action and relationship between streets and virtual space.
Similar to the architectural design of public spaces that hosted occupations [Zuccotti Park designed by Cooper, Robertson & Partners; Tahrir Square in Khedive Ismail’s urban plan and Gezi Park / Taksim Square by Henri Prost], that included certain functions, codes and programmes that indicate or restrict actions and activities within these spaces, the virtual space is also designed under certain specific programmes. Henry Jenkins indicates that the architects of these spaces of communication, the software developers and programmers, are identified as knots of arborescence (in the sense of Deleuze and Guattari rhizome): "they write the software code, thus programming the options and restrictions available to and imposed on users when exchanging information and participating" (Jenkins and Thorburn 2004). In both cases, there are established rules, spaces, codes, directions and conditions in order to use those spaces, but contemporary revolutions demonstrated that by knowing the infrastructure, system, language and code, they empowered and reinvented them. Information and spatial practices re-organized and transformed both spaces: collectives channelled spaces from inner to external knots of arborescence, in the form of inhabiting them temporally [occupations in physical and virtual spaces].

OWS and Zuccotti Park widespread spatial tactics and virtual strategies in social networks, inscribing them in the architectural urban landscape. Occupiers realized that there was a vital importance of space on a micro-level because they contest the sovereign power of the system regulator and controller of bodies in the [virtual + physical] space (Foucault 1979), as ‘terrains of resistance’ (Routledge 1994). Marshal Ganz explains that occupiers succeeded by acting in a dissident spatial strategy, placing their bodies where they were not supposed to be (Ganz 2011) and implying a shift from the production of things in space to produce their common virtual and physical space. It was an ‘open space’ that represented the inscription of a networking logic into the organizational architecture of assembling bodies – the radical space [Chapter 4].

The use of digital platforms during these occupations turned citizens and social groups into dissident collectivities that articulated simultaneously the logics of protests. Contemporary social revolutions developed different strategies and tactics thanks to digital networks, making them faster to happen. The virtual and physical occupation was the most important arena of dissent public spaces, and these new arrangements were articulated in the contemporary public space. It brought Castells’ ‘urban questions,’ where new urban qualities influence social dynamics and organizational forms led to the action of radical spatial performances. It was the virtual space the one that articulated the reappropriation of the architectural urban landscape.
2.2.1. Micro-virtual actions making spatial strategies

The Figure 5 shows Twitter timeline in Egypt from 24th January to 3rd February, each node corresponding to a row of tweets. The figure represents a significant chute when the government shutdown the Internet in the country on 28th January; yet, many tweets were posted making the blockade halfway successful. At the same time, there was a significant rush in tweets of blue nodes, showing the sense of urgency that the shutdown created. Each dot represents a tweet, which represents a digital device, which embodies a body. Hence, each tweet is a body in the physical space, but the absence of dots from 28th January to 1st February makes a reverse effect: an emptiness in the virtual space meant more bodies acting in the physical space. The direct implications of virtual and physical spaces are seen simultaneously, they both are material and they

Figure 5 Twitter Timeline from Mideast Network 24 January - 3 February. Source: www.kovasboguta.com/1/archives/02-2011/1.html

both are digital. Thus, this figure represents the materialization of bodies in spaces during the occupation, not before nor after, it is placed during a temporality that exercised a socio-spatial dynamic.

This state of spatiality has a previous process of gestation. Three years before Tahrir Square, The New York Times published an article entitled “Revolution, Facebook Style,” in which the writer, Samantha Sapiro indicates that El-Facebook group “6 April Youth Movement” was created under the support of workers from El-Mahalla El-Kubra town, who planned a general strike on 6th April 2008; by January 2009, the group had more than 70,000 members. In 2010, the Facebook group “We are all Khaled Said” was created after the death of this young man, who was attacked by the police. This situation placed the Egyptian society on a state of alert; thus, before the 25 January Revolution, there was a strong influence of social mobilization on digital platforms and rallies on streets, producing simultaneously many-to-many communication as an assembly. Facebook, as the most effective social media website during the 2011 revolution, had 8,357,340 members in Egypt by July 2011. 78% of them were between 15-29 years old and 22% above the age of 30. The same year the Egyptian Ministry of Communication made public a report in which it read that 70 millions of Egyptians owned a mobile phone that same year, constituting more than 87% of the country population. Meanwhile Twitter had 1,131,204 users between January and March 2011; the most used hashtags used were #egypt (up to 1.4 million mentions during this period), and #jan25 (1.2 million mentions). And finally the third most influent social network website, YouTube, which according to Techno Wireless, during the first week of the occupation Egyptian users viewed 8.7 million pages on YouTube.

On the other hand, OWS started as an idea in the Canadian magazine Abdusters, when it launched the proposal to protest on Wall Street on its website. The proposal was made weeks after the Arab Spring and received an important push during the Spanish Indignados and the Greek protests. The idea of ‘occupying’ Wall Street went viral on the Internet, reaching focal attention on grassroots social movements and attaining curiosity and engagement within social media. Having information from previous protests, OWS was more organized and established than Tahrir Square or Indignados. Abdusters’ tweet: “America needs its own Tahrir acampada. Imagine 20,000 people...
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taking over Wall Street indefinitely. #acampadaWallStreet represents the notion of being in the square and appropriate its space. Ideas, tactics, organizational structures, strategies, performances and mechanisms were spread through Internet by previous occupations. Kalle Lasn, Co-Founder of Adbusters, mentioned that:

What made Occupy possible was the kind of anarchist stuff that was happening in Greece, the acampadas in Spain were young people started to fight back against the kind of regimes that they live in, and then, the big moment, when Tunisia and Egypt exploded. I think that this occupy movement had a lot of fertilization from the bottom-up. And it wasn’t one event; it was one series of events... from Greece we got a kind of Anarchist inspiration, from Spain we got a whole bunch of way of organizing acampadas, and from Tunisia and Egypt we got this ide that you can get hundreds of thousands of people out on the street by using the social media, and pulling of a regime change. So you see, we learn different things from different places... In a way everyone feels part of a global swarm, you can feel part of movement of young people who feel that their future doesn’t come. And every morning you get that feeling that unless you stand up and start living for a different kind of a future, you won’t have a future. And there are hundreds of millions of people who feel exactly as you do. 18

The organization of spatial performances, especially when forming occupations and mobilizations of information, brought different strategies and recognition of spatial tactics. In an interview made by Léon Egberts to Kalle Lasn, he states that the global connection made the movement and people to be "plugged into a global network of activism," it was the hub of "global activism," highlighting the general use of strategies and ideas from other occupations, and support from global activists and people related to former occupations.

In contrast to the lack of coverage from the mass media, occupiers used the virtual space to spread the movement’s actions. OWS received the support from Anonymous group, which was determinant in the process of this occupation. It helped to spread the movement’s platform worldwide in a way that was difficult to block, making visible its outreach after the first week of the occupation in Zuccotti Park. Initially, there were around 200 people occupying Zuccotti Park, while after uploading Anonymous video online supporting OWS, the number of protesters rose to a peak of approximately 5,000 the following weekend. In the peripheries of Zuccotti Park, there was a parallel internet-based activism strengthening the movement. According to the Anonymous activist 'MotorMouth,' he indicated to The Guardian that members of this group were physically at the park
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17 Adbusters on Twitter. 10 June 2011. https://twitter.com/adbusters/status/7898903232376832

one day and the next day online. Videos and messages attributed to the hacker collective Anonymous helped the hashtag #OccupyWallStreet, while the Guy Fawkes mask, image of resistance from the film and novel 'V for Vendetta,' became a symbol of the OWS occupation. OWS and Anonymous used social networking media in different ways during the occupation, as another Anonymous activist named 'Jackal' indicated:

This is a new way to protest. Many of us have done our fair share of street protesting. But they drag us into the streets, and they mace us. Now we have brought our protests into the online social media space. We do it all at once - the street protesting along without distributed denial service [DDoS] attacks. We are a bit of an online flash mob.

This statement shows how contemporary movements respond to social dynamics, in the virtual space as a quick but deep shock wave, and in the physical space, as a core of spatial dissidence. The emerging alliance of the square occupation and online activism broke the collective notion of how those spaces were used; they changed them in a habitat for contemporary public space.

The infamous pepper-spray incident, in which it could be seen that a police officer sprayed two women protesting, and the massive arrest of nearly 700 people that were crossing Brooklyn Bridge, were catalysts for mass media to cover OWS. Thus, the mechanisms of the movement made a transformative factor to the process of the self-representation. After gaining visibility on Wall Street, hashtag #Occupy spread fast in other cities of the United States first, and then around the world like London, Frankfurt, Tokyo, Bogota, and so on (Img. 7). The international network of activism helped to facilitate the irradiation of Zuccotti Park towards other countries and it amplified to the media attention, spreading a spatial process of upward scale from local to global.

The increase in the number of actors and/or geographic range of coordinated claim making, which happens when 'localized collective actions spawns broader contention when information concerning the initial action reaches a distant group, which, having defined itself as sufficiently similar to the initial insurgents (attribution of similarity), engages in similar action (emulation), leading ultimately to coordinated action between the two sites.
(McAdam y Tarrow 2004).

---

2.3 Discussion. Hyper-forum

An example of a platform that banks on virality is the ‘Crowd Voice,’ which contains videos, images, photographs and testimonies about political movements around the world. The impact of traditional social practices surrounding communication, relationships, space, play and work have been affected by social networks, presenting opportunities to expand their dynamics. Virtual communities took the approach to digital networks to communicate and create – through social practices – new social networks in the physical space. Protestors combined media and cognitive skills to social, emotional and cultural elements that motivated collective participation in protests and occupations. This state empowered subjects in different ways, more open, multiple and diverse in the contemporary public space. The political protests in this space was digitally supported by heterotopias, seeking diversity in actions that did not interpret feelings as signs of weakness but as potential insights. Like philosopher Wolfgang Welsch points, these actions did not consider autonomy, independency and individualism but development in-and-through relationships in multiple scopes. Castells, relating to the Spanish Indignados, says: “Let us rebuild ourselves (...) from the inside out, not waiting for the world to change to find the joy of living in our daily practice” (Castells 2012).

Like Asmaa Mahfouz’s vlog that called for protest on 25th January in Tahrir Square, was first posted in her Facebook page and then uploaded on YouTube, and became one initial individual action that was shared and spread on people’s personal accounts, causing personal engagements for protesting in Tahrir Square. This communicative action was achieved when individuals successfully
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communicated actions (Habermas 1962 [1991]), and as Castells relates, they were networks of individuals as “insurgent communities,” while “social explosions of resistance do not need leaders and strategists as anyone can reach everybody to share their rage.” The diffusion of squares for occupation is combined with digital networks and mass media coverage, helping distant groups to receive not only information, images and strategies, but also real-time events and energy. The upward scale transformed process of mobilization by increasing the overall number of occupiers and resources to its possession, and second, by gaining collective collaboration in-and-out the occupation zone (Sassen 2005). Contemporary occupations became the hub in the network and created its own system network of occupations, which increased its overall strength. Yet, it was not only technology but also social aspects of technology that facilitated to move easily between on-and-offline relationships, shifting to international activism (Bennett 2004). Dissident spatial performances used codes to produce spaces, while the virtual space experimented and acted in urban practices with ad-hoc performances and collective participation (T. M. Tierney 2013). The physical space was transmuted in a radical temporal stage.
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We don’t even know what a body can do.

Gilles Deleuze, Lecture transcripts on Spinoza’s concept of Affect, 1978

"I know what a body is" is a statement that could be grasped in architectural treaties like Le Corbusier’s "Modulor," Ernst Neufert’s "Architectural Standard," or Henry Dreyfuss' publications on gender body dimensions. These modernist theories represent the human body as a standard measure, transforming it into a spatial normative where architecture is based on considerations for an ideal normatized body. Le Corbusier's "Modulor" as a normative body, which figure does not follow the ideal body in the classical meaning of aesthetics, neither represents anybody's body. It is a body that refuses to evolve,1 making it to interact with a fixed architecture that produces a normative behaviour in a pre-defined program.

Thus, “¿what happens when form is no longer the stable outline of mass but the key dynamic condition within a field of bodies?” 2 There is an obsolete relation between the body and the contemporary city, in the sense that social dynamics are continuously changing but the built environment does not evolve or adapt with them. This obsolescence in urban materiality is visible in 2011, when OWS and the Arab Spring, altered [physical and virtual] public spaces. These occupations show that reducing the body to a standardization model is a short abstraction of bodies and public spaces. Indeed, people challenge their standard representation as a non-existing body and generate instead a new spatialization of the body, an architectural body3 that involves with its context and develops processes of symbiosis and synergy. These events scrap against standardization and place bodies and spaces as living entities that evolve.

There are new approaches in architecture from the contemporary role of objects – referred as bodies [Chapter 4]– which are not passive clumps of matter but bodies of potential, disposition and forces (Meehan, et al. 2013). These forces are materialized in the urban scope during occupations, initiating projectable platforms. Judith Butler refers to this transformation as the movement of bodies claiming in cities:

We miss something of the point of public demonstrations, if we fail to see that the very public character of the space is being disputed and even fought over when these crowds gather. So,

3 Architectural body is a concept researched and elaborated by Arakawa and Madeline Gins. They explore the relationship among architecture, human body and creativity defined and sustained by one another. They promote the use of architecture and design in dealing with the blight of the human condition, recommending that people seek architectural and aesthetics solutions to the dilemma of mortality. “A Architectural Body” is a book written by Shusaku Arakawa and Madeline Gris, Tuscalosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2002.
though these movements have depended on prior existence of pavement, street, and square, and have often enough gathered in squares.

(Butler 2011)

Therefore, the body 'in' the public space is a relationship that is considered in this chapter through architecture, first through a state of revolt and then through occupation.

### 3.1 Revolt and occupation

However, when we come to the story with our contemporary sensibilities, what strikes us most is something else: the very word ‘revolutionist’, the existence of a figure who openly demonstrates fidelity to a cause, to an idea. Our society, after all, can perceive dedication to a cause only as a lack of reflexivity, as fundamentalism. The ‘last man’, preoccupied by the thought of ends (of history, of events, of revolutions...), cannot imagine a political cause to fight for.

Slavoj Žižek, *Welcome to the desert of the real*, 2002

At present, there is a general discourse about a type of revolution: the technological revolution, and how it has changed social and spatial relationships. However, in terms of politics, the term revolution is seen as a radical nonconformity action made in a moment out of control. Bulent Diken relates is as a ‘one-dimensional’ structure in which politics are hyper-politics: “we are free to politicize anything and criticize everything, but only in a reserved, non-committal way, only in so far as our ‘critique’ is confined, in a properly fetishist manner, to what exists” (Diken 2012). Nonetheless, in the ancient world political revolution was understood as the state when societies were moved in cycles of degeneration by passing the power to different groups of people. For example, like in Plato’s book “The Republic,” democracy develops a revolution from the poor against the oligarchy, seen as a regenerative movement (Plato 1992). It establishes a particular difference between the understanding of revolution in the ancient and modern conception: the first one does not recognise the possibility of permanent breaks, while the second one rejects the principles of the ancient thought. Rather than moving around a path, revolution breaks with the past.

When referring to the origins of the term, revolution shares a common derivation with revolt. In Merriam – Webster Dictionary, ‘revolt’ is defined as a fight in a violent way against the rule of a leader or government; an act that shows do not accept control or influence of someone or something and cause [someone] to feel disgust or shock.
Revolution and revolt (…) go back to the Latin revolver “to revolve, roll back.” When revolution first appeared in English in the 14th century, it referred to the movement of a celestial body in orbit; that sense was extended to a “progressive motion or a body around an axis,” “completion of a course,” and other senses suggesting regularity of motion or a predictable return to an original position. At virtually the same time, the world developed a sharply different meaning, namely, “a sudden radical or complete change,” apparently from the idea of reversal of direction implicit in the Latin verb. Revolt, which initially meant “to renounce allegiance,” grew from the same idea of “rolling back,” in the case from a prior bond of loyalty.

Merriam – Webster, Revolt.

‘Revolt’ comes from the Latin verb *volvere* (turn), an initial significance that is far from the politics scope. Revolt has different meanings in its origins such as curve, entourage, turn, return. Later on, in Old French, it means envelop, curvature, vault, omelette, roll, and to roll oneself in, loaf about, repair, and *vaudeville*. During the 15th and 16th centuries, French language received an important Italian influence, attaching to its meaning *volutis* and *volute*, the architectural term that refers to spiral or scroll like the ornaments in capital columns that form the basis of the Ionic, Corinthian and Composite orders. It includes *volta* and *voltare*, a circular movement and by extension, a temporal return. *Volta* also means ‘time’ in Italian as ‘in one time’ or ‘once:’ turning back.

Alain Rey, a French linguistic,⁴ compares the cohesion of these diverse etymological origins and evolutions. He refers to revolt as to twist, roll, wrap, and cover, an idea of twisting or enveloping in a topological and technical concept. In addition, Julia Kristeva in her book “The Sense and Non-sense of Revolt: The Powers and Limits of Psychoanalysis” (Kristeva 2000 [1996]) expresses the lack of current relation between revolution and helix, to rebel and to wallow. She highlights the contemporary meaning of ‘to revolt’ and ‘revolt’ as words that come from Italian and keep the Latin meaning of ‘to return’ and ‘to exchange’, which today implies a diversion at the outset of the assimilated to a rejection of authority. Then, Kristeva references to revolt in the psychological sense:

The word [revolt] contains an idea of violence an excess in relation to a norm, and corresponds to émouvoir (to move), émeute (riot) for ‘revolt.’ (…) Until the eighteen century, the word ‘revolt’ is not used for war, as is the series ‘rebel,’ ‘rebellion,’ but it is used in the political and psychological domain.

Kristeva, The Sense and Non-sense of Revolt, 1996
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⁴ Alan Rey is a French linguistic, lexicographer and a radio personality in France. He has collaborated with the Dictionnaire Alphabétique et Analogique. [http://www.babelio.com/auteur/Alain-Rey/3122](http://www.babelio.com/auteur/Alain-Rey/3122)
The historical and political sense of ‘revolt’ remains until the late 17th and beginning of the 18th century during Louis XIV years, when Voltaire uses ‘revolt’ to refer to civil war, unrest, cabal, insurrection, war, and revolution. Then, relationships between revolt and revolution are on the same scope but not clearly differentiated. ‘Revolution’ appears first as an astronomical and chronological term in the French Academic field, while in the middle age, ‘revolution’ marks an end of a period of time that has ‘evolved,’ signifying completion, occurrence, and completed duration. In the second half of the 17th century, the word comes closer to a sense of conflict and social upheaval and during the 18th century, ‘revolution’ is widespread with parallels frequently drawn between planetary and political mutations. Revolt shows a special plasticity from its conception to its current use. Julia Kriteva proposes three figures of revolt:

- Revolt as the transgression of a prohibition
- Revolt as a repetition, working-through, working-out
- Revolt as displacement, combinatives, games

These proposals are dependent on each other during revolutions but not during revolts. The revolt does not revive permanency, even if technology allows doing it; instead, it exposes to be an untenable conflict that manifests itself. “Revolt is distinguished from this notably by the fact that the tension toward unity, being, or the authority of the law (although always at work in modern revolt) is accompanied by centrifugal forces of dissolution and dispersion” (Kristeva 2006).

In this sense, Ian Parker treats psychoanalytic change as the model of “social transformation” when it is not, ‘individual self-questioning in a clinic’ being incommensurable with ‘political strategies in public collective space’ (Parker 2004). This assertion brings back one of the most important events in history, the French Revolution of Victor Hugo. He makes a prose of revolt in Les Misérables, first by distinguishing riot and insurrection like intrinsic figures of revolt and its relation to truth. He differentiates revolt as a historical phenomenon that may be infra-political, while insurrection as a phenomenon that ties politics to history:

Of what is revolt composed? Of nothing and everything. Of an electricity disengaged, little by little, of a flame suddenly dashing forth, of a wandering force, of a passing breath. This breath encounters heads which speak, brain which dream, souls which suffer, passions which burn, wretchedness which howls, and bears them away. Whiter? At random. Athwart the state, the laws, athwart prosperity and the insolence of others. Irritated convictions embittered enthusiasms, agitated indignations, indistinct of war which have been repressed, youthful courage which has been exalted, generous blindness; curiosity, the taste for change, the thirst for the unexpected, the sentiment which causes one to take pleasure in reading the posters for the new play, and love, the prompter’s whistle, at the theatre; the vague hatreds, rancors,
disappointments, every vanity which thinks that destiny has bankrupted it; discomfort, empty dreams, ambitions that are hedge about, whoever hopes for a downfall, some outcome, in short, at the very bottom, the rabble, that mud which catches fire - such are the elements of revolt. That which is grandest and that which is basest; the beings who prowl outside of all bounds, awaiting an occasion, bohemians, vagrants, vagabonds of the cross-roads, those who sleep at night in a desert of houses with no other roof than the cold clouds of heaven, those who, each day, demand their bread from chance and not from toil, the unknown of poverty and nothingness, the bare-armed, the bare-footed, belong to revolt... Revolt is a sort of waterspout in the social atmosphere... if we are to believe certain oracles of crafty political views, a little revolt is desirable from the point of view of power. System: revolt strengthens those governments, which it does not overthrow. It puts the army to the test; it consecrates the bourgeoisie, it draws out the muscles of the police; it demonstrates the force of the social framework. It is an exercise in gymnastics; it is almost hygiene. Power is in better health after a revolt, as a man is after a good rubbing down.

Victor Hugo, *Les Misérables*

Revolt presents an ambiguous status because of its intrinsic relationship with social atmospheres and uncertainty with power. In this regard, the historian Eric Hobsbawm,\(^5\) refers to ‘revolt’ as a relatively unorganized individual or collective upheaval present for centuries, while revolution is “a modern answer to an ancient problem of oppression and injustice” (Diken 2012). For Antonio Negri, revolt is never only a matter of action; it is also the force of opposition that grows out in resistance and reflection (Negri 2004). Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri indicate that revolts are spread through different contexts by using communication and common practices desires, defined as “international cycle of struggles:”

Slave revolts spread throughout the Caribbean in the early nineteenth century, revolts of industrial workers expanded throughout Europe and North America in the late nineteenth and early twenty centuries, and guerrilla and anticolonial struggles blossomed across Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the mid-twentieth century. In each of these cycles of struggles, the common that is mobilized extensively and communicates across the globe is not only the commonly recognized enemy – such as slavery, industrial capital, or colonial regimes – but also common methods of combat, common ways of living, and common desires for a better world. (Hardt and Negri 2004)

Albert Camus believes that revolt is one of the “essential dimensions” of mankind. His ideas come to revolution as always implying an establishment of a new government. It contrasts to rebellion, which is an action without planned issues. Also, historians refer to ‘uprisings’ (from the Latin
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\(^5\) Eric Hobsbawn, is a Marxist British historian considered to be the “thinker of the XX Century history”. 
insurrection) as ‘failed revolutions’ because they do not match the expected trajectory, while ‘revolutions’ attain a permanent duration: “if the revolution triumphs, the State returns” (Bey 1985). Camus reflects on himself: “I revolt, therefore we are” or “I revolt, therefore we are to come.” Thus, a revolt gathers the collective in the momentum through strikes and other forms of civil disobedience, or through revolutionary warfare, so in the end the regime implodes, collapses amid disruption, defection and total disorder (Bayat 2013). Revolt is a ‘leap into flight’ out of the absurd, a constant confrontation, a challenge to the actual conditions without succumbing to the illusion of transcendence (Camus 1992 [1951]).

Revolt carries ideas of restrain and continuous conflicts carried out by the collective intelligence. It exists in the sudden, the dazzling perception, the moment as something that has never been experienced before. It is a rupture in the relation to the dominant order. Hakim Bey states that if history is time, then uprisings are the forbidden moments because they are temporary.

[Uprising] is like a “peak experience” as opposed to the standard of “ordinary” consciousness and experience. Like festivals, uprisings cannot happen every day – otherwise they would not be “nonordinary.” But such moments of intensity give shape and meaning to the entirety of a life.

(Bey 1985)

In contemporary occupations, it is possible to identify two characteristics: movement and change. The Arab Spring presents these two conditions. Commonly referred as the “Arab Revolution,” it is a paradoxical reality with a minimal reference in the meaning of revolution, a “rapid and radical transformation of a state driven by popular movements from below” (Bayat 2013). There was movement of people, significances, symbols, ideas, physical structures, objects, modes of urban living, and so on during the occupation. Religious divisions melt away, gender equality was visible, social classes disappeared, activism took place, self-organization and democratic decisions were made by all. Thus, there were conditions that altered their form from ‘revolutions as change’ to ‘revolutions as movement.’ ‘Revolution as change’ is a radical transformation of a state drastically undermined, set in a long period of time and in which there is not an exact starting and ending point. While ‘revolution as movement’ is an exceptional spatial and social supply that explodes the established system with undertaking forms and actions. There is a mobilization of bodies and spaces that disrupt the existing states rapidly, which is a process of displacement. In the 2012 World Risk Report, it reads:

Two dominant issues of concern emerged from the Arab Spring, the ‘Occupy’ movements worldwide and recent similar incidents of civil discontent: the growing frustration among citizens with the political and economic establishment, and the rapid public mobilization enabled by greater technological connectivity. A macro and longer-term interpretation of these events
highlights the need to improve the management of global economic and demographic transformations that stand to increasingly define global social trends in the decade to come (...)

A society that continues to sow the seeds of dystopia – by failing to manage ageing populations, youth unemployment, rising inequalities and fiscal imbalances – can expect greater social unrest and instability in the years to come.

(World Economic Forum 2012).

In this sense, Alain Badiou sees Tahrir Square as a constitution of a ‘communism of movement’, a revolutionary way of living the city from the authoritarian regime that was forcing specific relationships. Slavoj Žižek says that these political happenings, which are horizontal and without hegemonic organizations, leaders or hierarchies, create what he calls “the magic of Tahrir,” an eventual space. It is understood as a space of contestation and agonistic engagement. Moreover, Sungur Savran wrote in his essay “C'est une Revolte, Pas (Encore) Une Revolution” (Savran 2013), that in the 2013 occupation in Gezi Park and Taksim Square in Istanbul, people had immediate and specific demands which, if met, could refuse a state of crisis, pointing at it as a revolt. A revolution by contrast, makes demands that cannot be met by changing policies or governments, but require fundamental social changes (Ibid). Revolts bring enormous energy and a sense of renewal transformation of the public sphere, with wholly different potentialities in human actions that cannot happen under ordinary circumstances. The necessity of revolutions to be materialized in the physical public space is to give themselves time and space of revolts: to break off, to remember, to refashion.

Situated at this point, there is a connection with Hakim Bey’s TAZ [Temporary Autonomous Zone]. Bey refers to TAZ as spontaneous and subversive tactics that are part of time, land, and imagination, and then dissolve themselves to reappear elsewhere/elsewhen (Bey 1985). Nikolai Jeffs adds to this statement a subversive characteristic:

Subversion must be deterritorialized, decentralized, and delinealized, and that those small and nomadic types of resistance must be launched because there is no place that would not be territorialized by a national state (...) [TAZ] is invisible to the state and sufficiently flexible to disappear the very moment it is identified, defined, fixed.

(Jeffs 1997)

This kind of spatial and social projection assumes that all individuals are capable of changing and co-creating their own gestures, spaces, and dynamics, even if they are small comparing to the system scale. Thus, the social movements of 2011 created and were created by TAZ, in which “a
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6 Sungur Savran is editor of the newspaper “Gercek” and the theoretical journal “Devrimci Marksizm,” both published in Turkish.
radical re-ordering and re-configuration of the practices of ‘governing by the people for the people’s is urgently required” (Wilson and Swyngedouw 2014). However, revolts are transformed in occupations, and public spaces shift their sense of competition to be spaces of cooperation, from individuality to collectivity, from generic space to common grounds. These spaces are intimately connected to the event and the occupation to the multitude.

Occupations take their form when there is a surpass in a period of time that shifts inside activities different from revolts: from constant clashes with the police to an internal food supply organization. The occupation represents multiple images on the same layer, with different actions and states that exist simultaneously on the same urban plane but create singular urban layers in socio-spatial notions (img. 1). It is an on-going process of learning and experimentation, one that emerges but does not remain; still it exists long enough to change spatial notions from that point to henceforth. Occupations disrupt the sense of revolt and revolution: revolution as a complete change, revolt as a constant arhythmical explosion, and occupation needs to be a revolt with a spirit of revolutions.
3.1.1 Tahrir Square, Zuccotti Park, Gezi/Taksim. Similitudes, repetitions, and oppositions

_The Square_

Tahrir Square has been traditionally the stage for different revolutions and uprisings. Referring initially to 1919, one of the biggest uprisings took place. Egyptians demonstrated against the British occupation and since then, it has been the chosen place for political demonstrations. Since the colonial era, the fight against the British troops, the handover of the barracks to the Egyptian authorities between 1946 and 1947, the 1970 march at the funeral of Abdel Nasser and Um Qulthum, the protests against the United States’ invasion of Iraq and the Egyptian government’s support in 2003, erected the square as a place to protest. Thus, the history and memory of Tahrir Square provided inspiration for the 2011 revolution.

Atef Said wrote the article "We ought to be there: Historicizing space and mobilization in Tahrir Square" (Said 2015), in which he indicates that the square hosted 15 major political protests and three other occupations before the 2011 revolution. The first one took place in January 1972, the second one in March 2003, and the third one in March 2006. Said indicates that protesters sat-in the square and kept in control for less than 24 hours in each occasion. Before 2011, Tahrir Square was merely a vehicular roundabout and a meeting point for tourists [it is located next to the Egyptian Museum]. The square remained central to passers-by and transportation, but Tahrir allocated several cultural symbols and classical buildings: the Arab League headquarters, the Foreign Ministry building, the National Democratic Party headquarters [the government party building, which was burnt down on 28th January 2011], the Egyptian Museum, the American University, the Umar Makram mosque, and the Nile Hilton. In addition, 16 streets lead to the square creating a hub of movement and displacement. However, during the government of Hosni Mubarak, many rallies and demonstrations were blocked or controlled, in this regard, many experts exclaimed their surprise for being unable to predict that Egypt would face a revolution, in a sense due to the authoritarian regime and their efforts to suppress any opposition or intent of uprising against the government during three decades, and also because of the lassitude of people for living under a constant crushed economy. Plus, the government was not fully in control of the Internet, allowing generating situations that united people.

The results were unexpected, thousands of people gathered in Tahrir, something that did not happen in the last decades; therefore, the police reacted with violence. On this behalf, Jack Shenker, reporter for The Guardian, was arrested during the protests and was witness of other prisoners being tortured, assaulted and taken to undisclosed locations by police officers (Shenker 2016). There was a general violent atmosphere as people were marching under machine guns, there were barricades in streets, some of them blocked by tanks and checkpoints. In the third day of protests,
people started setting up tents, which was the transformation point from protestors to occupiers, understanding that the physical appropriation of the space one of the most important objectives. When the occupation was set up, many people visited the square, spending hours there and chatting with others, helping to create signs, participating in activities, collaborating with food supply, and those who did not stay at night, came back the day after. This spatiality created a cross-section in the Egyptian society, a mix of class, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, dress code, and ethnicity; groups that under normal circumstances would not have met in the same space at the same time. People gathered together in the square maybe not for all the same reasons but for common purposes, making a social congregation that broke down barriers and allowed having an acceptance and a space of the *commons*.

The occupation lasted 18 days and the square was gradually transformed into a city within the city. In three days there were camping areas, media rooms, medical facilities, healthcare impromptu clinics, pharmacy, gateways, stages, restrooms, food and beverage cars, newspaper booths, art exhibits, water point, kindergarten, recycling bins and portable toilets. The spatiality was transformed not only into a social and common public space but also into the biggest spontaneous event for community; establishing the *commons* Tahrir Square (Img. 2). While many journalists and authorities pointed out Tahrir as a chaotic urban cored, carried out by extremists and radicals, occupiers showed to be a self-autonomous organization that created a symbolic and cohesive solidarity socio-spatial condition, enhancing the place to host common actions and dynamics.

Prayers were held at the centre, the most secured area of the square. Services, trash bins and toilets were located on the western side adjacent to a construction site. Clinics were located on the edges of the space to facilitate the transfer of injured protesters to neighbouring hospitals.

*(Salama 2013)*

It was a process of self-adaptation and divergence, which represents Lefebvre's production of the space, featuring different and new forms of social organization. For occupiers, Tahrir became an urban heterotopia, a place for the commons engagement, collective projects, social discourse, and freedom of speech.
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7 Paul Cruickshank, "Why Arab Spring could be al-Qaeda’s fall." CNN Report, 21 February 2011.
The Park

OWS occupied Zuccotti Park for nine weeks. It was born as an idea of the Canadian magazine *Abdusters*, which urged people to take the streets on 17th September 2011 and reproduce a “Tahrir moment in Wall Street.” Participants used online platforms to post information and generate discussion groups. On the day of protest, people arrived to Chase Manhattan Plaza, which was the chosen place to protest, although they found out the square was fenced off and police officers cordoning it. Meanwhile on Twitter, there were tweets informing that Bowling Green park, the second chosen place, was closed too. Hence, to avoid a possible dissolution of the protest, protestors decided to go to Zuccotti Park, which is a POPS – Privately Owned Public Space, and avoiding a possible irruption from the police. This legal framework allowed protestors to stay in the park because one of the conditions of this POPS was the entrance of any member of the public and did not specify a limit of time. Thus, the protest was transformed into a camping zone.

OWS produced outlines of micro-cities: set up a kitchen, a zone for serving food, a legal department zone, a sanitation department, an open library with donated books, a designated area to perform general assemblies, a medical station, a media centre, a meditating zone, two info desks, a comfort area and a sacred space. Due to the park’s quadrangular form, occupiers produced nodes and workstations that cut diagonally the park. By overlaying the established condition of Zuccotti Park
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*Privately Owned Public Space – POPS, is an urban regulation where there is a private owner of a park with a public access. This architectural urban conception will be treated deeper in the chapter 5 of this thesis.*
with new and different activities and installations, the occupation generated what the anthropologist Tim Ingold denominates as “taskscape,” a topography of related activities deployed in space and changing over time (Ingold 1993). Parallel to the physical occupation, there was a virtual occupation, which helped to generate a local and global synergy. People assembled on the virtual and physical space, navigating through a hyper-Zuccotti Park. This alternative urban body modelled by the commons, showed autonomous social and spatial self-organization, where granite and asphalt, data information and algorithms initiated new socio-spatial dynamics temporally. However, the energy of the occupation was intermittent because the intensity was not constant. As winter was coming earlier than expected in New York that year, it generated a direct implication on the occupation infrastructure.

First, camping tents were light, they were not appropriated to resist winter and the replacement of tents for more adequate ones would have represented a motive to remain permanently. This situation was not the purpose of the movement, and it would have been illegal in terms of residential and urban regulations. Moreover, OWS followed a particular structure including General Assemblies, committees, working groups, and horizontal activities, all of them developed in the open space of the park. These activities would have been difficult to perform in winter.9 Thus if occupiers had sheltered from cold, rain and snow inside their tents, the occupation would have become a more ‘inside’ body, triggering to lose its intense sociability and creativeness of spaces.

Secondly, energy. OWS was created by a huge quantity of energy, meaning it needed an important source of force to keep it in motion. Nevertheless, the dilatation of dissident activities in OWS made to lose energy within the camping zone because they became quotidian.

Third, authority action. Mayor Michael Bloomberg took full responsibility for the OWS eviction, indicating that he was acting on behalf of the park’s owner “Brookfield Properties,” and on behalf of health and well-being of the city’s residents and the occupiers as well.10 Considering that New York has one of the highest rates of private public spaces, the awareness of this situation was reflected on the Mayor’s decisions who acted, as he proclaimed, on the side of private owners.

Forth, the inconsistency of demands. The absence of direct and specific demands came in part from a refusal to produce limitations of the state-based politics, including top-down structures but not offering alternatives. In the occupation zone, there were general debates and discussions about different social, financial, and political aspects, giving voice to all but also provoking confused, bitter and sometimes disappointing platform.11
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11 When the author did her research at New York, she studied, analysed and collaborated with different groups that were born from OWS. Not in all of them but in most of them, the horizontality and the lack of direct demands made
Fifth, police eviction. The aggressive swept out of Zuccotti Park on 19th November 2011, was the final tangible existence of OWS. Hundreds of police officers were involved, “some of them wearing riot helmets” (Baker and Goldstein 2011). For the operation to clear Zuccotti Park, officials trained specific strategies following experiences and conflictive situations from Tahrir Square and the Indignados. The training involved urban battlefield and counterterrorism (Ibid). Finally, they evicted the occupation at the most vulnerable time, in the overnight hours from Monday to Tuesday.

The police could not evict the occupation before because there were ambiguities in the park's regulations as POPS. In this regard, the city’s authorities intervened with different actions in these kind of spaces: fire marshals prohibited tents and other structures and removed generators in late October when cold was becoming more intense. Immediately after the eviction, the police erected barricades at Cortland Street, one block north, and at Pine Street, one block south. These points served as an expansion zone to increase the perimeter of control area, taking further outward from Zuccotti Park.

One of the results from OWS was that many social groups around the world emerged, people became more interconnected with the movement’s vision, and also new architectural urban regulations were generated to avoid possible future occupations [Chapter 5]. Lastly, it served as inspiration for other occupations during the following years (Gezi/Taksim, Umbrella Movement), and linked closer citizens and the practice of the everyday city.

_The Square / The Park_

On 28th May 2013, a small group of activists set up some tents at Gezi Park in Istanbul, protesting against the government’s plan to demolish the park and build a shopping mall. The demolition of Gezi Park signified removing the last remaining green park in the centre of Istanbul. When activists gathered in the park, they were tear-gassed and pepper-sprayed by the police, however, they used social networks to spread photos and videos of these actions. The day after, hundreds of people tried to gather in Gezi Park but there were clashes with the police. Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan made public a statement saying that the decision [the urban plan construction] was final and that the park was going to be demolished no matter what.12 As a reaction, thousands of people gathered in Taksim, set up tents and initiated an occupation. However, on 30th May at 5am, occupiers faced one of the most violent clashes between protestors and the police, they raid pepper-spray, tear gas, and set on fire tents. In contrast, the mass media aired soap operas, documentaries and entertainment programs – like the infamous ‘penguin incident,’ where CNN-Turk broadcasted a documentary on penguins, while international news channels were covering
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the clashes in Taksim. This situation motivated more people to join the protests in order to be in the front line creating an image of unity and solidarity. After the clashes, protestors were able to remain in Taksim Square and Gezi Park.

To take Taksim Square was an action very important for the population. It has been traditionally a symbolic place for the secular Republic and a place for official ceremonies such as the celebration of the Republic and the May Day parade. Taksim Square is Istanbul’s most central and political public space while Gezi Park is the only green space left in the centre of the city; hereafter both spaces have been subject of general importance and symbolism within the city and citizens.

During the occupation, Gezi/Taksim was a hub of social heterogeneity. It included leftists, secular-nationalists Kemakists, ultra-nationalists, Kurds, Islamists, unaffiliated, LGBT, environmentalists, football fans, students, merchants, artists, young and old, poor and rich, Muslims and non-religious, Alevis and Kurds; they all gathered in this space. Hence, the occupation attached an internal zoning where “micro-cities” were developed. Occupiers generated a mosque, a kitchen, a warehouse, an information zone, a stage, a media zone, a memorial, a speaker’s corner, an art zone, a library, a coffee area, a garden, a camping zone, a sanitation area and a health care zone. In these micro-cities, different social groups gathered together when in normal circumstances it would have been very difficult to do so. Hence, Gezi/Taksim was a self-governed machine, making visible groups of people and situations that were hidden in the city.

Taking as reference the Arab Spring and the Occupy Movement, Gezi/Taksim occupied the virtual space simultaneously. The virtual space helped to [re]produce the occupation and also to keep it as long as possible; creating a digital archive that fed internal and external experiences. For occupiers, social media was an indispensable tool, besides communication, they shared what the occupation needed like food, gas masks, water, barrettes, toilet paper, and so on. Twitter was used to share information about how to keep the occupation, Facebook provided news and updates, Flickr and Tumblr to share photos, and YouTube for videos. However, during the days of the occupation, there were restrictions to the Internet. The online connection was unstable and many times the served failed, and phone services stopped for hours and was very irregular in areas around Gezi Park according to the lawyer Selen Cimin, who participated in the occupation, thus, occupiers created an open Wi-Fi hotspot in Gezi/Taksim to be used by people in the occupation.

On 15th June, P. M. Erdogan demanded an end to the occupation, so the police entered into Gezi/Taksim that morning with water cannons and rubber bullets in a rapid and extended action. Once evicted, they fenced off the perimeter and cordon it off, obstructing the entrance of any person and expanding the perimeter of the control zone to the surroundings. As a result of this occupation, the shopping mall was not built, neither the Taksim Square’s pedestrian concrete platform.

Similitudes, repetitions, oppositions

These occupations are usually referred as spontaneous social movements. However, none of them were spontaneous, they were fed permanently with information and activities in virtual platforms and public spaces. Activists and bloggers were constantly activating and planning protests against particular situations and tried to reach the maximum number of people, in some cases for months. During occupations, sharing information, ideas, knowledge, images, and experiences was crucial to keep their form but due to their political and spatial scopes, Tahrir Square, OWS and Gezi/Taksim had different outcomes: in Tahrir Square the occupation lasted 18 days, in Zuccotti Park 59 days, and in Gezi/Taksim 19 days.

The crucial use of the Internet and the necessity to be in the streets increased intersection and interplay in the urban scope in situ. This binary situation of the ‘virtual’ and ‘physical’ spaces generated the mobilization of a corporeality in the public space. It re-deployed the meaning and repertoire of TAZ, altering tent camps, and socially and spatially experimenting on public spaces. These occupations allowed connecting multiple movements and [re]connecting online-and-offline activists with the contemporary public space. Various theorists argue that the combination of hi-tech networking and no-tech gathering develop forms of “communicative action,” “distributed networks” and “open source activism.” Another important factor these occupations faced was the weather. OWS took place in fall, so the occupation area was not prepared resist winter, otherwise structures would have been more stable and permanent. However, by doing so protestors would have done something illegal according to New York’s Urban regulation, which allowed the police to enter immediately and dismantle the camping zone.14 Contrary to Tahrir Square and Gezi/Taksim, their cities have a climate that allows to be outside during the day and night. In Cairo for instance, the average temperature between January and March 2011 was 17°C, while in Istanbul between May and July 2013 was 23°C, if they both had remained for two months as OWS did in New York.15 These three occupations demonstrate that they change establish parameters in scopes such as spatial, legal, virtual and social. They also reveal the need of being temporal. Thinking that they could exist indefinitely is not their purpose nor their intention, still they stretched the occupation until reaching the breaking point, making visible its limits and redrawing its borders.

3.1.2 Collective installation in temporal urban borders

The three occupations that are the focus of this research, passed through a series of moments that altered the conceptions of public spaces and their architectural infrastructure, and challenged the system in which they were design, planned, and used. The processes of these spaces to become occupations, involved the practice of three motors: the collective, the multitude and the commons.

The collective individualism is according to Georgette C. Poindexter,\(^1\) spatially delineated by individual expressions of the self that is aggregated in the community definition (Poindexter 1996). On the other hand, Gilbert Simondon\(^2\) indicates that the psychological individuation is an affective process before a cognitive one, and then the social individuation [the production of social group larger than the single biological person] takes place. Individuation for Simondon is a process of the in-between, which undoes dualities. Physical individuation is more an individualization, which is also the condition of individuation, while collective individuation is one that brings the individual to constant transformation. When the police blocked the entrance to protestors into One Chase Manhattan Plaza, that shift converted protestors into a collective individuation. Meanwhile in the virtual space, Twitter was the platform that communicated and sent information that pushed this transformation.

The emphasis of collective participation is the core of protests as they required material examination that included social and spatial relationships. The Canadian Magazine *Abdusters* fed for months the movement towards the occupation in Zuccotti Park. Their first online post was on 2\(^{nd}\) February 2011, influenced by the Arab Spring Revolution and continued during the following months. On 17\(^{th}\) September 2011, the protest followed the plan to reach One Chase Manhattan Plaza, as it was not possible, people walked to Bowling Green Park and ended up in Zuccotti Park. This displacement was done in Wall Street’s grid, and during the process, the protest was transformed into revolt. Protestors moved towards one direction, one targeted space, one purpose looking at the same point and moving as a mass in an established space. But when they faced the first spatial blockade, the mass was broken and turned into a collective participation. Each individual was part of a collective body and had to take a decision, whether to stay or leave, to give alternatives or be muted, to participate more actively or be passive, to collaborate among each other or retort as an individual; it was this the moment of responding not only to what they faced in front of them but also in between them. The shift in the body’s movement, their behaviour, and condition of protester, motivated also a change in their spatial projection as a contested spatiality. Thus, the collective involves the collective subject and collective actions, which are defined as subjectification. “By subjectification I mean the production through a series of actions of a body and
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16 Georgette C. Poindexter was an Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Pennsylvania. 1996.
17 Gilbert Simondon (2 October 1924 – 7 February 1989) was a French philosopher best known for his theory on individuation that would inspire later to Gilles Deleuze and Bernard Stiegler.
a capacity for enunciation not previously identifiable within a given field of experience, whose identification is thus part of the reconfiguration of the field of experience” (Rancière 2001).

From ‘Occupy Wall Street’ to ‘RE-Occupy WALL Street’, was the proposal for altering collectively the space. Critical geographers suggested that ‘accumulation by dispossession’ works as a term for describing a shared concern of contemporary global movements (Harvey 2005), but only when dispossession of dynamics stretches the appropriation of the space. The occupations demonstrated that it was possible to denaturalize dispossession through relational comparisons and collective efforts that mapped counter-spatial practices. The succession of events exemplified some spatial conditions, which by following Matthew Sparke’s spatial designations, these are (Sparke 2013):

- **Target space.** When preparing the protests in the virtual space, the target space had important significances and symbolisms. The targeting gave meaning to broad their extension by dispossession to other situations. It set a series of relations between people and places that Samuel Weber indicates as ‘targeting,’ which implies particularities of time, while space is transformed from media of alteration and dislocation to conditions of self-fulfilment and appropriation (Webber 2005). He suggests than in the end, targets tend to resist such singularizing spatial subsumption (Sparke 2013). Indeed, OWS showed the vulnerability of the everywhere space, where camping out in cities across the world was possible because of the place’s energy and the virtual collective participation.

- **Everywhere space.** The Arab Spring that started in Tunisia but was followed through the entire region, and OWS that was extended around the world reaching more than a thousand cities, they both took the form of online multiple images. These sites of occupations were sometimes in the physical space, and sometimes in the virtual. The virtual space included a series of encampments that played a role in the creation of the everywhere space. The geography and the information mapped ongoing spaces whose interventions made possible to include elements throughout the gaze of the net. The everywhere space – “a shared and common world” (Sparke 2013) was suddenly resonant platforms of ideas, energies and experiences about repossessing the space – initially – but resulting in the reinvention of it.

- **Time-space.** The momentum of the protest, expanded them everywhere and proved pivotal understandings of public spaces. They could be anywhere, but they needed to be built by a continuous socio-spatial energy, and by intermittent temporalities.

The collective participation open new relationships in which each member of the collective executed with its own skills, in an individual or collective way. This was one of the strongest points during the occupation, when instead of remaining passive, each individual acted collectively in an
extended period of time. This new state generated new spaces that are complimentary to the previous ones:

- The shared space. When protestors were one collective force in one same space. Rebecca Solnit indicates that in this space:

> People of all kinds can coexist, from the homeless to the tenured, from the inner city to the agrarian. Coexisting in the public with likeminded strangers and acquaintances is one of the great foundations and experiences of democracy, which is why dictatorships ban gatherings and groups.

(Solnit 2012)

The multitude mobilized highly heterogeneous groups that shared in and thereby produced spaces and spatial practices, bringing different and unique significances in occupiers. The shared space in OWS was for instance the practice of the "human microphone" (or Mic-Check), a "Human Transmission Technology" (Lambert 2013). This creative tool produced a spatial invention: “Mic-Check is the scream that precedes any speech from anybody speaking on the Square and during the marches when (s)he requests the oral transmission of what (s)he will say” (Ibid). In New York, the use of a microphone, loudspeaker or amplifier without permission from the city council is banned. Hence, instead of weakening the occupation, it made OWS stronger and leaderless because nobody held the position of speaker, it was who could do it. It was also an important feature in the General Assemblies by increasing the range of audibility and by extension, the amount of people participating. Lambert adds that

(...) as low-tech as it [Mic-Check] seems, this means of communication is a representation of high-tech networks used to communicate with the multitude of other delocalized bodies who participate in the movement in some ways, even without being physically present.

(Lambert 2013)

- The vibrant space. The temporal space when protestors started shifting their condition to occupiers. Zuccotti Park before the occupation worked as a corporate open space with passive activities like sit and chat, eat and watch. Nevertheless, during the occupation, the park took a phylogenetic and revolutionary approach to spatial typology, where new functions of the space were adopted based on human interactions. There were open platforms for public speaking, spaces for medical rehabilitation, spaces for storing medical and food supplies, and such like.
The affective space. When the hitch situations of the occupations were converted into a space of opportunities, everyone, everywhere felt affected during occupations. A concern with affect as a problem space was raised by Slavoj Žižek saying that “one of the great dangers the protesters face is that they will fall in love with themselves”. He explains that:

The protesters should fall in love with hard and patient work – they are the beginning, not the end… While it is thrilling to enjoy the pleasures of the “horizontal organization” of protesting crowds with egalitarian solidarity and open-ended free debates… the open ended debates will have to coalesce… in concrete answers to the old Leninist question, “What is to be done?”

(Žižek 2011)

Žižek experiments with psychoanalytic theories of pleasure and jouissance, and brings to the space: “What is to be done?” considers a utopian space of OWS as a world contested space. Thus, the affective space acts as a “transition or lived passage from one degree of perfection to another, insofar as this passage is determined by ideas; but in itself it does not consist in an idea, but rather constitutes affect” (Deleuze 1978). Affect is the continuous variation, for someone it is the force that increases the power of acting: “it’s a state of a body insofar as it is subject to the action of another body” (Ibid), it is the action that one body produces on another when implies contact. The affective space is originated by a particular susceptible society that feels the action of others.

The spatial continuity (and at some extend division) of these occupations, subtending various engagements with assembled bodies and with their contribution to gatherings, exceeding the relations of the preconfigured spatial imaginary. In this sense, Manuel DeLanda18 says that assemblages are composed themselves by assemblages in terms of forces, nor forms (DeLanda 2006). Meanwhile, Deleuze insists on immanent open-ended qualities of an assemblage that gives continuity to bodies. And Spinoza conceptualizes the boundedness of the object as processes rather than pre-given final forms. With a temporal division in the assemblage, one is constituted and another is constitutive, thus there is a temporal balance between a revolutionary moment and a state form (emancipation and restriction of assemblages). It is in this situation that the emergent envision of experimental and collective assemblages propose new conditions of spatialities that form the commons. In addition, Judith Butler elucidates the dynamics of public assembly under prevailed economic and political conditions, understanding assemblies as plural forms of performative actions, and extending to performances and precariousness, where the destruction of liveability conditions has been a galvanizing force in occupations. Assemblies of physical bodies
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18 Manuel DeLanda (1952) is a Mexican-United States writer and philosopher, adjunct professor at Pratt Institute School of Architecture.
have an expressive dimension that cannot be reduced to speech, including forms of long-distance solidarity but also for allowing a potential to be the closest relationship.

In the occupation, Butler’s relationship between assembly and precariousness, points out at the body that suffers precarious conditions and still persists and resists bringing out a dual dimension of the corporeal state. Assemblies make visible and audible bodies that require basic freedom of movement and gathering. By enacting a radical form of collectivity, a new sense of the commons emerges to take a forward position towards the occupation.

Seize upon an already established space permeated by existing power, seeking to sever the relation between the public space, the public square, and the existing regime. So the limits of the political are exposed, and the link between the theatre of legitimacy and public space is severed; that theatre is no longer unproblematically housed in public space, since public space now occurs in the midst of another action, one that displaces the power that claim legitimacy precisely by taking over the field of its effects... In wresting that power, a new space is created, a new ‘between’ of bodies, as it were, that lays claim to existing space through the action of a new alliance, and those bodies are seized and animated by those existing spaces in the very acts by which they reclaim and resignify their meanings. (Butler 2011)

It was not a coincidence that these occupations took place in some of the biggest and most populated cities around the world: New York with 8.4 million inhabitants, Cairo with 7.7 million, and Istanbul with 14 million. There are infinite borders in these cities, either social, class, spatial, political, religious, gender, and so on, dividing cities in every possible layer and point. Nevertheless, that division was blurred during occupations. Established borders ‘within’ spaces were transformed while some others disappeared; social and spatial borders played in giving rise to struggles, revolts and radical actions that shaped their ongoing development. These common dynamics faced ‘internalities’ and ‘externalities’ [factors and processes]: in occupations zones internalities processes referred to interactions [either or both in the virtual and physical space] adhering a movement of ideas, identities and materiality. Externalities refers to factors in social, political, and spatial conditions that shape the movement and dynamics of collective participation, usually forming activities of counter-movements for the generation of the commons by being extended to the outside world (Mendez and Naples 2015). The commons transforms the public space into temporary spaces through collective self-spatial organization. In contrast to public space, which is held by an authority, or in the case of the POPs by a private owner, the commons can be enclaves, they tend to be determined by limited groups of temporal stakeholders with a geographical attachment to the occupation area. The commons has to do “with difference, not commonality, it should always be expanding those who can participate” (Stavrides 2015).
During the revolts, the spatial borders struggled the challenge, reinforced and affected contested bodies and their force and desire to transcend the space – usually involving a symbolic characteristic. Thus, the binary system of the inside/outside was far from limited to capture the complexities at play in the case of spatial borders. In occupations, bodies, objects, and spaces became corps of resilient spatialities that broke the ‘container’ state, highlighting contradictory spaces of established socio-spatial structures (Gupta 1998). In this sense, Martin Heidegger refers to boundary as something that does not stop but as something that begins its presencing (Heidegger 1971). Thus, global assemblages of contemporary occupations revealed bodies of generating and inhabiting contemporary urban scopes that took into account the virtual space, the collective spatial practice and the state of ‘being’ connected. Occupations reappropriated, reworked, and deployed cultural differences (as gender, religion, social class, and such like). They dissolved borders to let form a space without a specific shape or border, it shrank space and distance among bodies. The occupation zone was a space that negotiated and inhabited multiple contradictions and forms of difference, calling attention on the excluded.

The physical state, the legal framework, and the virtual outcome, promoted an intensification on the commons. In this sense, Deleuze sets three states for the common notion: the first one as the notion of what there is in common between the body affects the body itself and extends to its maximum living common notions. The second as a kind of knowledge [connaisance]. And in the third one, the collective is a multiplicity. There is a limit where all bodies agree and the common notions are individual. The commons heightened the intelligent individuality that was capable of practicing and producing experiences on others and on the collective at the same time. The distance between the self and the subject relies on the aesthetic moment: the self during the revolt and the subject during the occupation. It was the sensation of ‘being together apart’ that transformed the spatial experience, hence in the revolt, it included corporeal, individual and collective experiences, while the occupation involved aesthetic, corporeal, collective and temporal experiences and actions. Whereas Rancière situates this perception between what is seen, thought and felt as sensorial experiences, it is already a space of displacement, which is at the same time, a continuum source of commons. This movement from experience to displacement is the core of the commons’ aesthetics.

OWS, Tahrir Square and Gezi Park enabled an unprecedented spatiality that set up bonds and conditions during the affective space for building relationships for the contemporary city. Adding to the global overview, Mike Davis initiated a review of these utopian spaces:

The electrifying protests of 2011 – the ongoing Arab Spring, the “hot” Iberian and Hellenic summers, the “occupied” fall in the United States – inevitably have been compared to the annis mirabiles of 1848, 1905, 1968 and 1989. Certainly some fundamental things still apply and
classic patterns repeat. Tyrants tremble, chains break and palaces are stormed. Streets become magical laboratories where citizens and comrades are created, and radical ideas acquire sudden telluric power. Iskra becomes Facebook (...) But will this new comet of protest persist in the winter sky or is it just a brief, dazzling meteor shower? For the moment, the survival of the new social movements - the occupiers, the indignados, the small European anti-capitalist parties and the Arab new left - demands that they sink deeper roots in mass resistance to the global economic catastrophe... It's a frighteningly long road just to reach the starting points of earlier attempts to build a new world. But a new generation has at least bravely initiated the journey. (Davis 2011)

The newly meaningful and embodied public space came out from the counterparts of the occupations by repossessing spaces, symbolism, uses, geographies, ties, tension, and relationships. Spaces of resistance, contested spaces, dissident spaces, affected spaces; there is affection in all these spaces, and all altered established borders. The spatial experience – in the case of OWS, was a direct impact of the aesthetic on the collective action, which generated a bigger collective participation and engagement, one that was shared as a deeply realisation on individuality and collectivity. During the protests, the identification of the individual was unable because they were mass, while throughout the revolt, protestors shaped a collective individuation, the in-between moment from revolt to occupation was the multitude, and in the occupation, the commons allowed the creation of new spatialities.

3.1.3 Spatiality of the rhizome in the occupation

Contemporary occupations were not only nodes of acceleration in social and spatial aspects, but also producers of high-speed resonances. This intensity striated the space: one day there was a carnival atmosphere in Tahrir Square and few days later there were unrestrained states of violence in Libya. An insurgent deterritorialization was possible because of the fast-paced rhizomic synergy between bodies in the streets and the instant form of communication in the virtual space. Both spaces displayed images that empowered the feeling of others, resonating with more bodies. These events were rhizomatic, horizontal, and leaderless, followed by multiple lines of expansion and resilient interconnections. Deleuze and Guattari’s theory of flows and striated space, relate an affective space that changes notions, qualities and characteristics of other spaces. Thus, speed of occupations involved bodily affectations, like Spinoza's relations to bodies that affect each other positively through good affectations, so they are able to create something more powerful that increases their capacity to act without having a specific form.
Spinoza’s axiom is that all bodies are either in motion or at rest, and that the motion or rest of particular bodies depends on the motion and rest of other bodies (Spinoza 1996 [1677]). Bodies in motion in a smooth space are unconstrained by other bodies in an un-code flow and force to remain fixed in a striated space by other bodies. The force that allows a group of bodies to control the mobility of other bodies is, as Paul Virilio explains, their capacity to generate speed. Hence, occupations created and multiplied affective connectivities that splinted unexpected lines of fight cutting through striations and producing lines of fracture, which worked as assemblages. This state brings the “Rhizomic Assemblage,” a concept based on the image of underground roots of plants (Img. 3). Deleuze and Guattari see dynamics like emergent networks from unusual, combinations that are tied to existing cultural meanings or relations (Deleuze and Guattari 2002).

![Img. 3 Rhizome of Cimifuga Racemosa](image)

Rhizome is derived from the Greek *rhizome*, root-stalk, a characteristically horizontal stem of a plant that is usually found underground, sending roots and shoots from its nodes. It has short internodes that send out roots from the bottom and upward-growing shoots from the top of the nodes. If rhizomes are broken into pieces, each piece may be able to give rise to a new plant (Liddell and Scott 1940).

A rhizome ceaselessly establishes connections between semiotic chains, organizations of power, and circumstances relative to the arts, sciences, and social struggles. A semiotic chain is like a tuber agglomerating very diverse acts, not only linguistic, but also perceptive, mimetic, gestural, and cognitive: there is no language in itself, nor are there any linguistic universals, only a throng of dialects, patois, slangs, and specialized languages.

(Deleuze and Guattari 2002)

In this sense, Gezi/Taksim received influenced by the people's background (political, economic and social situation of Turkey) but also from Tahrir Square and OWS. As a rhizome, it worked as an organism that created new movements, flows of information and dynamics. Gezi/Taksim was constantly sprawled and understood as a social phenomenon that reinvented the space continuously, as a rhizomatic flow.
The rhizome is reducible neither to the One nor the multiple. It is not the One that becomes Two or even directly three, four, five, etc. It is not a multiple derived from the One, or to which One is added \((n + 1)\). It is composed not of units but of dimensions, or rather directions in motion. It has neither beginning nor end, but always a middle \((milieu)\) from which it grows and which overspills.

(Deleuze and Guattari 2002)

According to Deleuze and Guattari, the relations of exteriority characterize the ‘whole.’ Based on remarks and relations of exteriority, the own ties of individual components explain the relations that create the whole: all the properties of the whole are results of practices of individuals’ parts (DeLanda 2006). In this sense, Deleuze and Guattari have approached six principles.

- Connectivity. It is concerned as any component of the assemblage that may be detached from it and plugged into a completely different assemblage (Deleuze and Guattari 2002). The relations of exteriority guarantee that “assemblages may be taken apart while at the same time allowing that the interactions between parts may result in a true synthesis” \((Ibid)\). Connectivity states that every part of the system is connected to another part in any possible way. In Gezi/Taksim, people ‘went down’ to the Square/Park because they were previously in contact in the virtual space, which was an interpersonal network with a common purpose: every person was related to another person (either in the physical or virtual space).

- Heterogeneity. It as the connection between things of different nature. Deleuze and Guattari employ biological examples, such as the symbiosis of plants and pollinating insects; i.e., the wasp and the orchid show a mandatory relation in the course of co-evolution. The heterogeneity of the components is considered an important characteristic of assemblages that includes territorialisation and deterritorialization.

- Multiplicity. In a rhizome, all parts are connected to one another and these to others, and the others to a greater number of others. It has no beginning or end.

- Rupture. It states that the rhizome can never be broken. If any of its parts is interrupted, it will continue in a different path (or plane), or be deterritorialized, but will remain.

- Cartography and decalcomania. For the first term, Deleuze and Guattari referred as the method of mapping for orientation from any point of entry within a ‘whole’, rather than tracing \textit{a priori} path. Decalcomania is a method of forming through continuous negotiation with its context, constantly adapting by experimentation, performing a non-symmetrical active resistance against rigid organizations and restriction (Deleuze and Guattari, 2002). It is possible to enter to any point but it is not possible to trace it. Whereas the rhizome allows the structure and pattern of reality to emerge through interaction testing the reality, accepting all points as part of them.
The protest of Gezi Park started with around 50 environmentalists demonstrated against the demolition of the park. Because of the propagation of images and videos of the police attacking the activists, thousands of people felt ‘connected’ to the protests, initiating consequently the occupation. Throughout the occupation, the effects of surprise disappeared and the resistance became part of occupiers’ daily routine: Gezi/Taksim became familiar, personal, busy, and dynamic. It operated as an organism on an everyday basis while initiated some sort of carnival gathering people from different backgrounds. By applying a rhizomatic communication wherein multiple channels were used to strengthen networks from one space to another. The advantage of spreading communication across diverse overlapping networks was that it became more difficult to stall its advance. Manuel Castells points out that horizontal features of networked social movements use anonymity as practice, not ideology (Castells 2007). Hence, occupations produced social changing networks rather than social movement organizations, and used virtual space that linked together the diffusion of information and the direct action of people. It was a ‘commons spatial rhizome’ where the creation of the affective space helped to share emotions and arguments.

“Everywhere is Taksim, everywhere is resistance” as one of the most famous slogans during the occupation of Gezi/Taksim, expressed specifically the importance of the space and borders: the first one transmuted and the second one blurred, and in both cases by the existence of the commons using architectural notions. Hence, if the rhizomatic spatiality in occupations challenged these parameters and opposed to the idea of having starting points and predictable paths, then comparing the relations between objects and bodies, the rhizome formed temporal architectural assemblages. In Gezi/Taksim, Zuccotti Park and Tahrir Square, the occupations worked in horizontal schemes with no specific directions and where multiplicities of individuals and new spatialities were part of occupations.

3.2 Bodies in the architectural space of the occupation

The roundabout was the icon of the 2011 revolutions, especially of the Arab Spring. As an urban element, it is seen by Eyal Weizman in his book “The Roundabout Revolutions” (Weizman 2015) as “Dante’s circles of hell,” where its geometry acts as a counter to the counter-revolution, as an immanent power of people that “need to find its corollary in sustained work at round-tables – the ongoing formation of political movements able to enact political change” (Ibid). Weizman follows the history of roundabouts in Europe and North America in the early twenty-century and its exportation to colonial places in an attempt to discipline and police ‘chaotic’ cities. During the last decades, roundabouts functioned mainly as circular traffic marks, but they were also self-regulated urban spaces.
Self-regulation, as Michel Foucault taught in his work on governmentality, is not about the free interaction of agents, it is also about the creation of a frame within which such interaction can take place. The roundabout could thus be seen as a literal (and somewhat comical) diagram of this principle: it is an apparatus that combined a set of elements including the urban form of the street circle, traffic regulation, and the production of a modern subject (the driver) who can self-regulate. The roundabout’s unfulfilled promise, however, like that of deregulated capitalism, was to optimize flow with minimum top-down intervention. Just like the ‘self-regulated’ market, it has not only come into crisis, it has become the mode by which crisis took shape.

(Weizman 2015)

Roundabouts have in their centre monuments that usually evoke a local symbolism, making them untouchable but seen by all. In Bahrain, the occupation concluded in a spatial particularity. As part of the Arab Spring. At the moment of the protests, the country was ruled by a monarchy system and its economy was the lowest compared to the region. Young people were the most active agents in social networks, and by following the energetic moment of the Arab Spring, they congregated a general protest on 14th February. Their intention was to rewrite the constitution with a popular mandate.  

For weeks, the government started a series of actions trying to avoid the protests. It offered to release some prisoners arrested for demonstrating and also the King Hamad bin Isa Al Khalifa announced that each family would receive 1,000 Bahrain dinars ($2,650) to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the National Action Charter Referendum. Despite these efforts, the general protest began on 14th February 2011 but there were immediately clashes with security forces, who used tear gas, rubber bullets and birdshot. The following day, thousands of protesters marched to the Pearl Roundabout in Manama, set up tents and camped overnight.  

Two days later, the Pearl Roundabout was taken by security forces and in the process, four protesters were killed and over 300 people were injured. The city was placed under lockdown with tanks and armed soldiers taking up positions around the capital city, followed by two days of clashes. Finally, on 19th February, protesters re-established their camps at the Pearl Roundabout and remained until 16th March, when the camp was evacuated, bulldozed, and set on fire by the Bahraini Defence Force, riot police and the Peninsula Shield Force. Two days later, the Pearl Monument was demolished and replaced by a vehicular intersection, its name [Pearl Monument] changed to “Al Farooq Junction” and since then, security forces have sealed off the area (Img. 4).
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In the case of Cairo, Tahrir Square became one of the most congested zones. Its typical image was an aerial view showing the vehicular chaos, although after 2011, it was replaced by an image of thousands of people and camping tents (Img. 5). Weizman reflects on the banality of roundabouts and why, as utilitarian instruments of traffic management, they have been historically sites of political protests and revolts. The repetitions of these actions in these spaces reveal intersections that make these phenomena being reproduced in space and time. “Urban roundabouts are the intersection points of large axes, which also puts them at the start or end of processions” (Weizman 2015), they showed the power of occupations as tactical urban acupuncture, blocking off all routes going in and out, moving outward vehicles and attracting bodies, pressuring simple pivotal points within a networked infrastructure and putting the entire city under siege. The difference with public spaces is that the roundabout has a purpose to regulate vehicular traffic, not to gather people. It keeps people away by an ephemeral wall created for the constant use of vehicles moving around it; hence they are seen but not used (Ibid).

The common point of the revolutionary roundabouts is the balance between the void they constitute and the relatively dense urban fabric that surround them, providing a spatial control. The fact that thousands of bodies decided to occupy that particular space at that time constituted a radical political attitude by the exclusivity of the space, and by extension, the exclusion of others. The difference with other gatherings in public spaces, as football matches, carnivals, etc., is that in the occupations people gathered simultaneously in time and space, in the outdoor space of the square instead of the inner architecture that shelters.
Tahrir Square set up a platform that reconsidered the human form when acting within these spaces of political contestation, forming the “Bodies Enacted.” This concept ties up the imaginary of ‘roaring square,’ a sense of mimesis of individuals performing the commons in an act of street politics. However, this occupation captured people by their complicity to experience the situation of oversaturated objects, images, and signs. It brought the idea of being caught within a temporal present, as Frederic Jameson explains in his essay “The End of Temporality:”

The reduction to the present... is also a reduction to something else, something rather more material than eternity as such. Indeed, it seems clear enough that when you have nothing left but your temporal present, it follows that you also have nothing left but your own body. The reduction to the present can thus also be formulated in terms of a reduction to the body as a present of time.

(Jameson 2003)

Faced with the futility of any form of long term planning in the public spatial realm, occupations provided free-form-organized-changing space lacked of boundaries. These new relationships were developed with the surroundings through collective experiences. One of these spatio-temporal actions in occupations was the graffiti. It was a powerful spatial expression during occupations that staged cities and brought a social representation. In addition, people used their bodies as canvas: they painted their faces, scrawl slogans on their clothing, hosted signs above the crowd, pointed bodily performances of dissident spatial practice, and by doing so, they changed simultaneously the city (Img. 6 Img. 7). It was part of a spatial process that drown out the multitude, while bodies served as politics of translation that shifted its representation alongside the occupations.

The body in the square, the body in the roundabout, the body in the street, during revolts and occupations bring Michel Foucault’s notion of “mon corps topie impitoyable”25 [there is no escape from my body]. In Tahrir Square, the body had a confrontation with the roundabout that resulted in a political spatial [co] [re] action. Judith Butler reveals what bodies do rather than what they say. She adds a hint on Derrida in which the act of repeating something brings an unavoidable variation, the reproduction of the norm reveals its weaknesses, and in the urban scenario, the established relationships between architecture and body risks undoing them. The norm was bodily enacted, but with little turnings, deviations, and inadvertent agency, the body in the roundabout was precarious. Indeed, those features were the strength of occupations because, as Laurent Berlant indicates, they were a kind of expendability where a person was supposed to be self-reliant but as such “one became isolated, which in turn made one feel more precarious, escalating anxiety” (Berlant 2011). It reinforced the need and urgency to be with others, and formed a collective body, consequently generating the commons. For Butler, all bodies are dependant and interdependent, she calls for

alliances of the unrecognizable that seek to expand the meaning of the words: “I am already an assembly, even a general assembly” (Butler 2015).

The performativity of bodies in roundabouts is the exercise of the right to place and belonging, the space brings the *being* and the *existence*, occupying a space as a multitude questions the established spatial conditions and as commons, transforms it. When Butler questions “What does it mean to act together when the conditions for acting together are devastated or falling away?” (Butler 2015), there is a sense for acting in the space, to be visible, to generate energy, and to be spatially recognizable in the public assemblage by sharing situations that produce trans-visibility. In a speech made in Zuccotti Park during the occupation, Judith Butler referenced the notion of the assembled bodies in public spaces:

It matters that as bodies we arrive together in public, that we are assembling in public; we are coming together as bodies in alliance in the street and in the square. As bodies we suffer, we require shelter and food, and as bodies we require one another and desire one another. So this is a politics of the public body, the requirements of the body, its movement and voice.

(...) I came here to support and offer my solidarity for this unprecedented display of popular and democratic will. People have asked, so what are the demands that all these people are making?
Either, they say, there are no demands, and that leaves your critics confused. Or they say: that demands for social equality and economic justice are impossible demands. And impossible demands are just not ‘practical’. But we disagree. If hope is an impossible demand, then we demand the impossible. If it is impossible to demand that those who profit from the recession redistribute their wealth and cease their greed, then yes, we demand the impossible. Of course the list of demands is long. We object to the monopolization of wealth, we object to making working populations disposable, we object to the privatization of education when education is a public good, when we support the right to education. We oppose the billions spent on wars, we oppose the expanding number of the poor, we rage against the banks that push people out their homes, the lack of health care for increasing numbers of people; we object to economic racism, and call for its end. None of these demands are up for arbitration.

(...)

It matters that as bodies we arrive together in public, that we are assembling in public; we are coming together as bodies in alliance in the street and in the square. As bodies we suffer, we require shelter and food, and as bodies we require one another and desire one another. So this is a politics of the public body, the requirements of the body, its movement and voice. We would not be here if elected officials were representing the popular will. We stand apart from the electoral process and its complicities with exploitation. We sit and stand and move and speak, as we can, as the popular will, the one that electoral democracy has forgotten and abandoned. But we are here, and remain here, enacting the phrase, ‘we the people’.

*(Butler 2011)*

### 3.2.1 Public space as occupation

Solon passed a law that when there was discord in the city, there would not make weapons nor with some nor with others, was subject to atimia and ceased to be a citizen. Pericles, meanwhile, affirmed:

"We are the unique, in fact, we believe that someone who does not take part of these things, is no longer a quiet but useless."

Fernando Quesada, *City and Citizenship. Hiking contemporary political philosophy*

The historical and symbolic state of the ‘revolutionary squares,’ gave to contemporary occupations the motifs to reclaim them as their own and to add new layers of history and symbolism. These occupations were processes that transformed temporally the conception and state of public space in different ways. For instance, on 1st February 2011, Tahrir Square hosted approximately 250,000 protesters in an area of 32,000 sq.m, a density of 7.81 hab/sq.m. In Zuccotti Park, the number of protestors changed along the two-month-occupation, which was a more extended and arhythmic

---

transformation. While in Gezi/Taksim, when security forces left the area for four days, occupiers created multiple zones in a *carnivalesque* atmosphere and a very intense way. Judith Butler refers these new but temporal public spaces like the production of the public:

> It is equally true that the collective actions collect the space itself, gather the pavement, and animate and organize the architecture. As much as we must insist on there being material conditions for public assembly and public speech, we have also to ask how it is that assembly and speech reconfigure the materiality of public space, and produce, or reproduce, the public character of that material environment.

*(Butler 2011)*

Situated at this point, the definition of public space involves a considerable literature. For many urban planners, architects and designers, public space is the void between buildings that have to be filled, in a good manner, under local governments and private developers’ visions *(Delgado 2011).*

For urban planners, public space has historically been described as open spaces: streets, parks, plazas, recreation areas, and other publicly owned and managed outdoors spaces, as opposed to the private domain of housing and work. Erving Goffman refers to this space as areas in which everybody has legal access: “I refer to the streets, parks, and places of public gatherings. I refer as well to public buildings or ‘public zones’ in private buildings. Public space has to be differentiated from private space, in which the access can be object of legal restriction” *(Lofland 1985 [1973]).*

These different approaches to public spaces in cities, question its current situation, blurring its state of public. In the contemporary scope, Manuel Delgado adds the ideological character of consumerism and a superficial political participation *(Delgado 2011).* He insists that in the capitalist reappropriation of the city, there is a conversion of urban space into theme parks, gentrification neighbourhoods, transformation of industrial districts, increment of suburbs, and so on.

But public space as a term relatively new. During the 60s, 70s, and 80s, urban thinkers referred to it as the value of streets, providing a sense of social space or common space. Delgado brings to the discussion, texts like “Death and Life of Great American Cities” by Jane Jacobs in which the notion of public space appears only once *(Jacobs 1993 [1961]);* Kevin Lynch’s “The Good City Form” *(Lynch 1981)* where public space is in the analytical index; Henri Lefebvre does not use this term at all; and in William Whyte’s “City” *(Whyte 1989)*, this term appears in four pages. Instead, most of them use “urban space” to indicate areas where people gather. Nevertheless, during the last decades, public space attached characteristics and conditions that in a sense, brings back to the scene, the Greek *agora*. *Agora*, in ancient Greek cities, means ‘gathering place’ or ‘assembly’, a place where freeborn citizens gather for military duty, to hear the ruling council, or to discuss about politics. Later, it served as a marketplace, merging political and commercial senses, although, Habermas induces this

---

space as a privilege of few. In the polis, citizens’ rights were highly restricted to a very narrow social group [the recognized as free citizens] excluding women, farmers, and basically, the throng of common people. The publicness of the agora stratified the situation of social inequalities in the polis.

Within the urban scope, the link between public space and civic culture, allowed democracy and citizenship practice. Walter Benjamin, Georg Simmel, Lewis Mumford, Henri Lefebvre, Jane Jacobs, Richard Sennett, Manuel Delgado, Manuel Castells, Jordi Borja, encourage the space for the commons as a true practice of citizenship in the public space. However, the condition of public space for the public is increasingly restricted. For instance, in London a journalist was making a report about public spaces in the outdoor space of the City Council building, when a private security guard stopped him and his cameraman for not having an official permit to record (the City Council plaza is a POPS). On 14th May 2015, the author of this thesis made a spatial test in the same area. She played with a kite in the City Council Square while her collaborator, Joao Rivo, was recording the action on the other side of the River Thames. After 15 minutes, Joao crossed Tower Bridge and recorded her in the same square. 40 seconds later, two private security guards approached to them and required to stop recording and obligated them to delete the video, otherwise they would have been detained. This action did not involve any political sense, it was not collective, but still it was dissolved immediately.

That same year in London, there was a social movement that spread through social media, images of public spaces filled with metal spikes to stop homeless people to sleep there. These metal spikes block anyone to sit, lay down or step. “It’s not just the homeless” says Selena Savic, editor of Unpleasant Design, “those impacted are usually homeless people, teenagers, the poor, those who are marginalised or don’t have good social representation, or who aren’t organised as an interest groups” (Omidi 2014) (Img. 8). As a ‘defensive architecture,’ Maryam Omidi indicates that it employs strategies to deter the behaviour that is not acceptable or proper conduct.

Similar to Habermas’ French cafes as public spaces exercised by the French bourgeoisie, they were only for those who could afford being there, similar to the Greek agora, or current public spaces that are commercialized. It seems that the state of citizen and public space is shaped by their social condition of affordance. This right to the city is classist, differing from its condition to serve to the public that contrast to Douglas and Friedman’s claims of “city for citizens” (Douglass and Friedmann 1998):

- The right to voice, where citizens can claim presence in urban space

---

• The right to difference, where citizens can participate in the development process of the use, function and meaning of space

• The right to human flourishing, where citizens have the ability to live life fully

Thus, if there is an absence of these rights, there is a suggestion of power over citizenship. The occupations showed that public spaces in contemporary cities restricted the citizens’ rights degenerating the condition of public space (Innerarity 2006). The depoliticization and impoverishment of public space is present in contemporary global cities: the defensive architecture, the commercialization of public areas, the privatization of public spaces, indicates the loss of the public character and practice. Such loss of publicness, blurs the notion of mediation in the public space because it does not offer opportunities to produce and discuss social matters in a collective body, it only makes visible the argumentation produced somewhere else.

Setha Low and Neil Smith denominates the current public space as the range of social locations that are:

[T]he street, the park, the media, the Internet the shopping Mall, the United Nations, national governments, and local neighbourhoods. Public space envelopes the palpable tension between place, experienced at all scales in daily life, and the seeming spacelessness of the Internet, popular opinion, and global institutions and economy. It is not a homogeneous arena: The dimensions and extent of its publicness are highly differentiated from instance to instance. (...)

Public space includes very recognizable geographies of daily movement, which may be local, regional, or global, but they also include electronic and institutional ‘spaces’ that are every bit as palpable, if experienced quite differently, in daily life.

(Low and Smith 2006)
In a study done by Stephanie Edgerly et al., they focus on the ability of YouTube to serve as a public space. Doing a research on different samples of videos and comments box, the authors argue that this box was a public space as it has a 'low barrier of entry,' by being connected to the Internet, there was a social interaction that raised several common topics (Edgerly, et al. 2009). Hence, if public space is the place for connecting with others, the virtual space enlarges the public spatial dimension, meaning that citizens have a larger space to act.

One component of an active public space is conflict, not in the sense of danger but as a dynamic, creative and operational relation. The heterogeneous structure of different cultures, languages and uses in public spaces, place interests and expressions that generate two subjects of urban and architectural fields: monumentality and centrality. Monumentality is the capacity to emit symbolism, like a bridge between different places and societies, working as an instrument to coexist, negotiate, interact and fight [as a relation]. Centrality on the other side is multinuclear, where symbolism can be placed simultaneously at several points in order to activate the territory continuously. Thus, public space has traditionally been first and foremost the ‘object’ of conflict over claims to its control and over the rights of occupation. These conflicts are usually about (Burte 2003):

- What uses and activities are acceptable in the public space.
- Who (public) has the greater right of occupation over different public spaces.
- Who should control or make decisions about [and on what basis the fate of public spaces access to them].

The evictions of OWS and Gezi/Taksim made visible a series of contradictions: public space is something that could not be used universally, by all within the commons state even if the political occupation of a public space is the citizens’ right. It revealed that public space is a contested space, involving a conditional possession of personal wealth. During the occupations, people used, changed and defended what they felt as their space. Through the virtual communication gave endless possibilities for people to connect and have a deeper impact on the physical public space. New ways of producing public spaces appeared such as DIY and DIWO (do-it-yourself and do-it-with-others), small spaces were implemented in cities and became catalysts for bigger impacts at larger scales and distances. Tensions between politics and public space were striated by self-organization, where citizens’ rights practices, social interactions and spatial production merged on the same plane. Public space seduces many people because it is not possible to give one only definition, it is always changing and transforming, causing contradictions and conflicts, and when someone tries to control it, it changes again its form, meaning and state. Its quality is sensed with the intensity of its use when empowers the maximum heterogeneity and has a capacity to stimulate social relations and different dynamics.
3.2.2 The multitude in the occupation

In their seminal work “Architectural Body,” Gins and Arakawa propose an architecture that “ought to be designed for actions, it invites” (Gins and Arakawa 2002). Their approach towards architecture, aims a relational concept of bodies: an architectural body, a body as an organism-person-environment.

What they regard as organism is a biomass that enables a process ‘to person,’ personing as the form of compact, subjective ‘nexus’ out of actions relative to the build environment in which they take place. The potential of a personing organism depends on how to position its body while ‘surroundings’ invite, provoke, and entice persons to perform actions; the enacting motions of these actions not only serve upon alternate vantage points but inevitably shift sense organs about. (Gins and Arakawa 2002)

There is a shift from the psychological model towards the movement that intercepts perceptions and “the air passage through which the body draws in atmospheric wherewithal” (Ibid). It is an organism-body-environment. The personing and the occupations are directly related when they occupy a space in the city in a radical and temporal manner. In the case of bodies within occupations, they re-territorialize complex compositions of the public in cities; the discursive formations of their bodies transform the public because they are personing by the surroundings. The intrinsic relation of body and architecture in the case of occupations explores a necessity to interact emphasizing trajectories of self and body in order to understand the space. Gins and Arakawa manage the construction of the concept “landing site,” a state that can be identified during the reinvention of the public space. It refers to a body related to other bodies allowing the movement and deterritorialization of spaces. It understands relational processes of bodies and focus on what they are capable of producing within the occupied space, where the body interacts with the perceived object. The notion of ‘site’ and the development of ‘being sited’ produce the organism-person-environment relationship, sites and ‘would-be-sites’ as organisms formed by many sites that cause a deterritorialization, allowing an opening towards the affective space through the “landing site.”

Personing, landing site, being-sited, organism-person-environment, are concepts that configure the notion of the multitude in occupations. First, the body regards the affective force that hides in the material ground through its movement, producing new spatialities. In the construction of the occupation, “all point or areas of focus (...), all designated areas of specified activity, count as perceptual landing sites (visual, aural, tactile, olfactory, proprioceptively, kinaesthetic somaesthetic [pain])” (Gins and Arakawa 2002). Thus, the body in the occupation notices and moves in relation to
other bodies and landing sites: the body moves between motion and rest, always in relation to spatial assemblages and other bodies. In this regard, Bergson relates movement and space as:

 [...] inextricably tied into his concept of duration as the major difference between entities or composites. Duration in relation to the shifting formations of space and place becomes the necessary compartment that moves with the re-territorializing forces of a body’s action.

(Brunner 2009)

For Bergson, differences are based on duration, not on degree, the force that shifts the space is the force of collective bodies. It obtains a radical form when is materialized in the landing site of the occupation. This spatial condition could be seen in Gezi/Taksim on 1st June 2013, when hundreds of people crossed the Bosporus Bridge in an attempt to reach Taksim: here, the mass was walking across a bridge. When it tried to arrive to Taksim, there were clashes with the police, being this the moment of shift from mass to collective body: there were individual reactions within a collective force in an area that was being deterritorialize, the collective body started a series of complex multi-micro actions on their intention for being-sited. Finally, the collective body managed to reappropriate Gezi/Taksim and in order to avoid losing it again, it was transformed into a multitude, a body that permitted to reterritorialize Gezi/Taksim as an occupation. The occupation was seen at different moments as a collective carnival where different groups were performing the space in diverse manners and times. It showed tangible modes of shelter, new models of living together, discussing and debating, as the ancient Greek agora, in a virtual and physical assembly; this was the state of the commons. The Gezi/Taksim occupation transformed the protests into an upheaval against the government’s urban plan and with the involvement of marginal political and activist groups such like LGBT, environmentalists, leftists, and such like, performing a series of spatial actions that could not have been done under quotidian circumstances. As per Bakhtin, the “carnival is not a spectacle seen by people, they live in it, and everyone participates because its very idea embraces all the people. (...) As a special condition and as the people’s second life, the carnival can also be exempt of some of the societal rules and restrictions” (Bakhtin 1984). Gezi/Taksim carnival-like included people dancing (Img. 9), streets as fashion festivals, walls with graffiti, tweets with the hashtag #OccupyGezi.

Occupation is the action that remakes the space temporally and radically; it redefines the role of citizens and the public space, emerges new assemblages of bodies that vary the urban geography and alter the architectural urban landscape.

In the case of Tahrir Square, the exchange of information and the generalized use of communication platforms such as social networks and mobile dispositive, allowed the creation of collective multisited-actions. This was a process that connected places and created collectivites around the region, and coordinated the collective body. Few months after, this radical occupation was extended to the
region and around Europe: Madrid, Athens, Lisbon, and Paris hosted occupations in their main squares. They shaped networks of exchanging occupations. In Syntagma Square, Athens, occupiers projected videos on screens showing images from the occupation in Puerta del Sol, Madrid; a spatial action that helped to generate a feeling that occupations were happening around the world and that occupiers were part of a large *commons*. These relations are “communities in movement:” they are developed through common actions in the shared public space (Stavrides 2016). Roundabouts, squares, and parks, generate their own space, the *commons*, with quotidian practices and belonging to a global net of occupations. Each one of these occupations had their own, specific and particular spatial characteristics, features and dynamics, establishing their own inhabiting urban and social regulations, which were filled with multiple-micro actions during occupations.

![Img. 9 Occupier dancing the folkloric dance 'halay'](image)

At one point of the demonstration, a group of people from the Muslim Brotherhood occupied the southeast side of the square, they had to pray so they occupied homogeneously this zone. At the same time, non-Muslims created a human chain to protect them and avoid a possible dissolution of the occupation ([Image 10](image)). Because praying is a ritual practice, it follows certain rules and time, making it easy to identify, and therefore, presenting a weak point in the space. This heterogeneous multiplicity reacted according to a programmed situation that generated multiple singularities that during the occupation creates, innovates, improvises, produces and is produced by the temporal exercise of the *commons*. It is an *in-situ* spatiality that reinvents social and spatial dynamics, using dissidence of objects, spaces and bodies to perform new public spaces.

The dynamics of occupations worked with notions of decentralization - recentralization [determinatorialization - reterritorialization]. In these reappropriated spaces, it was necessary to include the production and use of mediation spaces, common spaces were thresholds zones, borderless spaces whose forms were constantly changing, and they were porous and always in...
movement. Stavros Stavrides indicates that these threshold spaces were not defined nor define who [could] use them (Stavrides 2016); instead, they were dealers between occupiers and the occupied space. They opened a process of spatial identity in which the encounters were dispersed, a situation that permitted people to explore possibilities of new spatialities. Hence, communities in movement were located in occupation spaces, a “landing site” and a “being-sited” condition, emerging the path to the radical spatiality. This was a common space composed by heterogeneous spatialities, where conflict and differences were visible but were integrated at the same time within distinct spatial features.

3.3 Occupation as public space generator

3.3.1 OWS generating the contemporary public Zuccotti Park

In New York, public spaces have been traded as commercial components because of unequal distribution of economic resources, land value, and minimum planning.29 As an alternative response to provide public spaces to the city, in 1961 the local government created the urban

29 Adrian Benepe, Senior Vice President and Director of City Park Development, The Trust for Public Land; Commissioner, New York City Department of Parks & Recreation 2002-2012. On an article for City & State: “New York City must add parks as population booms,” he wrote: “With New York City’s population still growing and Mayor Bill de Blasio poised to add tens of thousands of units of new affordable housing by upzoning many neighbourhoods, there are no active plans to add new parks to accommodate all those new residents. But fortunately, a handful of visionary ideas are already on the drawing boards, waiting for the mayor to give the green light and allocate relatively modest amounts of money to get them built, compared to the massive, $6 billion park-building program of his predecessor, Michael Bloomberg.” 26 July 2016. http://nyslant.com/article/opinion/new-york-city-must-add-new-parks-as-population-booms.html
regulation POPS – Privately Owned Public Space [Chapter 5], in which the City Council gives special benefits to private investors in exchange of providing to the city public spaces. The organization APOPS – Advocates for Privately Owned Public Space, intends to introduce to the population, information about these POPS. They indicate that the City Council traded over 6 million sq.m of zoning concession for 32 hectares of POPS, and this process was not transparent. Indeed, it was OWS who made visible this situation where POPS have their own legislation. Thus, during the occupation, Zuccotti Park was turned into a contested public space. The appropriation of the public sense in a public private space was possible by the actions of the multitude's actions, not by walking through but by inhabiting it. The emergence of new and needed forms of gathering and relationships [as the Mic-Check and pizzas delivered to the occupation zone from supporters on the other side of the world] reinforced the idea that the occupation was both an act of dissidence and collective effort of spatialities.

OWS reclaimed public spaces as a consensus process of the collective. Every decision was made through a process of working groups and general assembly, occupiers worked together to come to decisions. Despite the duration on reaching a consensual point, these were stronger because everyone in the occupation participated in the process. It came up as a collective force in which everyone was involved. People created the general assembly in the east side of the park, an area faced five arc stairs that went up to reach the ground level, giving the spatial shape of an agora. The General Assembly was a gathering of people engaged to make decisions based upon collective agreements or 'consensus,' permitting a direct inclusive participation within occupiers. They addressed topics, debates and petitions to establish a consensus among participants: it was a process of facilitating communication and collaboration among occupiers, an open scheme that shared ideas, information, discussions, debates and decisions. This forum of communication, self-structured and autonomous, was a platform that gave voice to everyone. It converted the General Assembly in a de facto decision of the movement. Each proposal followed the same basic format: sharing the proposal to all, explaining why they made the proposal, and if there was an agreement, there was a discussion on how to carry it out. Within the General Assembly, there were small working/thematic groups that focused on supporting specific initiatives or relevant topics to the movement such as Art & Culture, Media & Communication, Food Zone, Legal Committee, Medical Zone, and more. David Graeber said that the use of the General Assembly was a key reason to OWS to gain momentum in contrast to many other attempts of protest. For speaking in the General Assembly, occupiers use the Mic-Check through a Stack list. Stack list organized and ordered the

30 A POPS. http://apops.mas.org/about/mission/
31 Nicholas Mirzoeff: “public spaces are supposed to be for us, the public. We’re going to constitute that sense of public by staying here,” in Occupy Theory http://nicholasmirzoeff.com/RTL/?p=314
sequence of people speaking with Mic-Check. During the Mic-Check, occupiers created a common language to avoid interruption, like clapping or yelling. When people wanted to show support to the person on the Mic-Check, they twinkled their fingers up, the "I'm ok with it but not really" was twinkling fingers at chest high, the disagreement was placing fingers down with arms at chest high, making a triangle with two hands was saying the person talking was getting off topic, the L sign with a hand as "speak louder", C shape hand was clarifying question, if someone had a point of information they throw up a finger, and crossing arms at chest was block, which meant that a person was so disagreeable to it that she/he had to leave the movement or the working group if that was agreed upon (Img. 11).

Mic-check (...). The process is meant so you can be empowered to go to your own communities, wherever you are, and hold general assemblies to talk about the issues that concern you. We are all in this together. Occupy everything. 34

Another way to form part of the active occupation was through the information desk ‘facilitation.’ The person had to express her/his desire to be an active part of the movement by saying what (s)he wanted to do, if had particular skills, volunteering with any task, and indicating the time of involvement. There were also online activists that shared similar actions in Zuccotti Park, like posting, sharing and coordinating in social media. The online activism previous to the physical occupation, the General Assembly, the working groups, the Mic-Check, the zoning functional areas, the way people interacted in Zuccotti Park demonstrated an autonomous and collective organization, in which the consensus on taking decisions and the way of people participating actively in the online-and-offline occupation produced a series of forms to inhabit the space in a public state, with a structure made by and for all (Img. 12).

It perceived distinct changes from inside dynamics and outside threats. In the first ten days of the occupation, the action was somehow pacific and calm, there were neither major disturbances nor significant problems inside or outside Zuccotti Park. Activists were protesting tranquilly around the area and carrying out two daily general assemblies. 35 Nevertheless during the second week of the occupation, dynamics changed. There were several clashes with the police, some of them were very aggressive, which were recorded and presented first in YouTube and then as evidence in trials. In one of these videos there was an officer punching a protester three times in his head and shoulder, later the protester was put under a soft lock in which he linked his arms with other protesters, sat down on the street and the police pulled him away and punched him several times. 36 Because mass media did not cover these events, occupiers and supporters used social media and live streaming to

34 This Mic-Check segment lasted thirty seconds and had three repetition waves.
35 Zuccotti Park is located in Wall Street, lower Manhattan, New York City. This park belongs to Brookfield Offices Properties, one of the biggest real state companies around the world.
36 (Friedersdorf)
inform and share information 24 hours a day. It was only until the infamous pepper spray incident of 24 September 2011 and the Brooklyn Bride arrests\(^{37}\) that made mass media to cover OWS (Figure 1). In the first case, a video shows around six women protesting on a sidewalk fenced off by the police, there were people watching, walking by, recording, and some police officers. One of them approached to these women and sprayed them in their faces.\(^{38}\) The video went viral immediately. In the second case, when protestors were crossing the Brooklyn Bridge towards Wall Street when around 700 of them were arrested.\(^{39}\) The police indicated that they were blocking vehicular traffic. Mainstreaming and broadcasting produced an important affluence and engagement of people in the city and across the world for the Occupy Movement. Manuel Castells shares this view by saying that “the media constitute the space where power relationships are decided between competing political and social actors” (Castells 2007).

Although, it was the social network the instrument for contemporary occupations to reach the general public, acquiring approval, mobilizing potential participants and producing synergy between anyone involved. The occupation in Zuccotti Park changed the notion of public in public spaces radically. It altered the space from being a host of passive activities such as walking through, sitting and chatting, or playing chess in one of the fixed tables, to be a publicness generator with *multiple micro-cities*, and the personal and inter-personal distance was distorted. While colourful tents set up a design of hyper-mediated stage of occupying, the bodies of occupiers exploited the symbolic potential of textiles, banners, and building materials, objects that usually have an everyday function were transformed into acting tools of dissidence [Chapter 4]. The relations between bodies and objects were indeterminate, mobile, temporary and rapidly deployable, it created new projections of architecture as long-term collective processes. It organized bodies in a spatiality created by the *commons*.

\(^{37}\) On 2 October 2011, OWS protestors and supporters planned a march across the Brooklyn Bridge. At the bridge, a small group of protesters walked on the roadway causing a blockade of traffic, immediately hundreds followed this route; however the police

\(^{38}\) YouTube video https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=moD2jnGTToA

HAND GESTURES GUIDE

AGREE

Description: Hold your hands up, palm open, and fan your fingers back and forth. Meaning: You agree with the proposal or like what you are hearing.

DISAGREE

Description: Hold your hands downward and fan your fingers back and forth. Meaning: You disagree with the proposal or dislike what you are hearing.

NEUTRAL

Description: Hold your hand flat and fan your fingers up and down. Meaning: You are taking a neutral stance on the proposal.

CLARIFICATION

Description: Curl your hand and fingers into a letter-C shape. Meaning: You either have or need clarifying information.

INFORMATION

Description: Raise your index fingers up. Meaning: You have information pertinent to the discussion (not for opinions).

PROCESS

Description: Make a triangular shape with your hands by joining your index fingers and thumbs. Meaning: Telling the group the process by which discussions are held is not being followed.

BLOCK

Description: Cross your arms in front of your chest to form an X. Meaning: You have very strong moral or ethical reservations about the proposal and will consider leaving the group if it passes.
During the 18 days of occupation, Tahrir Square was a contested public space. People gathered in the area to protests against the government and started a revolution that transformed the relationships between the people and the city.

For instance, during the occupation, occupiers transformed the KFC restaurant located in the northeast side of the square across Meret Basha Avenue, into a medical clinic for attending injured people (Img. 13). They also made of a spot in the north side of Tahrir Square a kindergarten because schools were closed. Referring to Jane Jacobs, this spatiality links her view on cities that “have the capability of providing something for everybody, only because, and only when they are created by everybody” (Jacobs 1993 [1961]). Sarah Ichioka, former director of the Architectural Foundation (FA), London, indicates that a good public space is a space that serves to multiple publics providing of infrastructure for them. People from multiple backgrounds can have access, feel comfortable and
free to express themselves within it; it is a space that embodies durability and flexibility.\(^{40}\) Thus, Tahrir Square meant the return of people to the public facing the fact that Cairo’s public spaces were banned from political manifestations due to the “Emergency Law” and became the space for possibilities.

![KFC Clinic, location. Source: BBC news Middle East. Reuters](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-12434787)

But besides this spatial transformation of Tahrir generated by the commons, it received another force of spatial transformation: the government. The government of Egypt initiated a blockade of streets to avoid the gathering of people with the intention to isolate the square. They used barbed wire, concrete walls, Central Security Forces (CSF) cars and trucks to block the access to Tahrir (Img. 14). These concrete walls were 3.70-meter height and placed strategically in the downtown area to restrict the protesters’ movements. In Mohammed Mahmoud street, which leads to the Ministry of Interior building, security forces placed three concrete blocks reinforced with metal straps, one above another.

When military soldiers were setting up the wall, Al-Ahzar University's students intercepted its erection. At that moment, the wall was 1.50-meter height so students stood on its top and some others created a human chain in front of it.\(^{41}\) Shortly, military forces came back armed and removed the students, protestors and residents from the area. They completed the last row of the wall and as students did before, soldiers did a human chain. In other spots of Tahrir, the military blocked streets using cars and trucks. In Qasr El-Aini Street, they blocked the access to the Parliament building with Central Security Forces (CSF) vehicles; the same happened in El-Shaik Rihan and Youssef El-Guindy streets. “The walls are the latest iteration of the gap between the rulers and the ruled,” says Mohammed Elshahed, editor of the Cairoobserver blog, and Mona Abaza adds, “it’s an emergent spatial memorial, this is now the place were so many people died fighting for this revolution, it is the revolution graveyard.”\(^{42}\)

\(^{40}\) Interview with Sarah Ichioka, “Good public space is one that embodies both durability and flexibility.” Public Space. http://www.publicspace.org/en/post/good-public-space-is-one-that-embodies-both-durability-and-flexibility

\(^{41}\) Wael Eskandar, via Facebook, in an interview with the author on 28 June 2014.

\(^{42}\) Mona Abaza, professor of sociology in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology, and Egyptology at The American University in Cairo.
Before the occupation, to reach Tahrir from the elite Garden City neighbourhood (where U.S. and British embassies are located) it was a five-minute walk along Qasr al-Aini Street. After the walling of Tahrir, this route was blocked, and to reach the same point, it took more than 40 minutes. In addition, there were also checkpoints, barber-wire roadblocks, armoured security trucks and burned-out cars. The barricading and walling were buffer zones where barriers, barricades, tanks, walls, wires, army controlled zones, soldiers, protestors, government buildings, and streets composed a phenomenon that altered the image of Tahrir. It was turned into an archipelago of militarized architecture where every element was part of a battlefield.

In this regard, the architect and urban planner Omar Nagati, explains that "walls are indicative of the post-revolutionary renegotiation of the rules of the game between people and authorities. People [were] setting the terms and authorities [were] just responding by building walls." While occupiers created the commons in Tahrir Square, the government was fragmenting the society, and this physical reorganization came with an inevitable impact in the psychology of those who lived on the other side. Walling-in the city is seen by Rem Koolhaas as a model for a concept of architecture because it is a material structure where one comes "eye to eye with the architecture's true nature" (Koolhaas 1995). Tahrir walls drew boundaries where the mise-en-scene of a borderline made a qualitative spatial urban difference. However, as soon as these walls emerged in Tahrir, they were covered with graffiti. People started to see this art form and mean of expression as a communication tool to share messages of unity.

These walls remained in Tahrir for three years, from 2011 to 2014, but in the second year, a group of artists and activists launched the project "No Walls" to transform seven walls into open spaces. In the giant concrete walls that blocked the access to Tahrir behind the American University, artists painted a very detailed graffiti that 'extended' the street (Img. 15) and established an urban resistance. This spatial practice resisted when people felt comfortable to place new ways of movement inside this new territory, finding other quotidian activities and searching new urban actions beyond the essential ones. By using different tactics, people presented their current hostile realm and their struggle in re-appropriating and creating their public space. The proliferation of street art presented a contested space in an intent to reclaim the right of the city. The new spatiality stood in both resistance and communal existence with radical and quotidian actions that became quotidian.

43 Omar Nagati, architect, urban planner and university lecturer. He is co-founder of urban research studio “Cluster” in Cairo.
Img. 14 Location and spatial affection of walls built up during the 18-day occupation in Tahrir

Img. 15 Graffiti on a wall blocking the entrance to Tahrir Square
3.4 Discussion. Transmutation of the architectural urban landscape

In general terms, the architectural design of public spaces distinguishes dynamic and static processes. The first one is characterized by the flows of people within it, their interactions, and the infrastructures that give kinetic energy in the urban context. Meanwhile, the static process is defined by the permanence of built assemblages, stable forms and shapes that provide reference systems and structures (Olsson & Haas, 2013). However, this situation is altered during the production of occupations because they create a series of conditions that confront the established design and conventional means of communication between the built environment and people.

This transformation of roles means changing conditions of the social scope within the public urban realm, where the urban complexity problematizes the notion of public and begins to redefine its system and language. Public spaces are expected to be used in certain manners, in ‘good manners’ [peacefully and pleasantly]. But when this order is interrupted, the public space enters in a state of exclusion and veto. The ‘expected use’ of public spaces preconceives general assumptions in the population, which are not analysed or reflected but assumed as normal and habitual. Indeed, these spaces are programmed for relaxation rather than for insubordination, like theorists of architectural urban design suggest that public spaces’ design follows experts and elected representative’s interests (Allmendinger 2002). Therefore, the occupations challenged and transformed heterogeneity in those spaces, projecting designations and producing criticism of established public spaces while the new publicness was a result of occupations (Lahiji 2014). In this sense, the urban occupation as a corporal assembly of the commons, created a series of situations and conditions that caused a reconstitution of the architecture of public spaces. Since the fragmentation of the city, it was an opportunity for bodies to form the commons, the architectural urban landscape was redefined by radical relations between bodies and objects, being the elements that constituted the transmutation of the space itself.

For this purpose, transmutation is referred to the alchemical, physical and chemical relation to convert one chemical element into another. This phenomenon appears in spontaneous nature’s form, when certain chemical and isotopic elements have unstable cores; the reaction is limited to change the form in which these elements are organized. Being alchemy a scientific process by which a structure has an object, it is possible to analyse and study from the understanding of the composition of the object, the matter and its steps to react. Then, the decomposition of the matter and its elementary particles reach even the subatomic level, and their reconstruction forms the transmutation. The reorganization of elementary particles previously decomposed constitutes the creation of a new body. This statement is the "Law of Equivalent Exchange" (Priesner and Figala 2001), where elements are the only primordial matter with different pairs of essential qualities that can vary but are essential for the transformation of the elements, causing the transmutation.
Besides, the mutability of qualities is applied to those essential qualities that are not inherent to the elements, relying on the equivalent exchange law of alchemy: in order to obtain something, it is necessary to give something of the same value (not necessarily in terms of matter but also in energy).

In Gezi/Taksim, the space started as a process of transformation in its shape, borders, conception, and location [from local to global and vice versa] (Img. 16). Here, matter and energy transmuted the space into something new, affecting the structure and organization of architectural urban elements and the movement of bodies and objects. Eventually, the commons associated and unfold a creative autonomous power, and by extending its limits, the resonance of the space took physical matter. But more than materializing the commons in the physical space, the continuous feed of energy built different and multiple micro-actions. The self-governance and self-management were active methods of TAZ, overlapping in time and space established urban dynamics with new spatialities and social relationships. These public spaces were transmuted by the energy of the multitude, allowing the exploration of spatial materialization of the body and the new state of the contemporary public space.

The intermittency was extended in time. One month after the occupation of Gezi/Taksim, on 9th July 2013, people gathered around the “Table on Earth” (Img. 17) for the first day of the Ramadan. Through social networks, people met and occupied the light-railroad crossing on Istikal Avenue to Taksim Square. This street is usually crowded with people walking through and shopping, but in this occasion, people converted it into a dinner table, where hundreds of people shared their food with others. Only few weeks before, the street was the scenario of clashes between the police and protestors. So, these different events converted the area in a performative spatial occupation, which provides empirical evidence about the power of people and public space in a bottom-up dynamic. The temporality and collective action, the energy and the multitude are elements capable of transmuting a space.

These spaces are characterized by nonexcludability and nonrivalry. It means that the use of public space could be any space in the architectural urban landscape as it was determined by public spatial practices. Contemporary public spaces were transmuted and reinvented in an ongoing temporal multiple process, while the experience of things recall the everyday, return the significance of the everyday and revalidate through the things that people make. Through strategies that sought to transgress conventional boundaries of architectural urban landscape, ideas and actions were generated from the intersections of culture-space’s particular conditions. There was a necessity of being responsive conditions that provided ultimately an architecture that was felt as much as it was understood, as immediate and tactile, legible and contributing to the commons.
Img. 16 Taksim / Gezi May - June 2013

Img. 17 Table on Earth, Istanbul, June 2013
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4.1 Dissident spatiality

History might have been very different if Karl Marx had been able to send emails.
Online activist, 1999

Dissidence as an aspect of creative practice depends on at least two qualities. Unpredictability and mobility, that are beyond architecture’s usual abilities.
Thomas de Monchaux, Toward a dissident architecture, 2012

Dissident
n. A person who opposes official policy, especially that of an authoritarian state
adj. In opposition to official policy.
O. Mid 16th century (in the sense ‘differing in opinion of character’): from Latin dissident – ‘sitting apart, disagreeing’, from dis- ‘apart’ + sedere ‘sit’.
(Oxford 2010)

Jacques Rancière indicates that politics is a dissident act: “the principle of political interlocution is thus disagreement” (Rancière, Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics 2010). In dissensus he says that:

[Dissensus] is not a designation of conflict as such, but is a specific type thereof, a conflict between sense and sense. Dissensus is a conflict between a sensory presentation and a way of making sense of it, or between several sensory regimes and/or ‘bodies’. This is the way in which dissensus can be said to reside at the hearth of politics, since at bottom the latter itself consists in an activity that redraws the frame within which common objects are determined (...). A radical intervention in human affairs by which the entire aesthetic field is reorganised, and we see things we have not seen before.
(Rancière 2010)

Dissensus does not present only a model of opposition, but it also means to open up a territory for different identities, so they could coexist during moments of conflict in a nonviolent mode (Hirsch and Miessen 2012). In this sense, Ines Weizman in her book Architecture and the Paradox of Dissidence, relates dissidence to the architectural imagination as a ‘discontent’ transformed into political actions such as revolts (I. Weizman, 2014). In addition, Michel Feher, ensuing Michel Foucault, explains that what dissent pursues is the mobilization of civic passion in a struggle for a radical reorganisation to force relations. ¹ When there is a heterogenic series of actions against the

¹ Michel Feher is a French philosopher and cultural theorist. He is also founding editor and publisher of Zone Books.
hegemonic forms of domination, dissident uses different tactics as activist practices. Hence, dissidence does not present a material sense, it 'haunts' space. Spatial practices, movements and gestures are camouflaged in architecture, changing its meaning and becoming more a self and autonomous action.

Over time, the scope of architectural dissent has been demonstrated by a refusal to participate in projects deemed unjust, by subversion of the norms and language of dominant/dominating architecture, or by a retreat into the private domain of paper architecture of hidden pedagogy. As such, the challenge of dissident practice lies between political compliance, acts of resistance and architecture's limiting concepts.

(I. Weizman 2012)

This dissident mechanism composes a body full of potential, disposition and forces that affect spatial configurations [¿What happens when form is no longer the stable outline of mass but the key dynamic condition within a field of bodies?]. During contemporary occupations, everyday objects are transformed into objects for protest and they also present opportunities to create new ones such as the ‘inflatable cobblestone’ or the emergency blanket. Dissident objects range between the physical and the speculative, melting time and turning themselves as mobilised tools, exploring and challenging the built environment, and generating spatial practices as temporal everyday habits (Gottdiener 1993).

Spatial practices act within the notions of space, which referring to Henri Lefebvre, space is not a natural property or dimension [like place], but is socially produced [modified, dominated, appropriated, etc.] by human activity (H. Lefebvre 1991 [1974]). The production of space involves representation by identifying the physical, mental and social space and it is not depicted as a geographical physical location [Cartesian], or as a commodity. Instead, it is a political instrument part of relations of production and property ownership, acting as a mediator platform for creative and aesthetic actions. Lefebvre makes a threefold distinction to explain the relations between dissent and space:

- *The perceived space* [spatial practice] relates to the social [re] production of space in daily life. Physical practices, everyday routines, networks, pathways and corridors, include individual rhythm and collective patterns of movement. These sequences, habits and patterns of movement in-and-through physical places are motivated by the diversity of place. Spatio-temporal patterns can be observed through Lefebvre's illustrations of *routes*

---

3 *Inflatable cobblestone* is an object created by Eclectic Electric Collective and Enmedio collective. It was used during the General Strike in Barcelona 2012.
(H. Lefebvre 1991 [1974]), where the body reveals acts of sensory perceptions in relation to physical presence in the human environment (Carp 2008). The perceived space denotes to the movement of bodies like traceable patterns that are tangible, textured, visible, sensorial, and simultaneously demand to allocate physical materiality by moving around, within, through, under, above ['people know best the places they frequent the most']. These conceptual models abstract out the embodied and sensory experiences of spatial practices that go beyond the designation of urban planners, architects, developers, and specialists (H. Lefebvre 1991 [1974]). The different conceptions of spatial practice-perceived spaces are linked to knowledge and experience of space and society, which leads to the conceived space.

- **The conceived space** [representations of space] concerns the [dominant] representations of space as a map related to the production of meaning. The Cartesian distinction between *res cogitans* [the thinking being] and *res extensa* [the physical world] in which space is conceived in geometric terms, is an extension rather than an element of thought. Thus, it could be reduced to a set of coordinates, lines and planes, and be capable of quantitative measurement (Butler n.d.). These forms of abstract knowledge are generated by formal and institutional entities that rely on the organization of the space. The conceptualization of tools, models, systems, methods, strategies, and images are part of the materialization of representation in the physical space, even if spaces could be perceived. This space refers to activities of thinking, imagining, reflecting, planning, developing, illustrating, shaping and re-shaping in both individual and collective activities. Although planning and design usually rely on official apparatus of representation of space, there is a bigger approach to the built environment. Ideas and concepts related to physical expression involve representations of space in different ways such as transportation models, private and public development, design guidelines, land use regulation, urban legislation and so forth (Carp 2008). These processes dowsse the third aspect when the conceived space is built or destroyed, used or avoid, entangling the **lived space**.

- **The lived space** [representational space] exists as the product of interaction of the first two categories, closely associated with the social and bodily functions of lived experience in both physical and mental space. For Lefebvre, the experience of everyday life is mediated and structured by the multifarious ways in which space is produced by the human agency, helping to shape social, economic, legal and political relations (Butler n.d.). This space forms part of the social imaginary of inhabitants and users of space, whose symbols are linked to non-hegemonic forms of creative practice and social resistance (H. Lefebvre 1991 [1974]). Representational spaces have a deep sense of meaning, while the mental space

---

6 Chris Butler, “Critical Legal Studies and the Politics of Space.” Griffith University, Australia
7 Ibid 15
refers to in-the-moment awareness of being alive or fully present. It includes collective and
private-public places, and experiences. The lived space is recognizable as a lived
experience that links significance and communication such as verbal, visual, symbolism,
photography, sculpture, music, architecture, gestures, metaphors, gasps, or the
straightening of one’s back. The fluid nature of this space evokes multiple lived
experiences that are not easy to identify because of their subjectivity from the observer’s
point of view.

As social space, the places that evoke lived experience are perceptible and practiced (spatial
practice); conceived as an idea and built accordingly (representation of space); and they
transcend mere use and mere thought to include these moments of immediate experience
(representational space). At the same time, because this aspect of the conceptual triad is defined
by lived experience, it is not necessarily attached to particular places and their physical features
but can happen in moment when ‘everything comes together.’

(Carp 2008)

This triad is what Lefebvre describes as the “third space.” It is the lived moment, personal,
experienced collectively, and powerful and unique social experience. It is in this space that dissent
makes its engagement, establishing space on its own terms [dissident space], coming along with
spontaneity and multitude. In addition, David Harvey examines the role of space in social
arrangements that produce conflict between different social groups, presenting a spatial dimension
through forces that seek to define and control the use of the space (Harvey 2012). He discusses the
nature of the commons as “an unstable and maleable social relation between a particular self-
deferred social group and those aspects of its actually existing or yet-to-be-created social and/or
physical environment deemed crucial to its life and livelihood” (Harvey 2012). Common space could
be considered as a relation between a social group and its effort to define a world that is shared,
creating a possible stable space kept out from ‘outsiders’ [such as favelas or slums]. It could be
porous in the process of making and dynamic when distributing modes of being occupied (Rancière
2006). The common space may be shaped through practices of an emerging and not necessarily
homogeneous community that tries to exchange any kind of relation, information, practice, and
experience with other communities.

Dissident spatiality invents new ways to relate Lefebvre’s third space, the common space, invisible
objects or bodies, collective, multitudes, micro-actions, edifications, urban elements, and spatial
practices within a not defined a-rhythmic temporality, intermittent and with a capacity to
resonate. Dissident spatiality is not spontaneous, it is prepared but not planned, it organizes but

---

8 Representations – usually images – of representational spaces are often used in advertising and entertainment in
different formats (screens, building façades…) because of the immediate response from the public.
9 Relating to occupations researched in this work such as OWS, Tahrir Square, and Gezi/Taksim.
does not systematizes, it could be activated but also deactivated. It causes conflicts and new forms of relationships between space [physical, digital and legal], and reinvents the organization of urban elements and their materialism and meaning, towards the radical spatiality.

4.1.1 Dissidence in occupations. Gezi/Taksim and the Umbrella Movement

In Istanbul, the 2013 occupation initiated as protests against a master plan that included three main areas of development: the creation of a concrete platform for pedestrians in the site of Taksim Square; the Military Barracks\(^\text{10}\) reconstruction from the ones demolished in 1940, this time as a shopping mall that included a cultural centre, opera house, mosque, cinema and museum; and the construction of luxury flats (Img. 1, Img. 2). \(^\text{11}\) Some activists related this urban plan as significant as commercializing Central Park in New York or Hyde Park in London: "That means to convert the area into a place where people can consume, give a walk and hang out; not a place for meetings and assemblies, to avoid a space for potential strikes and demonstrations."\(^\text{12}\)

During the 2013 protests, protestors received the support from the Besiktas football club fans, who had previous experiences in urban battle against the police. \(^\text{13}\) After three days of clashes, the police left the area and protestors and supporters were able to gather in the square. They blocked off nearly all the roads that led to Taksim Square with barricades and converted the area into a temporary police-free zone.\(^\text{14}\) This momentum was named by protestors as *La République de Taksim*,\(^\text{15}\) a Temporary Autonomous Zone [henceforth T.A.Z.]. Social fractions assembled together for the first time forming a new social structure in a symbolic space, which was transformed as the space of the commons (Göle 2013). In fact, the park provided a stage for interaction and performativity, creating its own language, repertoire of actions and opportunities for gathering, congregating, debating, supporting, and reassembling. Occupiers began to modify the space using objects that used to serve specific tasks, suited them into T.A.Z. The Img. 3 presents an urban landscape with daily-life objects that emerged as means of disruption. Telephone cabs flattered as part of a system of barricades; a bus that was taken by protestors at the beginning of clashes was used as barriers to avoid the entrance of trucks, and some days later, it served as an info desk; a

\(^{10}\) The artillery barracks called ‘Halil Pasa Topçu Kislali’ or ‘Taksim Kişlasi’ were built in the late 18\(^{\text{th}}\) century and destroyed in 1940. Since 1943, Gezi Park extends to the location of the barracks and the Armenian cemetery Pangalti which has been there since the sixteenth century.

\(^{11}\) Annex 2. Plan Taksim Square by Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, 2011 (In Turkish). The Project was made public in September 2011 (Radikal 2011). For a critical analysis of this project, see Pérouse (laviedesidees.fr, 24 September 2013).


temporary mosque was built in the park with two tents; a movable food supplier was made up with blue fabrics; and an open hospital was created with plastic straps. All kinds of structures popped up: bunk beds for sleeping, makeshift barricades constructed out of benches, tents, shelters made of fabric cut-outs, steel, wood, or plastic. These dissident structures were documented and archived into a digital graphic platform (Img. 4) developed by Herkes Icin Mimarlik [Architecture for All], a non-profit organization based in Istanbul. “Each unique structure that we encounter in the streets and Gezi Park has its own in-situ design and implementation process. Documentation of these temporary structures is of huge importance for further examination, considering their limited life-cycle.” These objects added a factor to kinship between being artistic and being political discontent, not by themselves but in communication with other objects. They sabotaged conventional practices and became part of an in-situ design, highlighting new architectural practices generated by anybody and everybody, and transforming consequently the role of a daily-life object in the city.

16 Dezeen Magazine. #OccupyGezi Architecture by Herkes Icin Mimarlik
Img. 4 Ad-hoc dissident architecture. Gezi /Taksim
However, during the development of this research, there was an occupation which processes were particular significant to this thesis, it brought new modalities of spatial practices that provided opportunities to explore wider the architecture of occupation: the "Umbrella Movement." It was an occupation that took place in Hong Kong for 79 days, between 26th September and 15th December 2014, and it was considered for this research because it compliments aspects of collective participation, dissident space, the space of the commons, and the public and private interface. The Umbrella Movement was created spontaneously as pro-democracy protests against Beijing’s plans for Hong Kong’s 2017 elections. The movement claimed a true universal suffrage and received general support from local citizens and people around the world through social media (Chan, 2014, p. 571-580). Because most of the spaces to gather in this city are private, the epicentre of the occupation was the HSBC building lobby, a private public space (a space open to the public but of private property).

During the development of the protests, thousands of people tried to gather close to this area, but as the city lacked of public spaces, protestors occupied the only spaces they could: highways, bridges, and sidewalks. This situation highlighted how much the private sector owned the city, which made people aware of the importance of public spaces and as a collective response, they turned themselves into occupiers by remaining in these infrastructures. They started to use daily-life objects in dissident modes, creating safety zones and villages with cardboards and textiles, and umbrellas were deployed as temporary roofs. The Img. 5 presents a rapidly constructed barrack in
a metro station exit, made with umbrellas, ladders, plastic and metal fences, maybe taken away from the police. In addition, protesters took photos, recorded videos and posted them on Facebook and Twitter, capturing a real-time-in-process in both public spaces, the virtual and the physical. They created first safety zones and villages, and umbrellas were deployed as temporary roofs. But there was a specific object that became indispensable and symbol of this occupation: the umbrella. The umbrella turned to be a powerful image of protection and resistance, as the artist Kacey Wong said: “it’s a soft thing but it’s also very hard in terms of our determination to win this battle”. Soon, people brought umbrellas in bulk and started using them for sheltering, barricading, writing slogans, being part of sculptures, and so on; causing an “enormous feeling of brotherhood.”

Installations, operations and messages started colonizing the city’s infrastructure. It was also part of a system to defend protestors from tear gas, as the associate professor of Sociology at Johns Hopkins University Ho-Fung Hung identified.

Hong Kong, umbrellas are daily items, especially during summers when temperatures rise above 30°C and it rains most of the days. It happened to be unusually hot and sunny during the middays of September 2014, therefore there were umbrellas floating around the city. Throughout clashes with the police, a photographer shot a picture of a man walking through a cloud of tear gas that was holding an umbrella (Img. 6); it became viral and was soon recognized as The Umbrella Man, as iconic as the Tank Man. Some days later, a statue of this Umbrella Man emerged in front of the HSBC Plaza, a roughly 3.5 meter-height statute made of wood blocks, holding a bright yellow umbrella with a right arm outstretched (Img. 7).

Quickly, people transformed them into tools of protection, and the “police started seeing an ocean of umbrellas on the front line instead of protestors (...); it is an artefact that is just effective in defending” (Img. 8). Cinemas, first aid spots, study corner, press stands, messages on banners and walls, tweets, YouTube videos, interactive workshops were some of the spaces created by occupiers in the city’s infrastructure. In the eight-lane expressway, people set up tents and fabric structures, resulting in an in-aesthetic urbanism where the processual assemblages were essential (Img. 9).

---

18 Ibid 39
21 Tank Man: a man that stood up in front of a column of tanks in Tiananmen Square protest on June 1989, the morning after the Chinese military had suppressed the protests by force. As the lead tank maneuverer to pass by the man, he repeatedly shifted his position in order to obstruct the tank’s attempted path around him. The incident was filmed and seen worldwide. Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tank_Man
The occupation had the capacity to generate emergent urban modes constructed with ephemeral materials and within an intense social environment. The multiplication of these series of artefacts conformed a resilient urbanism, where the hasty architectural decisions built symbolic urban artefacts, as Adam Bobbette refers, they were "counter-cities within the city." Footbridges, highways, sidewalks, roads, barricades, stages, tents, recycling, trash pick-up, supply deports, delivery networks, phone-charging stations, medical zones, religious spots, educational areas, social programming; they all moulded the hyper-commons. These T.A.Z., provided platforms to create socio-spatial relations emphasizing a reimagined proximity, coexistence, and interactions. They shaped new boundaries that blurred the existing ones, surpassing them in an abstract concept as active resistances to urban regulations.

Erving Goffman describes that daily life objects in quotidian situations are expected to have an acceptable dramatic role related to a specific social scenario (Goffman 1971) (Delgado 2011), which is conceived as mundane. Without porting sociability, the umbrella applies a certain promiscuity that deforms the structured organization of the space instantly, due to the re-appropriation of a multitude that generates identity and symbolism. Pierre Bourdieu indicates that

24 Adam Bobbette, Assistant Professor in the Department of Architecture, University of Hong Kong.
the anonymous is not completely anonymous and still powerless when exiting by itself, while in a collective body and temporality, anonymous is generated and generates relations of urban power. Hence, these objects are recognizable in the city when they are placed in dissident spatialities. People reinvent them in a process that reaches a high temporization through a maximum appropriation of their spatial conditions. The occupations generate architectural practices in which materiality is not disconnected from symbolism, it keeps its physical components while bodies are rearranged in a dissenter mode. Therefore, they alter the boundaries of what is in or out, central or peripheral, visible or invisible, sensible or perceptible, within a certain frame of time and space. Seen as collective praxis processes, they constitute an antagonist element within real subsumption of disobedience, an antagonist collectivity composed by the plurality of individuals, internally and externally (Negri, 2003). It is a distribution of the sensible when the materialities of bodies, of “sensible-intelligible experiences” are in tension with the built environment.

During the occupation, dissident bodies do not reconfigure the given state of things; instead, they reinvent themselves and create new states in a partitioned time, perceptible by all. They transmute a series of spaces that are replicated in time and space, bound up spatial practices, and form dissident spaces in the architecture of occupation.

4.2 Temporality and resonance generating the architecture of occupation

Archigram’s Instant City establishes a model to project through a series of investigations of mobile facilities. The project forms metropolitan dynamics by using a cataclysm as the first stage to ‘hook-u,’ a network of information, education and entertainment, like a ‘play-and-know-yourself’ facility. There is a combination of artefacts and systems that remains as separated and distant experiments; therefore, it takes a complementary form rather than an absolute one.

The Instant City could be made as a practical reality since at every stage it is based upon existing techniques and their application to real situations. There is a combination of several different artefacts and systems which have hitherto remained as separate machines, enclosures or experiments.

(Archigram 2009 [1972])

The Instant City is collective and coercive without a specific set of components; it uses notions of the environment and generates assemblages with infinitive variables. It is based upon existing techniques that combine states that are not usually linked, techniques that enclosure experiments and gather information about an itinerary of communities [discos, universities, local radio, etc.]. It transforms the ‘city’ in a complementary live system (Archigram 2009 [1972]).
A typical sequence of operations  
(truck-borne version)
1. The components of the ‘City’ are loaded on to the trucks and trailers at base.
2. A series of ‘tent’ units are floated from balloons which are towed to the destination by aircraft.
3. Prior to the visit of the ‘City’ a team of surveyors, electricians, etc. have converted a disused building in the chosen community into a collection, information and relay station. Landline links have been made to local schools and to one or more major (permanent) cities.
4. The ‘City’ arrives. It is assembled according to site and local characteristics. Not all components will necessarily be used. It may infiltrate into local buildings and streets, it may fragment.
5. Events, displays and educational programmes are partly supplied by the local community and partly by the ‘City’ agency. In addition major use is made of local fringe elements: fares, festivals, markets, societies, with trailers, stalls, displays and personnel accumulating often on and ad hoc basis. The event of the Instant City might be a bringing together of events that would otherwise occur separately in the district.
6. The overhead tent, inflatable windbreaks and other shelters are erected. Many units of the ‘City’ have their own tailored enclosure.
7. The ‘City’ stays for a limited period.
8. It then moves on to the next location.
9. After a number of places have been visited the local relay stations are linked together by landline. Community (1) is now feeding part of the programme to be enjoyed by Community (20).
10. Eventually by its combination of physical and electronic, perceptual and programmatic events and the establishment of local display centres, a ‘City’ of communication might exist, the metropolis of the national network.
11. Almost certainly, travelling elements would modify over a period of time. It is even likely that after two to three years they would phase out and let the network take over.
(…)
The Instant City as a series of trucks rushing round like ants might be practical and immediate, but we could not escape the loveliness of the idea of Instant City appearing from nowhere, and after the ‘event’ stage, lifting up its skirts and vanishing. In fact, the primary interest was spontaneity, and the remaining aim to knit into any locale as effectively as possible.
(Archigram 2009 [1972])

The relationship between the Instant City and contemporary occupations is presented with notions of temporal exceptional situations in the built environment. The Instant City is mobile and temporal, it adapts to the built environment and combines electronic, perceptual and programmatic
scopes, and communication is one of its main platforms because it exchanges information and experiences that are held in the city’s core, similar to contemporary occupations’ processes.

In both cases [the Instant City and contemporary occupations], temporality is the key aspect for their existence. Temporality is measured “as temporal specificity” (Negri 2003), and the relations of dissident bodies are extended to the materiality of the collective composition, the corporeality, a state in which time goes beyond individual and collective. This collective praxis liberates itself from a structured system and achieves asymmetries in spatial aspects. It endows with spontaneity as a process, not as a plan, through dynamics that are adaptable to a particular state: “this is the temporal territory, the body of the communist community” (Negri 2003). Negri presents the case for a theory of temporality as political, within the spatialization of time; he describes the dimension of temporality as “tessutto ontologico del materialismo” [ontological fabric of materialism] like the power of becoming subjective (Negri 1982). In the occupation, this materialism does not have a specific form, but it accelerates time; thus, the multiple micro-actions developed in contemporary occupations generate the architecture of occupation as a spatiality [space + time].

To this spatial characterization, occupations have a precarious condition (Rancière 2010) because they respond instantly to local and temporal needs. Contemporary occupations challenge established parameters while spatial practices are DIY26 urbanism modes that transport information, techniques, tactics, content, material and symbolism in the contemporary public space. As urban guerrilla practices, occupiers befit agents of maximum efficiency, making more with less in streets. Occupations range from the most pragmatic aspects [logistics, security, food, hygiene, medical care] to the most reflective ones [build-up alternative micro-societies on the mist of a larger one]. This situation echoes the manifesto created during the OWS General Assembly on 15 October 2011, when occupiers created a list of spatial zones, or T.A.Z.:

- Arts and Culture
- Craft-In-Everywhere
- Comfort
- Laundry and Shower Donations
- Design
- Direct Action Committee
- Education and Empowerment
- Facilitation Committee
- Food Committee
- Free/Libre/Open-source (FLO) Solutions
- Info/Front Desk

26 DIY: Do It Yourself
These T.A.Z. reflect the basic needs of occupations, which in this case are not particular to OWS but can also be reflected in Gezi/Taksim and Zuccotti Park (Img. 10, Img. 11) represents the consequence of the street-battle in Gezi/Taksim, from the chaotic state of clashes to an autonomous self-regulated body, forming an assemblage of the commons. It is an assemblage that contrasts to structural frameworks (Farías and Bender 2010), a tandem with new articulations of human-non-human materialities through relations of exteriority (McFarlane 2011). These bodies are capable to create dissident spatialities throughout the assemblage of an ad-hoc architecture, where everyday materials and objects bent spatial practices initiating a subversive design under a state of exception. Using tactics during the transformation of the public spatial conception, occupiers turn these spaces into hybrid urban zones in a temporal architectural exception. These systems could be planned or accidental, and design performs a chaotic mobility of objects that involves a conception of new designing methods.

This new urban capacity remarks a creation of platforms that invigorates subversively buildings, streets, neighbourhoods, behaviours, structures, and spatial relations. It strategizes the space through representations of political frameworks in an aesthetic scope: digital media (cameras, laptops, live-tweeting, Facebook, streaming), black bloc tactics, operational zone, art camp, meditation spot, etc. Thus, this architecture of occupation is far from being discrete, it innately striates the space when there is a fabrication of an occupation. The amount of energy contained on the public sphere creates a substantial porosity not only of private and public borders, but also arranges new dynamics of appropriation. The architecture of occupation is instant and ever-changing, collective and intermittent, practical and radical; it changes from radicalization as systematic product to radicalization as systematic motor.
In Hong Kong, at the Central Government Complex, occupiers replicated Prague’s Lennon Wall. The original Lennon Wall is located in Mala Strana, Prague, when an anonymous person painted Lennon’s face after his death in 1980, representing him as a peaceful symbol that contrasted to the local political regime [at that time, Czech Republic was ruled under a communist regime]. Soon, people started writing on the wall messages, quotes, lyrics, and paintings about peace, love and freedom. The police tried repeatedly to whitewash over the portraits and messages, but every day after, the wall was filled again with poems, pieces, and paintings of Lennon, even when there were CCTV cameras and overnight posting guards. It was mostly students the ones that continued with these series of dissenting actions in this particular space, and ironically, they were described as the “Lennonism movement.” Over thirty years later, occupiers filled with colourful post-it notes [more than ten thousand pieces] the exterior staircase of the Central Government building in Hong Kong, with written messages about democracy and universal suffrage, solidarity, peace, freedom, song lyrics and epigrams. Protests usually involve graffiti and paintings but the exceptional [de] territorialisation of the imaginary Prague’s Lennon Wall materialized collaborative spatial practices that fitted a forum for exchanging. The wall became a device for protest while post-it notes were physical Tweets, and the resonance of Prague was materialized in Hong Kong. For this purpose, resonance is understood as a system able to store and easy to transfer energy between two or more different storages modes, even if that means to lose energy in the transference [based on resonance in physics]. The tendency to vibrate bodies and increase their amplitude, causes a force that varies with time and depends on its place, fluctuating a state that is hard to grasp because it is displaced.

By covering buildings with post-it was a response from the released online document named “OCLP: Manual of Disobedience,” which indicated the legalities and illegalities according to Hong Kong’s urban law. This document suggested to avoid damaging or destroying public and private buildings and infrastructures, thus, occupiers used post-it notes to cover buildings’ surfaces and avoid affecting its structure. These series of micro-dissident-actions turned the city’s infrastructure into an improvised outdoor gallery of politically inspired art. The art expression in occupations is a powerful tool that engage people in different ways. The “Umbrella Man,” tents filled with cartoons and paintings, textiles forming art installations, umbrellas composing canopies, and so on, turned streets into enormous outdoor art exhibitions. “The art, pointedly political and often witty, has become as much an expression of the protest as the megaphone speeches and the metal barricades” (Lau 2014).

---

27 On a trip to Prague, the author could talk to local people, especially to owners of shops nearby Lennon Wall. On a talk with a coffee shop owner, he made clear that the wall, from its beginning, represented a way of expression for young people. He has painted on the wall several times but recognized that he did not do it from the first moment. During a conversation with the curator from the Prague Gallery, she indicated that the space that surrounds Lennon Wall has been positively activated during the last twenty years, and that was indeed one of the main reasons why they installed the gallery in the area.

Img. 10 Zuccotti Park. Zoning

Img. 11 La République de Taksim. Gezi Park zoning

Img. 12 Capture from YouTube video “Lennon Wall Hong Kong”
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L9njDijvKzs
In order to preserve the memory of this occupation, people created a large digital archive [some of them were displayed in the “Disobedient Objects” exhibition at the Victoria and Albert Museum in London in 2014]. Moreover, besides this outdoor exhibition, there were ‘bedrooms’ with elaborated cardboards, sprawling study areas, libraries, gardens, media centres, kitchens, and so on. This spatiality created not only new spaces of relations but also new uses of spaces and actions, where the ad-hoc architecture let the physical work to take place temporally.

Tents, encampments, tarpaulins, and fabric tents performed the ad-hoc architecture for the space of the commons. During the 79 days of the Umbrella Revolution, the movement succeeded in creating a model of civil society based on non-violence; it appropriated a large part of the business district in Admiralty, and separated affectively the government headquarters from the city. For days and nights, dissident bodies built a temporal city, consolidating spatial and social structures in an expression of new spatial conditions, a temporal dynamic, and a multi-dimensional structure. As Prague’s Lennon Wall, many spatial practices were used in Hong Kong from other occupations such as OWS or los Indignados, resonating these architectural practices. It has implicitly political participation and a valid form of cultural communication that ties networks between people and places. Then, these dissident architectural practices are about context innovation somewhat limited. Reclaiming the public sphere in a dense, commercialized urban environment like Hong Kong, means something regardless the message of the spatial practice image.

The ad-hoc architecture is a potential articulation of conflicts that negotiates spatially the discourse of temporal based on the principle of proximity, coexistence, and interaction. The dissident spatiality weds with the borderless and shares nowhere, but is a practiced-place through movement [walking] and mobility [ideas, objects, bodies, schemes, tweets], forming a space of experience where actions resonate. In Hong Kong, the created space has new meanings identified and produced by people on the streets, as Iain Chambers writes:

> It does not suggest an integration with existing hegemony or the mainstream of metropolitan life, but rather with the shifting, mixing, contaminating, experimenting, revisiting and recomposing that the wider horizons and the inter-trans-cultural networks of the metropolis both permit and encourage.

(Chambers 1993)

The ad-hoc architecture and dissident architectural practices form a radical space where the collective materializes dissident bodies by becoming a global network [in the physical and virtual space]. The dissident spatial experience experiments a break on the sequence of urban habits and customs, changing the space, exploring the temporal existence of a determined practice, and provoking new quotidian relations.
4.2.1 Temporal Architecture as a dispositive

To disobey in order to take action is the byword of all genuine creative... I would say that there is good reason to study the dynamics of disobedience, the spark behind all knowledge.

Gaston Bachelard, *Fragments of a poetics of fire*, 1990

The act of disobedience, or the refusal to comply, is inherent in the act of crossing a disciplinary boundary. It occupies several states simultaneously: architectural practices, geographies, DIY assemblages, and experimental performances. As seen previously, when the protest becomes the occupation, daily-life objects transmute their significance and explore their spatial limits. The chaotic mobility and displacement alter common objects in spawn protests, illustrating that design does not only shape and define, but also activates changes in politics, communication, social innovation, urban landscape and architecture. The dissident structures that emerge during occupations, provide unusual illustrations of basic and preconceived assemblages. In Hong Kong, protesters created a self-sustaining village within a month of the beginning protests, re-territorialising the sense of public spaces in Hong Kong. Barricades were primary assemblages during the first days of the protests that obstructed mobility and visibility and gave a sense of protection. Cling film and umbrellas turned into fledged campus and carpeted stairs, water coolers served as amplifiers and Wi-Fi boosters, and strings attached to street lamps became drying racks to hang clothes and towels. These acts of building dissident spaces are not made for protesting but for encouraging the city to be public. Thus, occupations are not scenarios for protesting, they are living spaces that require social and spatial production through an *ad-hoc architecture* and the dissident objects.

Stavros Stavrides in his book “Towards the City of Thresholds” (Stavrides 2016), writes that radical practices contain a potential transformation of the society. They are generally conceived as altering enclaves inside an ordered urban space; however, it is necessary to “think about them not as social containers, but as formative elements of social practices” (Stavrides 2016).29 Hence, the exploration of practices that potentiate a production of connection between spatialities and emancipated processes generate urban tools of threshold within occupations. These architectural practices that are visible and material, are also spatio-temporal, taking a dissident physical form, shaping new public spheres, and deactivating to resonate in other spatio-temporal enclaves. The ‘umbrella’ or the ‘post-it notes’ narrate a collective experience in a dissipent spatiality, overlapping the urban fabric with them. Because these practices disturb the normal behaviour of cities, they are considered as events that discontinuous and deregulates the experience in time and space: they are *happenings*. Happenings suit experiences of people and spaces, impacting on how urban dynamics relate among each other: the movement of matter, meanings, bodies, thoughts and order.

29 Translated by the author.
The ad-hoc architecture forms an apparatus in which the proximity and overlapping of dissident bodies creates infusions of spatio-temporal articulations. The representational exploration of multiple images distorts objects, which brings Marcel Duchamp’s “ready-made,” a conception of objects in and of this world, reassembled or re-contextualized to alter their meaning [an anti-rational and deliberated contradiction of convention-eschewed]. Duchamp’s Bicycle Wheel (Img. 9) consists on a bicycle wheel positioned upright on a simple stool, and the observer is given an assemblage of parts put together in an orthodox mode. The Bicycle Wheel presents the observer a number of puzzling suggestions, stretching the conventional boundaries of use and sense of objects by implicating the observer in the process of the piece’s construction and meaning. Duchamp selected mass-produced, commercially available, often utilitarian objects,30 arguing that an ordinary object reacts to visual indifference. And here, the connection to Duchamp’s readymade conception is extrapolated to the ad-hoc architecture, sharing notions of limits, sense and meaning.

A mode of experience according to which, for two centuries, we perceive very diverse things, whether in their techniques of production or their destination, as all belonging to art. This is not a matter of the “reception” of works of art. Rather, it concerns the sensible fabric of experience within which they are produced.

Jacques Rancière, Aisthesis: Scenes from the Aesthetic Regime of Art, 2013

The experience of architecture in an aesthetic platform, opens a gap on the notion of what could be an ordinary set of experiences. So, architecture sets its directions in the political framework, and “the political notion of equality cannot longer be separated from the politics of aesthetics, or

aesthetics of politics” (Lahiji 2014). Architectural practices in dissident spatialities during occupations, reinvent the relationships of doing, being, and communicating, which are perceptible in the space of commons [a particular doing requires the action-capacity of another] making from the ad-hoc architecture an urban apparatus.

[A apparatus]
Firstly, a thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions – in short, the said as much as unsaid. Such are the elements of the apparatus. The apparatus itself is the system of relations that can be establishes between these elements.

Secondly, I [Foucault] am trying to identify in this apparatus is precisely the nature of the connections that can exist between these heterogeneous elements. Thus, a particular discourse can figure at one time as the programme of an institution, and at another it can function as a means of justifying or making a practice which itself remains silent, or as a secondary re-interpretation of this practice, opening out for it a new field of rationality. In short, between these elements, whether discursive or non-discursive, there is a sort of interplay of shifts of position and modifications of function which can also vary very widely.

And thirdly, I understand by the term “apparatus” a sort of – shall we say – formation which has as its major function at a given historical moment that of responding to an urgent need.
this has dominant strategic function. This may have been seen, for example, the assimilation of floating population found to be burdensome for an essentially mercantilist economy: there was a strategic imperative acting here as the matrix for an apparatus which gradually undertook the control or subjection of madness, mental illness and neurosis.

Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge, Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*

Giorgio Agamben, following Foucault’s *dispositive* concept, indicates that its origin is related to the notion of “positivity,” an “etymological neighbour.” He realizes that it is a pure subjectivity of governance devoid of any foundation in being, it is a process of subjectification that “must produce their subject” (Agamben 2009):

I shall call an apparatus literally anything that has in some way the capacity to capture, orient, determine, intercept, model, control, or secure the gesture, behaviours, opinions, or discourses of living beings. Not only, therefore, prisons, madhouses, the panopticon, schools, confession, factories, disciplines, juridical measures, and so forth (whose connection with power is in a certain sense evident), but also the pen, writing, literature, philosophy, agriculture, cigarettes, navigation, computers, cellular telephones and – why not – language itself, which is perhaps the most ancient of apparatuses.

Agamben, *What is an Apparatus? And Other Essays, 2009*

While in “Aesthetics and Discontent” (Rancière 2009), Rancière discusses that “any object can potentially be an artwork and any activity can potentially give rise to artwork” (Ibid), like Marcel Duchamp’s “readymade.” In this sense, the temporal architecture as an apparatus works in the contemporary city during occupations, as spatial experiences that delineate new spatialities. Rancière puts in relation this artwork as a mechanism that bears a particular political meaning: “the power of ‘form’ over ‘matter’ is the power of the class of intelligence over the class of sensible” (Rancière, 2009). Rancière’s political equality acts in the aesthetic experience of architecture as an apparatus, in which any object can rise to the level of aesthetic experience if disrupts the ordered sense of space. *Ad-hoc architecture* acts as an apparatus that interrupts and disrupts the established order, it ensembles discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, and such like. Thus, the temporal architecture is an experienced spatial practice, not a dictated one.
4.3 Performing the architecture of occupation in the state of exception

4.3.1 Spatiality in the state of exception

Through Agamben’s conception of exception, it is the means to understand and conceptualize the contemporary city as a “city of enclaves.” The state of exception describes moments when a law is suspended under the premise of the society's protection from internal and/or external threats. Hence, an urban enclave is a defined area where a general law is partially suspended and a distinct set of administrative rules is applied. Agamben indicates that authorities decide when and for how long the law could be suspended, or when the threat stops being a threat, meaning that the state of exception could be permanent. He includes ‘zones of indistinction’ as mechanisms rather than states, which empties the period of law because its force is necessary to impose the state of exception. The zone of indistinction is therefore an active zone that hazes differences in order to be suspended. During occupations, it is the temporal coincidence of law that offers legitimacy, a distinction between exception and rule. “The camp is the space that is opened when the state of exception begins to become the rule (...) a permanent spatial arrangement which as such nevertheless remains outside the normal order” (Agamben 1998).

The occupation remains outside normal order, yet, the city is usually under control [CCTV cameras, authority forces, security guards, urban law, and so on]. There is a proliferation of checkpoints that identify, separate, and yield individuals.

Contemporary occupations struggle to re-appropriate and transform the public space, which shrinks with these urban elements of control. As the occupation is out of the normal rule, it is defined as a state of exception. But before the temporal settlement, the momentum when the protest becomes an occupation, public spaces and urban elements experience exceptional states in their essence. The way these spaces in occupations are used, made and remade, remains dynamic contestable and challenged, generating constant processes within multiple temporalities. There is a negotiation of materiality and virtuality over these elements without referring directly to representation of power, even if it is part of it. These spaces are not delineated by a defined perimeter, boundary or line; instead they are zones that change their form, reach, approach, practice and significance, they are porous and consequently generates a spatiality in movement. Eyal Weizman notes that the figure of archipelago describes a multiplicity of extraterritorial zones as states of exception:

These territories tend to be mobile or temporary, protected by makeshift barriers, temporary boundaries or generally invisible security apparatuses, and are the result of variety of

31 Stavros Stavrides. Emancipating spatial practices in struggle against the urban “state of exception”: Towards the “city of thresholds.”
contemporary processes that have caused the splintering of pre-existing political surfaces. They are extraterritorial because they are positioned outside of the sovereignty and jurisdiction that surrounds them, different kinds of ‘islands’ that collectively form an archipelago, although they are nor encircled by either sea or ocean.

(E. Weizman 2005)

In Egypt, the “Emergency of Law” was active for three decades until the 2011 Revolution. This state of exception was permanent, becoming the normal state.

A long tradition of constitutional thought reasons that in a time of serious crisis and danger, such as wartime, the constitution must be suspended temporally and extraordinary powers given to a strong executive or even a dictator in order to protect the republic. The founding myth of this line of thinking is the legend of the noble Cincinnatus, the elderly farmer in ancient Rome who, when beseeched by his countrymen, reluctantly accepts the role of dictator to ward off a threat against the republic. After sixteen days, the story goes, the enemy has been routed and the republic saved, and Cincinnatus returns to his plow. The constitutional concept of a “state of exception” is clearly contradictory – the constitution must be suspended in order to be saved – but this contradiction is resolved or at least mitigated by understanding that the period of crisis and exception is brief. When crisis is no longer limited and specific but becomes a general omni-crisis, when the state of war and thus the state of exception become indefinite or even permanent, as they do today, then contradiction is fully expressed, and the concept takes an entirely different character.

Hart and Negri, Multitude. War and Democracy in the Age of Empire, 2004

Agamben’s state of exception is based on suspension, overthrow or abolition of pre-existing juridical order, in which the individual loses its conditions of citizen. He reflects this state in the space of refugee camps, where life is whittled down to mere biological existence [the bare life]. The camp exemplifies the category of legal and spatial exception, although Agamben points at the refugee or labour camps. In this work, the camp has a spatial implication with the camp of occupiers, fabrics, assemblage systems, modular forms, easy to mobilize, protection from the outside; components that act as improvised islands where normality is suspended. The statement of camps overlooks not only in its physical and spatial conditions but also in everyday spatial practices that take place within these archipelagos; thus, a camp is the spatialization of exception. It is a demarcation of space: occupied territories, liquid borderlines, islands, buffer zones, curfew cities, state-led urban transformations, evictions and others (Franke 2003), a form of multiple variables between territory, objects, and subjectivities.

If the essence of the camp consists in the materialization of the state of exception and in the subsequent creation of a space in which bare life and the juridical rule enter into a threshold of
indistinction, then we must admit that we find ourselves virtually in the presence of a camp every
time such a structure is created, independent of the kinds of crime that are committed there and
whatever its denomination and specific topography.
Agamben, Homo Sacer. Sovereign, Power and Bare Life, 1998

Hence, occupations are seen biopolitical spaces in which subjectivity and otherness reinvent
constantly urban geographies, where occupiers face experiences of this radical spatiality. The
spatiality in this state of exception approaches a reinvention of everyday practices, following
radical design parameters. Then, relationships with-within the outside of the occupy area, is
transformed and there is not anymore an inside and outside, the ‘us’ and the ‘others.’ It is a
settlement that opens up self-organized modalities in which design continues to be ad-hoc
assemblages.

4.3.2 Performative spatiality

Performance provides open up, fluid and dynamic modes of occupations in both temporal and
spatial dimensions: “allied with architecture, performance had everything to do with efficiency,
sustainability, cost-effectiveness and the like, and nothing to do with performance art” (Gratza
2013). Architects like Didier Fiuza Faustino or the Italian collective Stalker, use the body to activate
urban spaces in their walking practice, connecting to performance art and questioning the status of
the self-contained art object.

In 2013, the Tate Britain presented “Performing Architecture,” a work with talks, performances,
workshops, sound and film projects by Alex Schweder and Lamis Bayar, Kreider + O’Leary, Effie
Coe, and The Architecture Foundation. The first phrase of the performance was: “Forget the
theory! Experience it through your body:

Schweder and Bayar transform the Duveen Galleries into a rehearsal space where invitations writ
large on the fabric of a rapidly changing Tate Britain, offer up playful and unexpected ways of
discovering how you can change a space by behaving differently in relation to it. What can one
to do with a wall? A hoarding? A bench? You will leave the rehearsal space a practised
Performance Architect and invent your own instructions as you happen upon more walls, more
hoardings, more benches. Perform them. Perform Tate Britain, perform your living room!34

33 Late at Tate Britain: February 2013, Performing Architecture. http://www.tate.org.uk/whats-on/tate-
brain/performance-and-music/late-tate-britain-february-2013
34 Online invitation to ‘Late at Tate Britain’. http://www.tate.org.uk/whats-on/tate-britain/performance-and-
music/late-tate-britain-february-2013
"Rehearse here, perform everywhere, time-bound and ephemeral, iterative occupations of the rapidly changing Tate Britain building, the architectural time gathered pace” formed the “Practised Architecture.” “The Wall Piece” (Img. 9) built up into a series of 42 sequential invitations, transformed the Duveen Galleries into a performative space: “Look only at this join and move left,” “Don’t stop touching the wall,” “Touch at this wall,” addressed phrases performed on a wall by visitors. The performance subverted cues of notions and approaches to architecture, that follows Alain Bourdin’s “La Métropole des Individus” (Bourdin 2005), in which a permanent movement “surf[s] on fluxes of fashion, atmospheres and events.” The performative action is a radical social gesture that goes beyond the production of an aesthetic object.

Another example of performative architecture is “TechnoGeisha,” which ensues the footsteps of the artist Lucy Orta in Andrés Jacque’s proposal (Img. 10), as a response of architecture to new urban needs. TechnoGeisha concentrates in an outfit different stimulations to urban uses and conditions, and creates a hyper-equipped device that acts as a mediator between people. It is portable and bubble-like environment designed to make people feel at home while they are in the urban space. This perception highlights that architecture is less to do with buildings and spaces than with actions and gestures, operating as a political expression that understands these relationships. The performative architecture is temporary, moveable, and open instead of permanent, fixed and enclosed. “Performance, like habits, involves neither fixed immutable nature nor spontaneous individual freedom, residing instead between the two, a kind of acting in common based on collaboration and communication” (Hardt and Negri, 2004). In addition, the work of Judith Butler and her theorisation of performativity in occupations, has been addressed to the spatial discourse in order to explore more dynamic relations between architecture and bodies (Phelan 1993). She makes a distinction between performance and performativity, where performance is relegated to theatrics and cannot be recorded or documented; instead, it pertains to visceral relations that do not do discourse.
The spatial performative practice uses tactics to critique power relations in the city, arising outcomes that generate social and spatial relations in which tactical performances are collaborative and transdisciplinary. In this regard, the Situationists used tactical performances to surpass spatial boundaries in the 1960s. They installed the unitary urbanism that challenged city structures such as the derive and psychogeography, using performance as an instrument to transcend the mechanisms of control. These practices are described as tactics that reinvent the public space: deploying graffiti, taking over the streets temporarily, creating new spaces through sensory experiences; here, movement is not about changing a position but a state. When Rem Koolhaas challenged to ride the flows of the generic city, in his theorization of a multitude in Lagos as a productive critique of neoliberal capitalism, the assumption between potentiality and action for the space was shown as a space of flows. During the 1990s, Koolhaas and Tschumi dealt with their desire to make performances and events as drivers of their architecture, inverting processes from adding to subtracting. Although, Koolhaas relates occupants as generators of performative practices, while the role of architecture is to create spaces in which they can happen.

In Butler’s book “Bodies that Matter: the Discursive Limits of Sex” (Butler 1993), performativity is reframed as the iteration of a specific modality of power as discourse. It echoes a variety of meanings and uses, enters in place and discusses about how the place is enacted through processes of performance. In this regard, Katarina Bonnevier says that Butler’s work does no longer give importance to define architecture as an object to be located, or as a text to be read, but instead she suggests that “architecture appears through its performance and through its enactment it comes into being” (Bonnevier 2005). In addition, Ulmer’s notion of eutectics (Ulmer 1991), makes the performative theory of “do architecture” [construing movements] to be the necessary inventive

actions that embody subjects and filling consequently the gap between theories of performativity and covered architecture. Hence, eutectics in contemporary occupations makes of architecture a process instead of an object. Such focus on dynamics, offers the promise of freedom, creativity and escape from essentials, place-bound identities, making their rhetoric to be extremely powerful in the contemporary collective imagination. The approach that performativity has with architecture seems contradictory at first because of the connotations that architecture has with power, permanency, stability, and richness, provoking changes by questioning architectural practices.

Nonetheless, Butler's analysis deploys a spatial rhetoric that has "material effects" (J. Butler 1993). She enact the historical positing of inside-outside within philosophy, where the object is cast beyond discourse and prior to language. But she moves quickly in the gaps that Foucault evokes, through models of thinking where time is privileged and place is largely absent, externalizing the collective body. The spatiality places subjects in a constrained state within a synchronic structure of discursive relations, "where the subject is potentially free to resist the structures within a diachronically-marked moment in the process of reproduction" (J. Butler 1993). Setting the open space of Gezi Park within the occupation, the spatiality negotiates between the established context and the new spatialized body, making the 'remade' state a temporal device, and the spatial relations canvas for experiencing the spatiality. Challenging the relationship between built and enacted architecture, as much as its affinity to the 'programme,' the architect Alex Schweder characterises the concept of "performance architecture" as the notion that relates occupied spaces and occupying subjects like permeable. (Schweder 2014). The subject perceives first its environment and then is changed by that perception. Schweder indicates that this person "alters his/her environment to make it correspond to their fantasies. This process continues until the scrimmage of objects and subjects produces an architecture where referring to the two as distinct becomes irrelevant" (Schweder 2014). Through the incremental accumulation of action, occupiers notice the city's infrastructures alteration as direct relations to their occupation. This new urban landscape exists in flux: buildings, uses, functions, meanings, and actions are transmuted and transmute the urban space without a steady speed. So, ad-hoc architecture acts as a performance, explores the moment when the observer becomes the occupier by using a reachable and manageable architectural practices. This spatiality transforms prominently his/her space and the others, and works as an individual that is part of a collective body. The occupier is part of the dissident urban corpse and learns to interpret its surroundings, giving the power to create its own space that is also the space for/of all.
In occupations, there are connected *micro-occupations* composed by different characters, agents and functions. *Micro-occupations* develop simultaneously micro dynamic environments that arrange spaces in certain ways, with a particular aesthetics through its organization and timing.

The movement of objects and bodies in these *micro-occupations*, transform the established conception of the space and opens new conditions of relationships. Deleuze and Guattari refer to these conditions like the multiplicity of objects that are never fully stable. They define this process as *territorialisation* (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972). In this sense, territory is not given but constituted, like the organization of individuals on it. It is possible to territorialize through a series of markings, signs, postures, gestures, sounds, and so forth, and it is structured by the *nomos*, defined by forms of behaviours and their functions within the territory. Also, territory has an outside, it has a way out. Deterritorialization on the other hand, detaches signs from the context and signification of the territory (Deleuze and Guattari, 1972), containing a loss of the *self*. It is a separation from a given purpose, defined only in terms of its territory. It needs to be understood in cultural and spatial terms, political and economic because it involves the sense of *dismembering* social relations. Nevertheless, deterritorialization cannot exist without reterritorialization. While deterritorialization is a separation from a given purpose, reterritorialization is a re-purposing in another domain, by restructuring a place or territory. The transformational process affects the spatiality of the occupation in its material, psychological, political, structural and virtual dimension [deterritorializing and reterritorializing], and moving away from a territory that is already established, producing changes in the relations and connections.

The design of the *ad-hoc instant architecture* is fundamentally a [de] [re] territorialization because it transforms banal things into dissident objects (Baudrillard, 1968). They also adapt the occupation needs as combined hyper-structures connected to a global network, constituting an *inner architecture* without borders. The approach is not to the object itself but to the relations between people, artefacts, diagrams, assemblages and environments in a temporal state.

The diagrammatic or abstractal machine does not function to represent, even something real, but rather constructs a real that is yet to come, a new type of reality (...). They constitute becomings. Thus they are always singular and immanent (...). Abstract machines consist of unformed matters and nonformal functions (...). Of course, within the dimensions of the assemblage, the abstract machine or machines, is effectuated in forms and substances, in varying stated of freedom. But the abstract machine must first have composed itself, and have simultaneously composed a plane of consistency. Abstract, singular, and creative, here and now, yet nonconcrete, actual yet non effectuated.

(Deleuze and Guattari, 2002)
In Tahrir Square, women were part of the occupation because this one created a democratic and radical spatiality that allowed them to be there. The former regime equated women protesting with prostitutes: "women protesters deserved to be raped because they demonstrate in public while a woman’s place, as we know, is at home" (Abaza 2013). Hence, women were a de facto practiced in the space of the commons, while Tahrir Square became the space that changed this social structure by establishing new forms of social and spatial relations. These changes were re-invented in action and [de] [re] territorialized public spaces. Women deterritorialized the public space and then, they reterritorialized it by being there.

Another sense of [de] [re] territorialization is the virtual space. In OWS, some online activists relied on Facebook and Twitter to reach people, used open-source software, and sources such as wikicoding. At these wikicamps, the open-source operated at a local and global scale simultaneously. Here, public space and political actions show some common facts during the occupations:

- Online tools change rapidly the dynamics of political action. The aggregative, rhizomatic, and exponentially expanding character of occupations reflect the distinctive capacities of social media.
- Media accelerates the pace of discourse and action. Flash mobs and viral tweets are hyped, and compressed temporally collective actions.
- Digital communities are good at building systems. Wikicoding and other modes of online collaboration can build online venues fast and well.
- These communities may still require face-to-face interaction to achieve substantive changes. Digital communication is easy, but for that reason it can feel too light and weightless to mobilize people to achieve deep structural changes.
- Bodies on streets matter for commanding attention and galvanizing engagement.
- Modern forms of police control violate basic civil liberties, from public assembly to everyday civil rights.
- Asserting a right to the city means claiming public places, online and offline, for assembly, dialogue and deliberation by multiple publics, varying spatial and temporal requirements.
- Privately owned public spaces [POPS] offer platforms for experimentation. The prevalence of corporate enclaves in our cities and the virtual space often homogenize and constrains public life. (Massey and Brett 2012)

Los Indignados created the document "How to cook a peaceful revolution." In this document, organizers call for spontaneity to set up camps, emphasising that the tent is a tool that could

achieve different objectives – not only spatial but also political and social through propagation. The document identifies tents as useful tools at the beginning of the occupation but eventually they become difficult objects to keep on the space and to maintain. It adds that tents have to be placed in a conspicuous location and disturb people as little as possible. This strategy let the creation of a city within the city itself, like micro-occupations. The creation of a zoning plan helps spatial and social organization in locating functional areas as media, kitchen, libraries, and so on. There is a list of protected actions that form the protest called “civil disobedience” that include: 37

- Holding signs
- Rally on a sidewalk and set up a moving picket line as long as people do not block buildings’ entrances or more than half the sidewalk
- Leafleting
- Protestors have a permit to march in the street, rally in a park with 20 or more people, have a procession with 50 or more bicycles, or use electronic sound amplification
- Drumming, dancing, singing, chanting
- Marching
- Standing still in a group
- Approaching pedestrians on a public sidewalk with leaflets, newspapers, petitions, and solicitations for donations
- Setting up tables on public sidewalks for those purposes, as long as the walk is not blocked
- Wearing a mask or concealing the face, though it is unlawful for more than two people to wear masks or bandannas

The initial camp is built upon improvisation: tape, string, tarp, cloth, metal tent poles holding up a sagging canvas roof, plastic sheets propped upon bamboo rods tapped together. OWS also produced a guide to occupy, indicating that depending on the place, strategies and tactics should adapt to their local context. About the occupy infrastructure, the document indicates the following: 38

- Internet. It is necessary to have an independent Wi-Fi hub.
- Network amplification. Occupiers could use human mic and internal activists that post information through social media and digital platforms.
- Kitchen. A system could be arranged to whereby food is purchased by donations and has to follow sanitary regulations.

NYC Chapter “Know your rights” (2008) www.tinyurl.com/legalinfo917a
• Electricity and water. Different types of electrical generators could be employed, from traditional fossil fuel units to bike power.

• Library. Usually a powerful symbol because it enriches the camp with intellectual life along actions. OWS contained more than 5,000 donated books.

• Livestream. It is a key part of to rely to the outside. The main point is that live video can be very compelling, particularly during periods of conflict with authorities.

• Blanket cell phone documentation. The presence of individuals recording their experiences changes the evolution of occupations. Instead of being experienced through traditional media, bewildering arrays of personal narratives transmit the occupation. Tweets, video streams, photos posted from the front lines of battles with police; they all play a role in making the protests feel more active.

In Tahrir Square, activists circulated a pamphlet as a plan for the 25 January protests. It is a 26-page document [only 9 pages were translated into English], that contains specific actions about what protesters might do during the occupation and how to react if there are clashes with riot police (Img. 18, Img. 19, and Img. 20). The creators of the pamphlet explicitly asked to distribute it only through email, not by Twitter or Facebook. Delocalization, de-situated, disjoining, disturbing propagating, wandering a nomadic practice, drifting, in the middle, between, in-between, intermediating, intertying, intervowing, separating, towards, moving, developing, becoming; they constitute techniques for shifting the self-definition of the urban geography's spatial terms. These contemporary changes intervene in [in]visible socio-spatial relationships within the urban landscape, as an affective design strategy that produces a process of extra-state zoning. There is an inherent possibility of reversal and collectivity, where qualifications disappear and spatial practices generate radical spaces.

In this regard, architectural practices become the playful ground where new ways of movement take form, addressing rarely to materials and embodying relations that occur in spatial practices; it develops alternative concepts of body, space, time and movement beyond the discursive state. The practice of [de] [re] territorialisation becomes the leitmotif for a re-conceptualization of architectural urban relations, making to lose settled boundaries. Because the spatiality of the occupation is dynamic, it is a process of change and impermanence, not a single local strategy or a relativized unfettered position.

On the other hand, during the protests in Istanbul, occupiers covered the AKM (Ataturk Cultural Centre) with banners, posters, flags, cartels, signs, placards (Img. 21). Many protestors reached the rooftop of the AKM building, placed banners and flags, and fired smoke powder, adding another

---

39 Annex 3
40 Ataturk Cultural Center, AKM, is a multi-purpose cultural centre and an opera house.
layer to the building. Simultaneously in Gezi Park, occupiers covered it with hundreds of tents. These series of re-appropriating actions in horizontal and vertical surfaces, acted as one whole mechanism that existed with the presence of the other one. The urban landscape acquired a new flexibility state where ephemeral situations embodied different structures and brought unusual but common ways of producing the radical space. Performing architecture is experienced during the state of exception of occupation, where occupiers generated new architectural forms without being represented but representing themselves, and made an immanent experience of the event. Alan Badiou relates these actions as states that become something else (Badiou 1988):

- The multiple composed of on the one hand, elements of the site, and on the other hand, itself (the event).
- Self-belonging is thus constitutive of the event; it is an element of the multiple.
- The event interposes itself between the void and itself.

Furthermore, Badiou indicates that the event remains anonymous and uncertain; it pins to multiple-being by the interventional capacity, and establishes itself in the interventional retroaction, “between the empty anonymity bordered on the site, and the addition of a name” (Badiou 1988). In “Event: Philosophy in Transit” (Žižek 2014), Žižek focus on the event in the sense that something extraordinary takes place. “Within a certain field of phenomena where things go on the normal flow of things, from time to time something happens which as it were retroactively changes the rules of what is possible in the sense that something happens” (Žižek 2014). The event is generated by that situation in a way that it changes interactively the whole situation. He adds that events are rare, they are dramatic encounters that shape the perception of the real. The notion of event is to create the space for the proper understanding of phenomena like occupations as narrative fields.

As a series of in-between becomings, the sign of the space opposes to rigid structures and positions, and opens and shifts the self-definition of objects, subjects and relationships, where their movements disrupt the established. The in-between performs new conceptualizations of spatialities, a ‘spacing’ generated by flows and movements of dissidence and displacements where spatial implications act on unexpected relations, dissonance, consonance, and resonance. The in-between becomings embeds the practice of resistance like the barricades around Gezi Park, which offer subjectivities in particular moments experienced as events. The situational dwelling practices in Gezi Park, Taksim Square and OWS are in themselves an ‘event-architecture’, and ‘archievent’ of dissidence, for taking decisions that displace, find resources [human, communicative and material], start different organizational systems, take technological tools, manage, and affect the space and the event.

41 Slavoj Žižek, Slavoj Žižek: Events and Encounters Explain Our Fear of Falling in Love. YouTube cannel: Big Think. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LXqPiY WJSII
4.4 Discussion. Radical Spatiality

The form of making the collective brings potential to produce a spatiality. The collective brings together bodies and the practice of politics to collaborate, to participate, to extend, to share, while tactics germinate in the radical of temporal actions. In occupations, a new spatial design dimension takes shape: bodies in proximity, making contact, keeping contact, and excluding contact during days and nights, create situations in which new gestures appeared with new significances and intimacies. The instant comes from handshakes, grasp of forearms, hold arms for building human chains and let a new intimacy to pass through them.

Materials and objects take proximities too: sleeping on the asphalt, waking up on roads, the pattern of the concrete on their hands, umbrella shelters for protecting from tear gas, bamboo sticks lodging structures, plastic wrap as walls, roads median like ad-hoc offices, texting on the ground, taking pictures of the cascading lights of skyscrapers, pavement covered by chalk, bodies touching the city, it is the making of micro-occupations. Only a collective acting together creates this space as part of a radical spatiality where people do not simply exist side by side in the space, indifferent
from one another, neither objects and materials, but explicitly appear for one another. Sitting, waiting on tents, and on the asphalt, make visible that the temporal space is a lot of observing and remaining. People discover the thickness of a street, what is incomplete, and the delay opens unpredictable relations, a spatiality that is based on complex varieties of contributors as non-stable conditions and contradictions. In this spatiality, the potential of the multitude relates material affection and performative actions, presenting intensities within the production in the state of exception. For Michel Hardt and Antonio Negri, the multitude does not represent as a productive force, but as creative process (Hardt and Negri 2009). Hence, the practice of radical spaces takes the event of the multitude as acting \textit{in-and-on}, in which determined actions increase their potentialities and virtual power. De-territorializing and re-territorializing dialectics go alongside these spaces.

The \textit{archievents} and \textit{micro-occupations} display objects for disobedience rather than disobedient objects; objects that are dissident devices and take all sort of forms and use, drafting the meaning of conflict and marking immensely the intersection of technology, social media and complex political challenges. The temporal \textit{ad-hoc architecture} is presented no merely as a formal act but as an enabler of political action, of communication and of production of dissident spaces. Objects, structures, bodies, boundaries, public spaces, digital spaces, laws, practices, movements, dynamics and reinventions resonate in different socio-spatial scopes [physical and digital], constantly under threat of disappearance and fabricating the \textbf{radical spatiality}. It is a displacement that creates the commons in a spiral and expansive relationship with all the elements. It renews through dissidence, the system of structures in the contemporary public space.

The radical spatiality, constantly but temporally, renews relationships among dissident objects. One of these dissident objects is the tent, a structure that is pragmatic for temporal occupancy and is seen as an indeterminate-mobile-rapidly-deployable device that acts as an architectural strategy. It counterpoints the idea of home as static, nuclear, enclosed, solid, stately, and gives to occupiers the power to generate \textit{micro-occupations} when it expands physical and imaginative limits to the architectural urban landscape. Fabricating the common ground that activates the \textit{ad-hoc architecture}, the tent shapes limits and possibilities of organic environments in the centre of hyper-dense, commercial spaces as it happened in Istanbul or Hong Kong. When tents are placed in public spaces, it presents the shift from protests to occupations: tents are arranged in rows, fitted neatly between the highways and streets, repurpose themselves as community noticeboards, and transform the asphalt into a canvas for political expression. By way of illustration, the Umbrella Movement turned the infrastructure that served only for vehicular mobility purposes into a \textit{hyper-structure} when people acted as a dissident body. They transmuted highways into libraries, classrooms, food supply stations, cinema, workshops, toilets, allotments, art exhibitions, \textit{agora} for assembly, flower gardens, mosques, and mobile food centres (Img. 15). The practice of the commons in these \textit{archievents} brings the notion of habit, which displaces traditional conceptions of
subjectivity to be placed in some deep inner self. “They seek subjectivity rather in daily experience, practices and conduct. Habit is the common in practice: the common that we continually produce and the common that serves as the basis for our actions” (Peirce 1992).

The radical spatiality questions the nature of daily-life objects, when are practiced with a dissident character. These deployed architectural practices are means of disruption that face an attempt to an ideal way of inhabiting the city by exploring dissident relationships. Within the radical spatiality, objects suit a practice of disobedient design and the extension of objects reaches a stage of creating new urban public landscapes. Indeed, the radical spatiality transmutes tents and barracks not only in certain physical devices, but also in dissident infrastructures and tools. When objects produce a dissident architectural practice, they induce different intensities and interactions within public spaces, the radicalisation of the space introduces new scenarios for subjects and objects to explore the radical spatiality as a verb instead of as a noun. The occupations generate a radical spatiality that activates short-term, low-cost, and reachable interventions and policies. The creative potential unleashed by social interactions process a collective radical public space where tactics develop multiple affective in the ‘citymaking.’ The radical spatiality exists as inception and gains energy and force while producing the commons. Thus, city’s infrastructures are hacked during occupations through architectural practices: DIY shelters, chair bombing, parklets, guerrilla gardens, bike lines, and such like, provide a dose of whimsy and envision different notions of public spaces. They compel examples of do tanks [contrary to think tanks] and disobedient urban squads that subvert slow formalities. Although dissent is about creatively reshaping surroundings [whether in the physical or virtual space], and short-circuiting existing systems, “it is ultimately about disrupting existing processes” (Lydon and Garcia 2015).


42 Inception: the establishment or starting point of an institution or activity. Oxford Dictionaries.
OWS, the Arab Spring, Gezi/Taksim, Facebook, Twitter and YouTube cannot be separated. Text messages helped to share photos and videos that became viral during occupations, communicating through mobile apps inferred in a wide availability and connecting with wireless devices. Assembling in the virtual space shifted how protestors participated and organized in the physical space. These architectural practices are about making the ordinary something extraordinary and widely accessible, blurring established parameters and limits for the commons, forming interconnected networks, crafting linkages between subjects and objects, and achieving temporally the *becomings.*43 As multiple active micro-occupations [visible or invisible], they enhance dissident assemblages. This means: short-term actions induce long-term transformations. These processes highlight moments that reveal how informal, mobile, temporary and tactical the architectural practice could be, exploring a modification of the contemporary public space. It is as Nabeel Hamdi says: “disturbing the order of things in the interest of change” (Hamdi 2013). These spatial practices use a deliberate and accessible means for achieving desires [commons] while embedding flexibility into the experience and project process.

To operate in the public space, Setha Low and Neil Smith approaches first to the urban scope as a place composed by civic spaces, leisure spaces, or simply functional spaces that have an important role in the development of cities. Nevertheless, they emphasize that public spaces allow the experience and practice of urban dynamics (Low and Smith 2006). Jordi Borja on the other hand, indicates that the principle of urban public space is not so much its juridical nature but the sociological approach, its uses and access conditions. However, defining public space as access or use is currently not enough, it is in fact the urban landscape where subjects and objects demand a process by experience. By experiencing a spatiality, it is necessary to reassess the public space essence. In this regard, Henri Lefebvre in *La production de l’espace* (H. Lefebvre 1991 (1974)), explains first a line for rethinking the relation between the architecture and the social, in a sense that Bernard Tschumi relates the relationship between the social and the built environment, going outside the realm of architecture to explore the space. Tschumi retains from Lefebvre the genuine social space as an assemblage of vital characteristics. First, it is a matter of accommodating social practices in a physically *good way*: streets designed to respond a fluent pedestrian use. Second, the social space is a matter of *representativeness*: it uses legible and imaginable codes. Third, the social practices need *symbolism*: identity, ownership, and civic pride. These characterisations of social spaces are located in Tschumi’s thinking and design on the late 1970s and beginning of 1980s,44 and in his project “The Manhattan Transcripts,” he tries to read architecture in which space, movement and events are independent, yet stand new relations to each other (Tschumi 1981). This dynamic conception resonates in contemporary situations, especially when trying to define the
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43 It is referred as temporal in the sense of the contemporary city, where new techniques, relationships, items and spaces are created continuously and the city needs to respond to them. Hence, temporality does not include an ending point; the dissident spatial practices are reinvented permanently but are always temporal.

public sphere like the contemporary occupations. They exposed dynamic relationships between space, subjects, objects, movement, event, dissidence and suchlike, materialized in the urban scope that is practiced and unfold the contemporary city's crescendos. "Architecture, then, does not occupy a place but provides place... and in so doing occurs as an event that 'there is'" (Cassey 1998 [1997]).

The Umbrella Movement settled contemporary dynamics in a state of exception using contemporary and daily-life objects to produce the public space. First, in a city like Hong Kong where there is a lack of public spaces, what protestors had before becoming occupiers, was a city filled with infrastructure for mobilization and commercial shops. Henceforth, occupiers deterritorialized the city's infrastructure and then reterritorialized it into their public space. Besides this [de] [re] territorialisation of the physical, and afterward, public space, occupiers reinterpreted these practices in the virtual public space. Fearing that the government would shut down the Internet as it happened in the Arab Spring in 2011, occupiers used the mobile app "FireChat," which works with Bluetooth and requires a maximum distance of 65 meters between the sender and the receiver. In less than a week, the app had more than 5.1 million chat rooms and during the peak point of the protests, it was downloaded half a million times, registering 37,000 mobiles using it at the time.45 This virtual condition generated a corporal approach much closer between occupiers, initiating a new active spatial common dynamic in both public spaces, the physical and virtual [the contemporary public space], which breed a relation for the new socio-spatial makers.

Radical is spatialized when there is a radical coding, a temporality, and experience spatial practice within the existing structure. Likewise, the spatial symbols of the occupations distinct between 'institutional public spaces' and 'insurgent public spaces.' It transforms quotidian actions into dissident ones with spatial experiences beyond the intents of its design or beyond the boundaries of the re-appropriation. Furthermore, the occupation shares a creative inclusive pre-figurative structure where the 'path is the destination,' towards the mobilization of radicality. The mobilization in this spatiality means that the act of experiencing and practicing the city with a dissident approach is an essential factor for the commons, while the idea of mobilization is essentially derived from the general idea of collectivity. According to David Niven (Niven 2004) the essence of mobilization is to conceive the fact that access to information increases and raises participation within cognitive and behavioural context. It opens opportunities to share ideas, strategies, tactics and practices involving movement, producing a public space that brings mobilization of data, information, objects, resources, knowledge and technology. Dissident bodies and the contemporary public space work as one-body in an urban assembly practice, turning space

into a resonance initiation of radicality. It forms a rhizome, a decentred, horizontal, multi-sited assemblage of innumerable focal points connected with each other in space and time.

Throughout the making of the radical spatiality, another spatial situation is visible, which shifts the meaning of experiencing spatial practices, and sets one of the most important parameters that affect directly to the production of architectural urban landscape design. OWS occupied Zuccotti Park, a POPS [Privately Owned Public Space], spaces born from the bonus plaza program that give allowances for extra floors atop new buildings in exchange of creating and managing public spaces. Since 2011, this regulation became popular in different cities, affecting the production of public space in the contemporary city, for what this situation is explored in the following chapter.

Thus, the radical spatiality is a non-binary relation of private and public, inside and outside, architecture and social science, the one or the other; it is instead a continuum that manifests itself in a plane of resilient simultaneities. Ad-hoc architecture and dissident architectural practices provide conditions that diagnose processes of becomings and reterritorialisation of obsolete urban dynamics. Rem Koolhaas claims that public sphere has withered away or perished. However, he is not talking about a specific urban landscape that becomes obsolete, in its place it is more about the cultural and political practice over it: the practice of freedom, political, personal, and collective. The spatialization of the radical does not recover the cultural, spatial and life loss, but settles all the conditions for the reinvention [not the creation] of them. The radical spatiality is experienced in an evolving time-space that David Harvey suggests as time and space shrinking simultaneously. Lefebvre on the other hand, discusses how the scheme of urban forms is the most immediate and concrete way of forming a city (Lefebvre 1996). This point allows people to produce their own social conditions: the meeting of different elements countenances the focus of design-make. It means empowering the everyday urban culture, actions and landscape, emboldening the radical spatiality for bodies to move freely by experiencing the space within a public sphere and processing culturally, a dissident architectural urban landscape. Nevertheless, the temporality and continuity of this spatiality depends on temporal inside actions and interactions. The discontinuity, arhythm, shock, and disturbance act as an urban narrative that produces design practices as the spatialization of radicality. Radical spatiality is the becomings, exploring, making, practising, failing, reinventing, temporal but continuously. It is a spatial designing practice that projects the architectural urban landscape in the contemporary public space.
CHAPTER V.
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CHAPTER V. POST-RADICAL SPATIALITY

The space of the commons differs from both public and private space. Public and private spaces entail institutionalized relations between people and things, regulated by the state: public property is maintained by the state and private property is guaranteed by it. Sometimes this form of government operates by maintaining the distinction between public and private spaces, and sometimes by blurring them. The endless privatization of public space is mirrored by the incessant intrusion of public agents into the private domain, both constituting useful techniques of government control.

Al-Mashà, The Return to the Common

¿What makes public space public?
Currently, it is certainly difficult to have one definition to answer this question. It is possible to say whether a space is public or private in terms of legislation, property, physical aspects, open or restrictive use, normative, collective imagination, appropriation, virtual, and so on. In any case, public and private space cannot be described only in Cartesian terms anymore.

5.1 The legal legacy

5.1.1 Privately Owned Public Spaces - POPS

The privatization of the public land is a concept that was born in 1961 in New York. However, the public only generally knew it when OWS occupied Zuccotti Park, a privately owned park. Places like the Hong Kong’s HSBC Plaza, Taipei’s 101 Tower, Paternoster Square in London, City Square in Melbourne, Zuccotti Park in New York, Liverpool One in Liverpool, to mention a few, are public spaces of private property, and expose a global chain of hybrid spaces with inconsistent nexus of public and private domains. The urban regulations that allow privatizing legally the public land are known as "Privately Owned Public Spaces."

Privately Owned Public Spaces - (from now onwards POPS)
1. A plaza, arcade, or other outdoor or indoor space provided for public use by a private office or residential building owner in return for a zoning concession.
2. A type of public space characterized by the combination of private ownership and zoning-specified public use.
3. One of 525 or so plazas, urban plazas, residential plazas, public plazas, elevated plazas, arcades, through block arcades, through block gallerias, through block connections, covered pedestrian spaces, sidewalk widenings, open air concourses, or other privately owned public
spaces specifically defined by New York City’s Zoning Resolution and accompanying legal instruments.

4. Law’s oxymoronic invention

_APOPS, Advocates for Privately Owned Public Space^1_

During the early 1900s, the industrial revolution set up a series of construction systems that allowed building higher skyscrapers. In New York, there was a critical reaction to the construction of buildings that blocked light and air to reach the ground floor. In a parallel operation, there was a kind of competition to grasp the tallest building in this city, in a sense because there were no restrictions or regulations besides the limits of construction systems (Img. 1). The 120 Broadway, also known as the Equitable Building (Img. 2) located in lower Manhattan, was a 41-floor office building completed in 1915. Its design was bulky and its walls rose uninterruptedly, however its sidewalks were only 1.5 meters wide. Due to the lack of relationship with the city, this design provoked concerns in citizens and planners. Thus, the New York's Planning Commission wrote the first urban regulation, the “Zoning Resolution” in 1916, which was the first one of its kind in the United States. This resolution regulated height district rules in buildings' mass and specified that buildings' design should consider the urban context. Although, these rules were not specific or technical, which generated a vague set of design parameters. This Zoning Resolution implied that if the building covered no more than ¼ parts of the whole plot, there were no height restrictions because it was assumed it would be slim and tall, without interfering with light and air to reach the ground level (Jerold S. Kayden 2000). Nevertheless, this initial regulation pointed at the height of buildings, not the conditions to relate to the urban context; hence, most of the projects covered their plots completely without open spaces. This situation changed when the Seagram Building was completed in 1958 (Img. 3). Mies van der Rohe’s iconic building became a model not only for architectural design but also for implementing urban regulations in the construction sector. One of the intentions of Mies van der Rohe was to connect the building with the city; thus, in a gesture of setting back the building 100 feet (30.48 meters) from the street edge, he designed an open plaza, attracting people to use it as a public space. This design distanced the building from the conventional New York urban morphology when Mies van der Rohe placed an in-between space at the entry of the building, and connecting this way the skyscraper to the city. Three years later, in 1961, the New York City enacted a general revision to its former 1916 Zoning Resolution, this time including the Seagram's design parameters, which became popular among local residents, critics, urban planners, architects, private investors, and local authorities. In this occasion, the Zoning Resolution offered incentives for developers if they included in their projects the “Privately Owned Public Spaces.” This agreement between the local government and private developers, influenced the development of the cityscape for the following decades (Img. 4).

^1_APOPS, Advocates for Privately Owned Public Space. http://apops.mas.org/about/
It represents a giant stride forward in the City’s efforts to meet the compelling problems imposed by a modern metropolis. It frees the City from the shackles of the past as embodied by the old code. The City’s first Zoning Resolution, passed in 1916 and hailed as a pioneering achievement then, had become hopelessly inadequate. Complicated by a three-map system with more than 2,500 map and text amendments, and antique and unwieldy provisions, it impeded rather than encouraged logical planning progress. It failed to provide a rational guide to the growth and future development of the City, and equally serious, failed to protect existing development from encroachment by incompatible or undesirable uses. A great number of new uses and new problems have come into being since the passage of the 1916 Resolution. Modern construction
techniques and a multitude of new materials have been developed. The automobile has demonstrated an insatiable appetite for space – for parking, for highways, for garaging – in an era when our old zoning code was hitched to the horse and buggy. The demands of these technological and social changes have been met by the new Resolution. Moreover, because of its rational structure, the Resolution will be easy to amend in order to meet the needs of the future. The new Resolution, for example, specifically makes provision for the inclusion of new uses in appropriate Districts as they come into existence.


This resolution introduced the concept of incentive zoning by adding a bonus of extra floor space, with the purpose to encourage private developers to incorporate open and publicly accessed spaces into their projects.

A Floor Area Ratio (FAR) defined the total floor area that a building could have in a specific zoning lot in relation to the area of the building plot.

---

2 Henri Bollmann, New York Map Guide, 1963. One of the greatest cartographic feats of all time, this 1963 axonometric (‘bird’s eye view’) map of New York City was the first such since 1866. The technique dates back to the 15th century, and developed in Germany into a fully flowered cartographic art form called Vogelschaukarten in Germany in the 1800s. Herman Bollmann prepared this particular map for the 1864 New York World’s Fair, where it was sold at information and tourist kiosks. In making the map in the 1950s, Herman Bollmann and his staff faced a seemingly insurmountable problem, one never before encountered by his few predecessors in axonometric cartography: how to show New York’s many and densely concentrated skyscrapers from the same angle and relative height, while not obscuring most of the city behind them? He and his team designed and built special cameras to take 67,000 photos, 17,000 from the air. Using these photos as a base, they then began to hand draw the entire city. Using then-secret cartographic techniques, Bollmann and team managed to depict the smallest details while simultaneously conveying the city’s soaring, vertiginous beauty. The viewer is thus placed in the position of an Olympian God, a perspective that no other technologic and artistic form offers, even in the Internet age: with this map spread out before you, you have the ability to look upon any part of the city at will, down to its smallest detail, without waiting for a camera to pan or zoom or cut, without waiting for the next web page to load or zoom. Via Geographicushttp://www.geographicus.com/P/AntiqueMap/NewYorkGuide-bollmann-1963
Floor area ratio = (total covered area on all floors of all buildings on a certain plot, gross floor area) / (area of the plot)

If private developers applied for POPS, they were rewarded with up to 10 sq. m. of FAR bonus for their buildings, with a limit of 20% in building size. The regulation was successful; almost every building built from the 1960s to the 1970s included the POPS amendment in their design. The local government required POPS to be open and accessible 24 hours a day, to include a sign indicating their state as POPS, which has to be mounted on a wall or a permanent free-standing post within 1.5 meters of the sidewalk, its centre 1.5 meter above the elevation of the nearest walkable pavement (Img. 5), and made of concrete or metal.

![OPEN TO PUBLIC](img)

Img. 5 Sample entry plate of POPS known as the “broccoli.”

During the following years, the Zoning Resolution was constantly updated in design and requirements sections. It added the permissible height of plazas above and below an abutting sidewalk, movable chairs and fixed benches, a minimum number of trees, and planter ledges, to mention a few. Nevertheless, during the 1970s crises, the City Hall took some decisions related to the Zoning Resolution in order to reactivate the city’s economy. It soft some regulations such as giving to developers special permissions to have higher densities in their constructions, to have more built-area, less environment requirements, less restrictions in designs, and faster procedures in processes reviews. In 1980s, there appeared again bulkier buildings, and by the 1990s, the Zoning Regulation was very complex and difficult to understand even for specialized lawyers (Kayden 2000).

To deal with this situation, Jerold Kayden, the New York City Department of Planning, and the Municipal Art Society, collaborated together in a research about POPS created from 1961 to 2000. It resulted in the book “Privately Owned Public Space: the New York Experience,” which indicates their legislation, data, use, and design. In numbers, the research quantifies 503 POPS, in a covered area of 300,000 sq. m. – nearly the 10% of Central Park area and a media of 1,400 sq. m.; 3% of this area is qualified as space for people from inside and outside the neighbourhood, 13% is categorized
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3 Jerold Kayden, professor of Urban Planning and Design at the Harvard University Graduate School of Design. He served as Co-Chair of the Department of Urban Planning and Design and as Director of the Master in Urban Planning Degree Program.
as a neighbourhood space, 21% as hiatus space for brief stopovers, and 18% works only for mobilizing as pedestrian circulation. 41% of the total area is described as marginal spaces “without any measurable public use” (Kayden 2000). There are also POPS that are not necessarily created but are maintained and preserved by private entities, or if a building has an indoor space, it is used for the public. By doing so, the developer is entitled to apply for tax benefits. The publication also specifies that by 2000, New York City granted over six million sq.m of additional floor area to developers, whereof nearly five million sq.m were built [a similar built area of the Empire State building].

_Location_

The Img. 6 presents that most of the POPS are located in Manhattan, specifically in Wall Street and Upper East Side. The reason is the basic mechanism of the Zoning Resolution: the reliance on the market attracted developers to build more offices or residential buildings where the demand is higher, in this case, mostly in Manhattan. Meanwhile in other areas of the city where the demand is limited or reduced in profit for developers, POPS simply do not exist. Consequently, it alters first, and then transforms, the architectural urban landscape of the city.
“Design Controls” refer mainly to ways of having light and air reaching the ground floor. In 2007, the City Council included an amendment related to design and operational standards for POPS, being the biggest renewing on the urban regulations since 1961. For instance, a plaza is defined as a space accessible to the public at all times, not less than 3 meters deep measured from the front lot line, not at any point more than 1.5 meter above, and not more than 3.65 meters below the current level of the joining the street.

The public plaza shall contain an area of not less than 2000 sq. feet (...). Any non-bonus open area located adjacent to a public plaza, other than an open area bounding, a street line used for pedestrian access, must either:

a) be separated from the public plaza by a buffer, such as a wall, decorative fence, or opaque plantings at least six feet in height; or

b) meet all requirements for minor portions of ‘public plazas’ related to size, configuration, orientation, as specified in section 37-716.4

![Image of POPS in New York. 155 East 29th Street](http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/planning/download/pdf/plans/pops/zoning_text_proposal_2009_02_09.pdf)

It indicated that these places need permissible heights above and below abutting sidewalks, movable chairs and fixed benches, a minimum of number of trees, planter ledges, and hard materials for most of the surfaces. About seating, the Zoning Resolution designates that at least 50% of linear feet of fixed seating, have to back at least 35 cm high and a maximum seat depth of 50 cm. Walls located adjacent to a seating surface do not count as seat backs. All seat backs must either be contoured in form for comfort or be reclined from vertical between 10 to 15 degrees. Moveable chairs shall not be chained, fixed, or otherwise secured. However, they could be removed during the night-time hours from 9:00 pm to 7:00 am.5

---

4 Annex 4
5.1.2 The Nomosphere and the nomospheric OWS

David Delaney's work "Nomospheric Investigations," [re]conceptualises the field of law and space, and proposes a coherent analysis about how practical intertwining are accomplished and transformed (Delaney 2010). He projects this articulation in Lefebvre's conception of space, constituting the realm of the legal and the spatial into what he denominates as the nomosphere.

Nomosphere refers to "the cultural material environs that are constituted by the reciprocal materialization of 'the legal', and the legal signification of the socio-spatial, and the practical, performative engagements through which such constitutive moments happen and unfold" (Delaney 2010).

Take, for example, law’s many material locations – the guarded precincts where what law there is, is everyday announced and imparted, reminded-of and applied, dutifully taught and dutifully learned, keenly catalogued and attentively researched or, else, professionally illustrated and then dearly made available. Take, in other words, our tribunals, courts, prisons, police stations, universities, law schools, law libraries, archives, law firms, etc. These precincts are seen to rise (as physical constructions) or develop (as institutional places) in Space. Consider, too, law’s innumerable people - the people by whom the law is said to be represented and, each time, given a name, a face and a voice – the name, face and voice of the thousand legal practitioners, judges, law, professors, law students, inmates, etc. who live, breathe and work in the West. They too are usually seen to occupy or be surrounded by, each time, this or that particular fraction of linear, measurable, calculable Space - this or that building, this or that subjective place (the place of a subject “like them”), or his or that office or bench (the place generated by a particular institutional context) – a space, moreover, with which or my or may not come across one day during our own everyday activities. Take, finally, law’s almost infinite web of legal instructions (rules, regulations, offices, judgments, procedures principles, concepts, etc.), which, they too, are to be found (or so it appears) in Space. Accordingly, in space as legal places law’s many material locations, people and instructions invoke and evoke the (legal) evidence of a neutral, universal equivalence (the equivalence between Space and the places that they are), as well as contextually suggesting what, from now on, the essence of each (legal) place should be dutifully taken to be.

(Stramignoni 2004)

The immersion on Lefebvre's spatial conception conforms a unity between physical, mental, and social space, while the nomosphere as a singularity, or in terms of its more specific or localized components, is irreducibly discursive, performative and material. It exists in the ever-shifting interplay among legal signifiers, material locations, things, and socio-spatial forms that mediate embodied practices (Munro 2012). Borders, checkpoints, prisons, colonies, empires, camps,
municipalities, and so on, show a jurisdiction and governance of this kind of spaces. Thus, it is necessary to differentiate the legal from the nomic. The first one refers formally to law, while nomic is understood as “the dimension of social order and ordering implicated by normatively inflected, world-constituting rules (nomic traces) with reference to which social power is constellated or finds worldly expressions. Such rules may be tacit or explicit, informal or formal” (Munro 2012). Both Delaney and Munro observe that the ‘parcelization’ of legality and spatiality is still fragmented, for what they need to be transversal. Legality is seen in a more material term and space in a more legal mode, which is a platform that embeds an interdisciplinary morphology.

David Delaney entices the socio-spatial notion as “one point of entry from which to initiate nomospheric investigations” (Delaney 2010), for what the OWS archievent is considered to understand the transformation of a temporal architectural urban landscape. During the evolution of this archievent, the everyday aspect implies a certain urgency or problematic in occupiers. They can refer to any scale, from the microscopic to the global, and embracing the location as a set of circumstances (Munro 2012), it “implies an active involvement of being and the world, it implies a dynamic of co-constitutively through which being [experience] and world are jointly made up or happen” (Delaney 2010). It can be an occurrence that shatters ordinary life, a radical spatiality that transforms collective experiences. Thus, the nomospheric dissidence in which conflicts present nomic situations are forced to actively comply or transgress.

Our situations are never conditioned by the workings of nomosphericity as (variously) imagined, materialized and lived. You are always either “home” or “not home”, “in public” or not. You are always in some state or subject to some jurisdiction. Are you ever outside of the international? (Delaney 2010)

In this sense, Zuccotti Park presents itself as an oxymoron.6 OWS reclaimed literally and symbolically the public in a private place (Sassen 2011), and display an irony of the occupied use of Zuccotti Park once called "Liberty Plaza" (Mendieta 2011). Elaborating symbolism, Mendieta argues that to occupy can only mean to re-occupy a space that was formerly public but sold to a real estate developer. To occupy means to reclaim what belongs properly to the public sphere. On the other hand, Peter Marcuse notes that in a city as dense as New York, there are few spaces where citizens can gather to learn, discuss, and confront issues of public matters,7 thus OWS converted a concrete park into a public square. The appropriation of Zuccotti Park is a rejection of the routines of corporate life in the city, presenting another layer of the blurred legislation about urban regulations and public spaces. The archievent illustrates that POPS are not really public, they are semi-public or
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quasi-public, controlled by landlords and determined who could have access or not to these spaces. During the occupation, OWS illustrated how citizens granted the ideal of public space, a place to express openly, to create and be part of assemblies, free entertainment, public speech [i.e., the Speaker’s Corner in Hyde Park, London], and challenged their commercial state [i.e., Spanish terrazas].

5.2 Transformation of the architectural urban landscape

5.2.1 From Tahrir Square to New Cairo

Land property in Egypt
In 1952, the Egyptian State implanted a land reform that changed the structure of land property. During that time, less than 6% of Egypt’s population owned more than 65% of the land, and less than 0.5% owned more than one-third of all fertile land. Owners charged high rents with an average of 75% of the income generated by rented land, thus, the president in turn Muhammad Naguih, installed in September 1952 the Law No. 178, which limited land holdings to 200 feddans (84 hectares) per person. Owners were entitled to transfer up to 100 feddans (42 hectares) to their non-adult children and to sell the remains in the open market. In 1961, a new law of land reduced the limit to 100 feddans per individual and 200 feddans per household. In total, 15% of Egypt’s agricultural land was affected. By the end of the 1960s, about 80% of land was officially redistributed with full rights to 318,000 small farmers (17% of families depended on agriculture); 25% of them owned between one and five feddans. The ceiling remained at 200 feddans per family, and the measures brought no benefits to landless or holders for less than 1 feddan. The law did not fully achieve its objectives since many large landowners managed, usually illegally, to keep possession of estates exceeding the limits. Under Mubarak’s regime, one in ten Egyptians lost their farms, and by 1990s, self-sustained farmer families became landless sharecroppers or migrated to cities. Instead, military officials were appointed as regional governors, village chiefs and put in charge of state-run companies. The military undertook land expropriations and started to run companies and factories [mainly in agriculture and construction]. Mubarak implemented further reforms alongside United States Agency for International Development [USAID] and the World Bank, and by 1991, he signed the Economic Restructuring and Adjustment Program with the International Monetary Fund [IMF], which liberated trade and prices, privatization, and labour

9 BeshirSakr, PhanjofTarcir, The 1952 land reform (Le Monde Diplomatique, 2007)
https://mondediplo.com/2007/10/10reform
10 Roy Prosterman, Egypt’s landless have no love for Mubarak (The Guardian, 8 February 2011)
flexibility, and removed several social safety net measures. These reforms resulted in an extensive dispossession of small farmers and a further alliance between economic and military political elites.

This privatization program led to an unprecedented plundering of national economy to a small elite. “Out of 314 state-run companies, 209 were privatized by 2005. The number of workers employed by public sector companies was cut in half between 1994 and 2001. The IMF praised the privatization program in 2006 for having surpassed expectations.” Only the 8% of land was registered, which meant that acquiring property was very difficult while governmental use of land was not part of official records. The land regulation monopolized by a small elite was followed by an endless list of rules and restriction. By 2010, very few people could afford to buy a piece of land and for those who wanted to build a house or to cultivate, needed a lease on land without receiving a title of property. In this situation, from 1998 to 2010, there were registered between 3,400 and 4,000 strikes that involved around 4 million workers. In 2006 there were 266 strikes, the following year 614 rallies, and 1,900 in 2009. These demonstrations were consolidating the energy for the 2011 Revolution.

Privatization of the architectural urban landscape – military

After the 2011 Revolution, the city's landscape started a process of militarization. Between 2011 and 2013 around Tahrir Square, there were continuous strikes that somehow formed a battlefield, which initiated a temporal mechanism that altered daily activities and spaces into stages or urban warfare. Concrete walls were placed and blocked mobility and congregation of people (Img. 8). There were metal fences on sidewalks, police stations, watchtowers, new monuments and statues in squares and parks, military hotels, administrative and companies’ buildings and even military training grounds (Elshahed 2015). These elements took the role of a militarized architecture that framed social interactions through movements. The architect and urban planner Omar Nagati, indicates that these walls are a post-revolutionary spatial renegotiation between people and authorities: “people are setting the terms and authorities are just responding by building walls” (Malsin 2013).

The walling created a buffer zone where barriers, barricades, tanks, walls, wires, army controlled zones, soldiers, protestors, government buildings, streets, and so on, composed a phenomenon that altered people and spaces’ behaviours. It fragmented Tahrir area in two spatialities: a regulated area and a conflict zone. Tahrir became an archipelago of militarized architecture where every
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Footnotes:

14 Joel Beinin, Egyptian Workers and January 25th: A Social Movement in Historical Context (Social Research Vol. 79, No 2, Summer 2012)
element was part of a battlefield. In November 2013, President Morsi passed a law that banned any form of public demonstration, and put under curfew Egypt’s major urban centres from 7:00pm for public security. According to Amnesty International, this law threatens freedom of assembly and grants unrestricted allowance to use force, including lethal force against demonstrators. With this law, the Minister of Interior and governors could declare public spaces out of limits to protest, including zones that surrounds presidential palaces, parliaments, ministries, diplomatic missions and embassies, court buildings, hospitals, prisons, police stations or points, military zones and heritage sites. In addition, if people wanted to protest, they needed to obtain five different permissions before they were allowed to gather in public, overnight sit-ins were banned, and gatherings of 10 people or more were immediately sanctioned.

![Img. 8 Egyptian army engineers and soldiers build a third line of concrete blocks outside the presidential palace in Cairo, 9 December 2012](image8.png)

![Img. 9 Tahrir Walls](image9.png)

15 The author made a field research in which, through interviews, observation and investigation, could identify certain aspects of this urban model in Cairo.
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Simultaneously, in the outskirts of the city, the government was using a different urban development strategy with the intention to build a new Egypt's capital. In 2008, the master plan “Cairo Vision 2050,” known as the dubaization model, followed the vision of other global cities’ projects such as Tokyo 2050, Sydney 2030, Paris 2020, London 2020, and Singapore 2050. By using the slogan “Global... Green... Connected,” the project bases on redistributing a significant part of the Greater Cairo Region's population in order to lower the capital's density (2050 2008). With Arab Emirates funding, this project presented a city centre filled with skyscrapers, green open areas, and bulky buildings (Img. 10). However, after the 2011 Revolution, the plan “Cairo 2050” was dismissed by the General Organization for Physical Planning (GOPP) (Tadamun 2014).

But it was the 2013 occupation in Gezi/Taksim the motif that provokes in Egyptians a possible new uprising in Tahrir Square. Therefore, the government closed officially the “Cairo 2050” project. However, two years later in March 2015, President Fattah al-Sissi announced the construction of a new capital city. Investing £30bn, this 700-sq. km. project (unnamed but commonly called “The New Capital”) included 21 residential districts, 1,250 mosques and churches, 1.1 million houses, artificial lakes, about 2000 educational institutions, a technology park, 663 medical centres, and 40,000 hotel rooms (Img. 11). This project meant the construction of an entire city by using private investment and following POPS regulations. This project is currently under construction. It has an area similar in size to Singapore, an airport bigger than London Heathrow, a park double the size of New York's Central Park, and a theme park four times as big as Disneyland, and it is expected to be completed in ten years (Cairo 2015). Nezar al-Sayyad, Professor of Architecture, Planning, Urban Design and Urban History at University of California, Berkeley, compared this plan to other similar projects such as Brasilia, Islamabad, and Canberra, and concludes it is farcical and fails to
achieve any prerequisite of success (Ibrahim 2015). In addition, David Sims, urban planner based in Cairo, told The Guardian that the plan was ludicrous:

The scale is huge, and there is questions like ¿how are they going to build the infrastructure? ¿How are they going to get water? ¿How will they move all the governmental buildings? In other words, I think it’s just desperation. It will be interesting to see if anything comes of it, but rather doubt it.
(Kingsley 2015)

Nezar al-Sayyad pointed that during the official presentation, some images presented in Cairo were taken from the project “Marin Bay Sands and Gardens” in Singapore, they were not even authentic. Thus, the 2011 Revolution brought two different urban, economical and legal interventions on Cairo: one is a city centre controlled by the army [concrete walls, metal fences, watchtowers], and one that intends to create a private-funded new capital city.

![Img. 12 Egypt's new capital to be situated east of New Cairo. Source: thecapitalcairo.com](image)

### 5.2.2 Spatializing Occupying London

The Occupy Movement was a decentralized and horizontal social multi structure materialized in the public space [physical and virtual] that activated new dynamics in the public sphere, a phenomenon that was quickly extended around the world. Nevertheless, in London the situation was particularly different from other Occupy protests. When the movement started to emerge, it was rapidly controlled, not by authorities but by private security guards. Protesters intended to sit-in Paternoster Square, the outside plaza of the London Stock Exchange building, located in the City, but they could not enter. The reason: the square was a private property.

The creation of Paternoster Square revealed a promiscuity of changing hands’ owners for more than twenty years. In 1980s, the city started a plan to demolish all the post-war buildings. At that time, the plaza was property of the Church Commissioners but in 1985, the Mountleigh Group took
a 250-year lease on the core of the site and organised an urban planning competition (Glancey 2003). The square, located adjacent to the north side of St Paul’s Cathedral in the City of London, was bombed in 1942 and re-built in 1961. Because of its symbolism, location, and history, the competition brought worldwide recognized architectures firms to the scene such as Richard Rogers, Norman Foster, Arata Isozaki, Richard MacCormac, James Stirling, Arup Associates and Skidmore Owings & Merrill. Arup's postmodern project won the competition although the Prince of Wales Charles and his ten-architect team presented a new project: a neoclassical concrete structure with an underground shopping mall. However, the Prince’s idea and Arup’s project were revoked. As the public was drizzling in ideas, the project was pointed to William Whitfield, a British architect, who designed the current curate’s egg (Img. 13).

Paternoster Square [from the Latin pater noster: Our Father] is surrounded by a mass of offices and bulky buildings where Whitfield designated two styles: classicists and modernists. These buildings are hulking: six and seven-floor high, with colonnades on the ground level and finishes in a mix of bricks and stones. The pedestrian alleys that lead to Ave Maria Lane are narrow, and there are classical-lite shops, flats, and offices; this pedestrian precinct invokes displacement, not permanence. There is a general use of stone, and lacks of water supply, vegetation spots, or comfortable seating. By 2003, the project was completed with an investment of £120 millions and
currently belongs to Mitsubishi Estate Co. (Img. 14). Anecdotally, it was repeatedly described as a ‘public space’ when it was under construction. In the fall of 2011, the owners of Paternoster Square were able to issue a court injunction that banned protesters to use the square for protests as they felt the threat of a new OWS or Arab Spring (Koksal 2015). Immediately, a sign was placed in the main access to the Square, which reads (Img. 15):

Paternoster Square is private land. Any licence to the public to enter or cross this land is revoked forthwith. There is no implied or express permission to enter the premises or any part without consent.

Any such entry will constitute a trespass. Limited consent is hereby given, but can be revoked at any time, for entry on the accessible parts of the square, solely for access to the offices, retail units and leisure premises for genuine building, retail and leisure purposes. Visitors must at all times comply with the directions given by our security personal.

Nonetheless, protesters did find a space to occupy in the City: a small triangular plot outside St. Paul’s Cathedral, yet it was not a truly public space as it belongs to the Church of England and the Corporation of London. Occupy London thwarted intention to occupy Paternoster Square proved the power corporations have in London, especially when regulating and deciding what, how, who and when the square could be used.

During the last years, London has transferred nearly one million sq. m. [an area of seventy-football pitches] of public areas to private investors. The latest POPS in this city is the “Granary Square” project (Img. 16), which was opened to the public in 2012 and is considered one of the biggest publicly accessed spaces in Europe (27 hectares) and in London since Trafalgar Square in 1845.23 Designed by Townshend Landscape Architects, this project is part of the master plan “King’s Cross Central,” is managed by a private estate of 10 plazas and parkland near the rail hub (Cross 2015). At the entrance, the welcoming sign says: “Welcome to King’s Cross. Please enjoy this private estate properly.” At the centre of the square, there are 4 banks of fountains that correspond to the size of the building in front, “the Cubitt,” and the channels next to the plaza contain individual jets that are programmed individually. The plaza includes restaurants, pubs, café shops, while the open space host festivals, concerts, and expositions. Thus, the design programme addresses a certain group of activities that are mainly commercial.

In recent years, large parts of Britain’s cities have been redeveloped as privately owned estates, extending corporate control over public spaces. Some of the consequences of this privatization of public land are the creation of new spaces characterised by high-security, defensible architecture, and strict rules and regulations that conduct particular behaviours.

Cycling, skateboarding, and inline skating are often banned, so are busking and selling goods, filming, taking photographs and any kind of political protest. In 2014, an urban law passed through the UK Parliament. The law “Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing” (Kingdom 2014) 24 tackles a wide range of issues and gives to local authorities the power to make Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs), to control access to open spaces. This law includes new Gating Orders [fencing public spaces], which could be applied to any public space. It gives to PSPO owners the authority to determine and restrict access under the articles 10 and 11 of the European Convention on Human

---

23 King’s Cross, Granary Square, https://www.kingscross.co.uk/granary-square
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Rights. 25 A dispersal power allows the police to remove any individual or group of people from a locality for up to 48 hours, and to confiscate property that has been used or is likely to be used in an activity that harasses, alarms or distresses a member of the public. These legal statements fusion in one-body to authorities and private investors as an association to pressure the aspect and use of these spaces.

5.3 Post-occupation architectural urban landscape

5.3.1 Post – POPS. New York

The Lincoln Center Atrium in New York, the “David Rubenstein Atrium,” a POPS re-designed by the architects TWBTA in 2009, and serves mainly as a ticketing facility for the Lincoln Center. In the official website, it describes the place as:26

- A vibrant community-gathering place to linger in and enjoy, with plenty of places to sit
- A venue for free weekly performances
- A resource for discount tickets to available Lincoln Center performances
- Food service from Chef Tom Colicchio’s witchcraft café

(1) A local authority may make a public spaces protection order if satisfied on reasonable grounds that two conditions are met.
(2) The first condition is that—
(a) activities carried on in a public place within the authority’s area have had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, or
(b) it is likely that activities will be carried on in a public place within that area and that they will have such an effect.
(3) The second condition is that the effect, or likely effect, of the activities—
(a) is, or is likely to be, of a persistent or continuing nature,
(b) is, or is likely to be, such as to make the activities unreasonable, and
(c) justifies the restrictions imposed by the notice.
(4) A public spaces protection order is an order that identifies the public place referred to in subsection (2) (“the restricted area”) and—
(a) prohibits specified things being done in the restricted area,
(b) requires specified things to be done by persons carrying on specified activities in that area, or
(c) does both of those things.
(5) The only prohibitions or requirements that may be imposed are ones that are reasonable to impose in order—
(a) to prevent the detrimental effect referred to in subsection (2) from continuing, occurring or recurring, or
(b) to reduce that detrimental effect or to reduce the risk of its continuance, occurrence or recurrence.
(6) A prohibition or requirement may be framed—
(a) so as to apply to all persons, or only to persons in specified categories, or to all persons except those in specified categories;
(b) so as to apply at all times, or only at specified times, or at all times except those specified;
(c) so as to apply in all circumstances, or only in specified circumstances, or in all circumstances except those specified.
(7) A public spaces protection order must—
(a) identify the activities referred to in subsection (2);
(b) explain the effect of section 63 (where it applies) and section 67;
(c) specify the period for which the order has effect.
(8) A public spaces protection order must be published in accordance with regulations made by the Secretary of State.

Before the re-design and construction of the David Rubenstein Atrium, there was "The Harmony Atrium," a City Council property as a public space. It was an indoor public space that extended from Broadway to Columbus Avenue between 62nd and 63rd streets. It attracted many people who used its rocks-climbing wall and also homeless people sought shelter during winter especially. For the new project, the architects TWBTA expressed their desire to create a hot spot outside the Lincoln Center, where people could buy a day-of-show ticket and-or sip a cup coffee or a cocktail before or after the Center performances. Tom Dunn, director of the David Rubenstein Atrium, indicated that the project was a "true urban oasis, a theatrical garden that's got these wonderful architectural signature items, 25-foot-high vertical gardens, floor to ceiling fountains, and a 97-foot-long installation in felt by the Dutch textile artist Claudy Jongstra – all designed to be a welcoming space for the public."\(^{27}\) The Atrium project was part of the $1.2 billion Lincoln Center redevelopment and has an area of 650 square meters\(^ {28}\) (Img. 17). People who assist to the Centre’s performances, mainly visitors and tourists, use currently The Atrium\(^ {29}\).

This project stratifies both use and people that are allow to be in this space. It is a situation that reflects how architectural design and urban regulations work as a system of exclusion and fragmentation. Hence, the power that multitudes and public spaces showed since 2011 incited the creation of POPS and an increment of regulations in more cities across the world. Facing the fact


\(^{29}\) In a visit to The Lincoln Center in 2012, I decided to spend one day and night at the Atrium. The space was used by freelancers but mainly tourists and people that stopped there for a drink, to get tickets for the Centre’s performances or exhibitions, or to meet people before entering to the Centre. After talking to waiters, bartenders and security guards, they said - among other things - there have not been issues with homeless people or any spontaneous action that could be violent or uncomfortable. However, they said sometimes there have been performances that involved art, music, or dance.
that local governments lack of enough budget to provide and manage public spaces, they have been systematically adjusting these regulations in their urban development plans.

In the position of a private developer, the rational is simple: the value of the incentive is equal or exceeds the cost of providing public space (Kayden 2000). This financial mechanism incentives and attracts private developers because it gives more built area [the higher the building, the more expensive the property is on upper floors], offers taxes benefits, and offers the building an open space that also increases their properties value. Large parts of capital cities are redeveloped as privately owned estates, extending corporate control over squares and thoroughfares. As the Occupy Movement highlighted, private owners can refuse the right of entry to members of the public, closing off swaths of the city and promoting instead, passive activities: “at times when you are not working or shopping, you may go to restaurants or attend to a show or sport’s spectacle.”

Consequently, there is very little space to do spontaneous activities in current cities. This oxymoronic POPS state blurs the space as public.

Before the occupation in Zuccotti Park, mostly local workers used the place during morning early hours, evening and lunch rush hours, speeding the movement to-from work. The design incentivized passive activities such as sitting or walking through, without leaving any chance to do spontaneous and flexible activities, resulting in an over-designed pseudo-public space. Besides these conditions of spatial control, POPS added another aspect: private security. In this sense, private figures decide who and how could be in these spaces, combining in one body architectural urban design and urban regulations. The POPS owners’ association implemented a legal document called “Rules of Conduct” is 2007, indicating which activities are permissible and prohibited. However, after OWS archievent, this document was reviewed in 2012 [the last version dates to 13th August 2015] ensuing consequently in exhaustive catalogues of conduct. This document contains provisions about design and content of POPS.

A “Rule of Conduct” sign shall not prohibit behaviours that are consistent with the normal public use of the public plaza such as lingering, eating, drinking of non-alcoholic beverages or gathering in small groups. No behaviours, actions, or items may be listed on such sign that are otherwise illegal or prohibited by municipal, State, or Federal Laws.

(Kayden 2000)

Rules of Conduct signs specify prohibitions in four categories: movement (i.e. no skateboarding); sound (i.e. no radio-playing); illegal activity (i.e. no distribution of controlled substances); and use of space (i.e. no sleeping). These signs express a view of public space as a refugee from urban life

rather than a place of social engagement, a situation that Jerold Kayden highlights as a contradiction to the origins of POPS. In the 1958 Zoning Resolution draft, there was a matter-of-factly that recites the rationale for incentivizing public space through zoning:

In order to bring more light and air into the streets surrounded by tall buildings, as well as to create **more usable open space**, a bonus device has been established to encourage the setting back of buildings from the street line.

(Planning 2015)

In the original bonus agreement of 1961, the regulation dealt with plazas in front of buildings, in connection with the Corbusian model of the *tower in the park*, vexed by contextualists and their street-wall model. According to the City's own analysis, the Zoning Resolution never expressly defined which limits the owners could enforce, if any, upon public use. Thus, one of the aims of the new Rules of Conduct was to remove the condition that POPS have to be open and accessible by the public at all times. In addition, they ban 'loitering' and forbid congregations of a large number of people. In this regard, the Real Estate of New York is reportedly preparing to ask the city to endorse universally applicable rules prohibiting future OWS-style use of public space, coming together with the right to close these spaces at night (Img. 18). Some of the new regulations are the following:

- **No camping or erection of tents**
  During OWS occupation, this article started to circulate in the Urban Department of New York. Nowadays, this regulation is part of different cities' urban plans.

- **No Snoozing in Public**
  Most cities have an anti-camping ordinance that prohibits camping or sleeping in public spaces, particularly public parks. They were used before to avoid an image of homeless people using these spaces during nights.

- **No umbrellas**
  The Umbrella Revolution in 2014 turned the umbrella [object] in a symbol of defiance and resistance. Consequently, local governments prohibited the erection of permanent or semi-permanent structures such as tents, tarps, and umbrellas. In Seattle, these urban regulations determine that people cannot have an umbrella open unless they are standing or walking and holding it, otherwise they are considered structures, for what they could be confiscated.

- **No Open Flames**
  The *burn ban* generally applies to outdoor cooking like grilling in POPS.

- **No lying down on the ground or on benches**
  These activities are currently considered as a criminal offense that can result in a fine of $50 in the United States, or up to €300 in Spain. In addition, the city council
of Honolulu spent about $11,000 removing benches and installing stools (Lockton 2008).

- **No tarps or sleeping bags**
  Because OWS started the occupation with the use of these elements, they are currently prohibited.

- **No obstructing the Pedestrian Walkway**
  In New York it is called “impeding pedestrian traffic.”

- **No Private Belongings in Public Space**
  Chicago’s spur-of-the-moment version of San Francisco’s sit-lie law applies to the private belongings of protesters. Occupy Chicago website alerted activists with the plan “Occupy Chicago, Phase 2 – Mobilization,” by saying that every item needs to be completely mobile.

- **Unaffordable Fees**
  The city of Dallas, Texas, demanded that Occupy Dallas fork up to $1 million for liability insurance if they want to keep their permit and continue occupying Pioneer Plaza.

- **No Potties**
  It is one of the most direct regulations against the Occupy Movement, to avoid bringing a Porta-Potty.

- **No Masks**
  This regulation prohibits masked gatherings of two people or more, with the exception of masquerade balls, although it does not apply to Carnivals or Halloween.

- **Mass Arrests, Excessive Force**
  When OWS protesters crossed Brooklyn Bridge, the police arrested over seven hundred people including journalists. The purpose is to scare protesters and those who are considering joining the movement, galvanized protester’s solidarity (Khalek 2011).

These new Rules of Conduct and Zoning Regulation, seek to sanction protesters and involve them in a complex system of laws, regulations and civil ordinances. It is a softer repression that locates protesters in a bureaucratic tether. Hence, should POPS owners be allowed to prohibit the use of these spaces by organized large groups? Are passive activities like quiet conversations or sharing lunchtime the only approved behaviours? POPS were meant to create and contribute meaningful life to the city, not only by assuring that those spaces are provided as legally promised, but also by encouraging improvements, activities, and public educational opportunities.
5.3.2 Reconfiguration of the architectural urban landscape

Zuccotti Park in New York, Tahrir Square in Cairo, Gezi Park in Istanbul, Puerta del Sol in Madrid, Paternoster Square in London, HSBC Plaza in Hong Kong, Euromaidan in Kiev, 101 Tower in Taipei, City Square in Melbourne, Syntagma Square in Athens. This endless list shows different spaces that befit catalyst factors when taking decisions about the transformation of the architectural urban landscape. The contemporary occupations [the Occupy Movement, Indignados, the Arab Spring] are a strong force for changing the global urban landscape physically, virtually and legally. They bring to light the little discussion and knowledge that there are about how public spaces should be in the contemporary city, but they also show a blurred-to-public fact: these achievements display a noiseless stabilized situation over the public sphere, the privatization of public spaces.

The city is in a progressive privatization when facing the fact that local governments do not have the money to provide, create or maintain public spaces. However, that situation does not represent a problem, there are POPS well designed that respond to people’s needs. Nevertheless, these cases are more exceptional than common. The co-production of public spaces that incorporate private actors is a phenomenon that is increasingly being established in urban centres of global cities [referring to Saskia Sassen’s “The Global Street”]. Progressively, cities are scenarios of ready-made public spaces: “it is instead a global corporate subject. The situation enforces innovation by people and communities, even if they do not necessarily become powerful in the process, they produce components of a city” (Sassen 2015). City planning has become adept at the delivery of high quality public realm as part of large-scale private developments combining office, retail, residential and leisure: they all need public spaces. The planning system has not caught up with the fact that these POPS are often subject to private management private requirements, leading them to pursue control of public areas and to apply codes of conduct.
POPS so different and distant as San Francisco or Hong Kong have similar physical components and
design parameters that compose the urban landscape in a worldwide homogeneous landscape.
Developers use a copy-paste strategy from New York’s POPS without attending the local needs and
contexts. Local history, stories, planning culture, actor networks, and spatial conditions have not
been taken into account when designing and locating POPS; instead, there is a replication of use:
fixed chairs and tables, granite pavement, certain number of trees, bushes on perimeters, long rows
of concrete, or stone benches. In addition, private security, the excess of CCTV cameras, and fences,
are elements that include security connotations for controlling the space and people’s behaviour
(Img. 19). The consequences of multiplying and expanding POPS affect from the personal psyche to
the ability of protest, they make people feel too monitored and controlled, they eradicate most of
the possible collective spontaneous actions and allow communal activities to unfold. In this regard,
David Harvey indicates that “the freedom to make and remake our cities and ourselves is (...) one of
the most precious yet most neglected of our human rights” (Harvey 2012).

![POPS in different cities](image)

Public space is defined not only by being publicly owned and funded but also by its public use.
Susan Chin, Executive Director, Design Trust for Public Space, New York. *Putting Public
Space in its Place*. Graduate School of Design, Harvard University

Public place means any place to which the public or any section of the public has access, on
payment or otherwise, as of right or by virtue of express or implied permission.
Anti-social Behaviour, *Crime and Policing Act 2014*, United Kingdom
Civic spaces, leisure spaces, or simply functional spaces have either an important or discrete role in the development of cities, however public spaces are the ones that transform themselves in tools of urban politics with a much wider significance (Carmona 2015). In this sense, Jordi Borja (Borja 2002) indicates that the definitional principle of public space is not that much its juridical nature [public or private property] but its sociological [use and conditions of access]. There are buildings of public property to which the public cannot have access while other of private property are used by the public. Thus, it could be said that public space in contemporary cities relies on is its access, referring to the degree of access granted to "outsiders."

This spatio-social-legal framework is relevant in the conception of a public space, merging in the same plane with POPS. Hence, definition helps but does not reconcile the public space. Privatized public spaces are an example of the eviction from the public, and the modification of the historic meaning of the city. Therefore, POPS' regulations transform the architectural urban landscape. It is simple, what was small and-or public, and is currently becoming large and private. Small properties, local shops, public parks and square are crossed by large shopping malls, commerce chains, high-value housing, and so on. This homogeneous architectural urban landscape addresses a certain group of people: consumers. Generally, POPS are identical for using grey seats, fixed tables, puny birch, espaliered trees, long rows of dark granite benches or mini amphitheatres and stairs. Gradually, new different flanks open as they do not meet the requirements of the contemporary city. In fact, several important questions challenge the current status of this landscape. ¿Who should design public spaces of cities? ¿Which are the potentials that should generate public urban architecture? ¿Should public spaces be design? ¿How could a public space be measured as an accurate public space? ¿Could the private sector participate in the provision of public spaces without losing the genuine sense of public? ¿Do these spaces depend on the achievements of democracy and social equality on the availability of urban public spaces? ¿Is it possible to universalize the features that a public space should take no matter where they are located? ¿Are the temporary and informal public spaces the ones that propose an innovative use of the city? Whether a public space is of public or private ownership, it must serve to the city and inhabitants. Moreover, whether there is a space for public protest or not, it does not mean there is a factor in urban design because protestors take places, they do not go to places that are designed for such purpose. However, it is important that citizens have the possibility to enact their right to protest or gather in an assembly. In order to make softer the control and surveillance over public spaces, stones, bricks, towers, chains, plastic cones, riot police vans, are replaced by flower planting, sentry boxes, benches, bollards, CCTV cameras, one-way systems, open Wi-Fi connection, and so on. Through a three-party collaboration, the RIBA [Royal Institute of British Architects], the Home Office, and the National Counter Terrorism Security Office, published a counterterrorism guide in October 2011 [one month after OWS occupied Zuccotti Park]. This document called "RIBA guidance on designing for counter-terrorism," addresses to architects and planner to consider
different design parameters in their projects as minimum requirements for the future architecture of protection:

Clear lines of sight around the building, absence of recesses on façades or elevations, materials as reinforced concrete, especial and resistant glazed façades, uncluttered street furniture, orientating the building so that it overlooks public space [usually POPS] to support informal oversight by those who use and visit the location, well-managed access points and reception facilities, external barriers and-or a strengthened perimeter to prevent access to the facility, to limit secondary fragmentation, avoidance of hiding places around buildings and within façade arrangements, any pedestrian and vehicle gates to be compatible with the robustness of the remainder of the perimeter.

These solutions discourage people from lingering but welcome if they engage commercially. Thus, the modern building style of concrete blocks [bunker style] has been replaced by discrete elements that cover the space of surveillance and control. Thus, these designing parameters do not only include architectural and urban design but also an insertion of legal regulations. In London, after the local 2011 riots and global occupations, new and more restricted and controlled regulations and guidelines were updated as part of the "Protection of Freedoms Act 2012." Restricting the movement of vehicles and tracking people’s movement and behaviour are some of the main aims of this regulation. It includes a range of less obtrusive barrier techniques that avoid considerably walls, ditches, water features, and slopes. Instead, it promotes the use of bollards and movable bathroom cabins, elements that are usually ubiquitous, cheap, flexible and easy to deploy. This new designing set permits a slender visual strategy: shallower foundations, temporal structures that could sink in the ground when not in use, bollards can be disguised as picnic tables, balustrade walls, waste bins, flower tubs, plant holders and so on.


5.4 Extrapolation of privatized public spaces post-occupation. Tokyo

Saskia Sassen in her book “The Shifting Meaning of the Urban Condition,” she indicates that in order to develop an urbanism that is the equivalent to the open source urbanism, architectural practices are the ones that can face the urban problematic and its unusual spaces (Sassen 2006). By detecting, creating, intervening, and making, temporal architectural practices could develop common spatial tools that extrapolate the activation of post-public spaces. Erik Swyngedouw calls for a “reworking [of] the ‘creative’ city as agonistic urban space rather than limiting creativity to the musings of the creative class” (Swyngedouw 2009). It is a reconceptualization of how architectural design of public spaces should be and accommodate heterogeneous approaches and uses. In this situation, the post-public space is presented itself as a generator of publicness: the simultaneous production of contemporary public spaces that involve and transcend technical decisions and design, financing and management. It operates at a variety of scales that overlap and intersect in order to create a mosaic of spaces in a multi-layered space: physically, virtually, legally, and politically.

The generation of a common spatiality in current cities is altering the conception of public space. This is possible due to the virtual era in which data collection and access to information could be instant, transforming the relationships between people and spaces. The contemporary occupations have shown that there is an enormous desire and need of people to gather in physical public spaces, but also to represent, share and activate different actions and places in the virtual public space like Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, to mention few. These occupations have provoked some changes in the processes and development of public spaces, stimulating their privatization. After the production of these occupations, local governments have applied extensively the urban regulation “Privately Owned Public Space” [POPS], with a special emphasis to avoid - physically and legally - any attempt of the public to sit-in and occupy public spaces. Cities like New York, London, Cairo, Madrid, Seattle, Santiago de Chile, Tokyo and so on, have pushed this regulation during the last five years, allowing private investors to design, build, manage and regulate these spaces. In their design, many of these POPS do not necessarily fulfil local needs, respond to local context, dynamics or history; instead, there is an application of a ready-made designing formula that generates a homogeneous and fragmented architectural urban landscape, especially in city centres where the cost of land is more expensive. Parks, squares, streets, and sometimes entire neighbourhoods, take more and more an analogous form in which the commercialization, and the spatial and social control, are consistent conditions. In this sense, Tokyo is presented as a platform where the privatization of public spaces is extrapolated to every layer and level of the city, in large part due to the next 2020 Olympic Games. This event presents an opportunity to prepare the ground for a large-scale transformation, not only of the physical and aesthetic aspects of the city, but also of urban regulations and spatial functions. This modification of the architectural urban landscape
produces an image that brings in turn an emotional impact inside and outside the city through its public spaces.

Tokyo is a particular place in terms of contextualizing contemporary public spaces. Although, the concepts public and private are relatively new in Japan, they stretch their inclusion to the second half of the 20th century. While in the West, ‘public’ is a strong and powerful term due to its sense of empowerment, general access and availability to the community, and private of an individual or a particular group’s possession that is not open to the public, in Japan, these two terms have a different perception. Public in Japanese does not have a literal translation; hence this word has been integrated into Japanese language as paburikku,32 meaning something that is related to the public domain. The equivalent Japanese meaning of public-private would be uchi-soto. Uchi means 1) inside, 2) house or home, 3) group, and 4) wife or husband; while soto means 1) outside, 2) outdoors, 3) other groups, 4) outside the home, anything outside the uchi.33 This division reflects the Japanese dichotomy between the inside and outside, more like intimacy and community, rather than public and private (Img. 22).

At the same time, however, the areas of the city (e.g. chome) from another kind of insider group beyond which is another outside. While these latter suggestions may show a measure of ambiguity (the street may be ‘outside’ of the plot but inside of the uchi), it is no more so than is common to most aspects of Japanese life. In fact, what we have are layers of (positive) insides and (conceptually empty) outsides.34

In Japan, the term “public space” does not have a direct or unique understanding and representation, becoming a flexible conception that could be adapted to different contexts. In the first part of the 21st century, the capital presents subjectivities of a variety of public spaces in a similar set of privatised public spaces. This scenario is identified in “global cities,”35 where the most powerful force is the global property market, leading the urban design development.

![Image 22 Public-private (uchi-soto) street relationship, Tokyo](image)

32 Paburikku is a katakana word, which is a script used for foreign words in Japanese language.
34 Ibid
Matthew Carmona, Professor of Planning and Urban Design at UCL’s Bartlett School of Planning, and Filipa Matos Wunderlich, Lecturer in Urban Design at the same university, reveal in “Capital Cities,” how London’s public spaces have changed since the late 1980s due to the intervention of the capital realm (Carmona & Wunderlich, 2012). Streets, plazas, and entire neighbourhoods have been created or modified driven by private interests: Canary Wharf in the Docklands, Paternoster Square in the City, Stratford and the Olympic Villa, all these areas have received private funding for their development, attaching consequently the figure of ‘products.’ This model creates a process of expansion for corporate spaces more than for public spaces since they include, most of the time, only a commercial and market feature. However, Carmona and Freeman identify a possible way to successfully integrate commercial characteristics with the surroundings, though these cases in London involve an extensive control of spaces and people. If for market these decisions are made upon rational thought to serve private requirements, the objectives of urban design follow the privatized role.

### 5.4.1 Occupying Shinjuku Station

To measure a public space in this scenario of privatization is a matter of economic return on property investment. Buildings that offer this kind of corporate public space to the city whilst retaining property and management, set-up detailed parameters of aesthetic and functional standardization that in addition, take greater control over the public sphere. Thus, the potential users of these spaces are a specific group of people: consumers. Loukaitou-Sideris and Banerjee in “Urban Design Downtown: Poetics and Politics of Form” (Loukaitou-Sideris and Banerjee 1998), argue that this mode of design cuts off the space, it fragments and separates, which in turn can be easily controlled. Nonetheless, shifting the public space into a corporate space in order to avoid potential protests or social gatherings, is a designing tool that has been applied for decades. One of the most illustrative examples is Shinjuku Station, the busiest station in the world, currently a commercial complex and once the stage for one of the biggest social protests and occupations in Tokyo.

In the spring of 1969, the “Folk Guerrilla” was a movement of students and activists that occupied the West and East exits of Shinjuku railway station for about five months; they carried out Anpo protests (over the Japan – U.S. security treaty) and anti-Vietnam War. In February that year, thousands of people occupied the large open space on the west exit lower level of the station, known as Shinjuku Plaza, and performed debates, meetings, concerts, speeches, artistic

---

36 According to the Guinness Records, in 2011, Shinjuku Station was categorized as the busiest station in the world. With an average of 3.64 million passengers per day and over 200 exits, it serves to Tokyo’s western suburbs via intercity, commuter rail and metro lines to the centre of the city. Source: http://www.guinnessworldrecords.com/world-records/busiest-station/
performances, clashes with the police, dances, group discussions, built-up barricades, temporary encampments, gatherings, and sit-ins (Img. 23). These collective actions formed an aesthetic political movement that transformed the station from being only a transport hub into a living agora. The occupation generated an agora that striated the urban fabric, redrawing simultaneously the boundaries between the public and the private. During the development of the protests, daily life continued around the station, workers kept commuting and shops opened regularly, though many passers-by stopped and joined the gatherings, collaborating many times with demonstrators. But most of the cases, they just shouted at protesters for interrupting the local order and not claiming specific demands (Andrews 2014).

At that time, Shinjuku Plaza was a complex multi-level net of roadways, railways, bus terminal, parking lot, transit points, and mezzanine levels, completed in the late 1966. The project was envisioned as part of the Metabolist movement and precursor of the Osaka Expo (Img. 24). The round form and the sense of plaza acted as generators of Shinjuku's agora, where the "Folk guerrilla" was a blending fiction because it merged utopia and spatial praxis at the same time. There was a search for a new spatial praxis embodied through an emotional connection in the community, directly influenced by other protests like May 68 in Paris, the student protest in Seoul, the global anti-Vietnam war and the feminist movements in the United States and Europe. At the pick point of the protest, more than 7,000 people joined the occupation (Andrews 2014), connecting collective spatial practices to ideology and utopia. It was a temporal reinvention of the public space that at the same time rediscovered the city limits, possibilities and potentials of bodies in the public space (Img 25).

The occupation was officially evicted on 26th July 1969, followed by an immediate transformation of the station towards one more controlled and eventually, programmed. In Ouchida's film "Underground Plaza," a documentary about the Folk guerrilla, one of the last scenes is a view of the plaza with dozens of policemen making announcements on loudspeakers: "Don't stop, keep moving. Don't stop, keep moving."

After the occupation, the was a project to redevelop Shinjuku Station area as a master plan, which removed pedestrianized shopping streets [forcing out homeless], and the fountain stopped running. The result was a more multifarious commercial network of buildings. Its current state is very complex system of paths, staircases, and ramps, while its exits lead to major commercial zones in the outside, inside, underground and upper floors of the station. The place for transit and commuting is always in movement, while the mega shopping areas are the only places for staying (Img. 26).

37 Keiya Ouchida, director of the film '69 Hari-aik Chika Hiroba ('69 Spring-Autumn Underground Plaza) and also known as Chika Hiroba (Underground Plaza), was a documentary about the "Folk guerrilla" protests in Shinjuku Station. It was first shown in public in 1970 in black and white.
5.4.2 Public space privatized. Miyashita Park

Miyashita Park is one of the few green open areas in Shibuya Ward, a commercial, entertaining, fashion, and business district that brings thousands of people every day. In Shibuya Station, the second busiest station in the world, 1.2 million people commute daily in Tokyu Toyoko Line, an average of 3 million people at the entire station, and up to 3,000 people walking through “Shibuya Crossing” every time the traffic light turns red. It is a complex and multifaceted structure that operates 24 hours a day where movement and efficiency are critical points. Miyashita Park is located 350 meters away from Shibuya Station, turning it into a very attractive spot.


In 2008, a representative of Nike Japan contacted Yoshiharu Tsukamoto, founder of the architectural studio “Atelier Bow-Bow,” and requested to redesign the existent park, after the studio released the book “Made in Tokyo” that same year (Img. 27). Some of the design conditions were that the park should follow a sports theme, include equipment for rock-climbing, skating ramps, dancing floor and two futsal courts. In addition, Nike indicated that it was necessary to pay fees to use the sport facilities, which was approved by the Shibuya Ward: futsal field ¥4000-7000/1h (approx. $30), skateboard park ¥200/2h (approx. $2.00), and climbing wall ¥350/2h (approx. $3.00). The park had to be closed during night-time hours, from 22:30 to 8:30, and finally, to change the name of the park to “Nike Miyashita Park.” The construction cost was $4 millions, with public and private funds, turning the project into a Public-Private-Partnership (PPP). On 30th April 2011, the 14,000m² park was reopened to the public.

The location of the park provokes it to be an “interstitial” space: on the west side, there are the Yamanote and Saikyo’s railway lines, and on the opposite side there is a six-lane avenue. It is 330 meters long and 25 meters wide average, and is elevated one floor as there is a parking lot on the ground floor. In order to add a climbing wall and a skateboarding park, Atelier Bow-Bow expanded 1.50m to all sides over its structural limit, which was destined for circulation and concrete benches (Img. 28). The studio wanted to preserve some remnants of the park, so they reused some of the old concrete walls to build some tables, connected the park to the street level through two staircases and one lift.

Tokyo City Council created Miyashita Park in 1930. It was placed in-between Meiji Street, Yamanote Line, Udagawa River and Shibuya River, in “Miyashita-machi.” After the Second World War, the park had to be reassembled and the area around was greatly developed, but it continued being a resident neighbourhood (Img. 29). In 1966, a law changed the resident use of the area and replaced the name of Miyashita Town to Shibuya. Because of the 1964 Olympics, the park was rebuilt all at

---

41 Shibuya City Office, “Refurbishing of Miyashita Park at Shibuya City.”
once (Img. 30). Japan’s economy improved during the 1960s, increasing the number of cars on streets; thus, Shibuya Ward decided to put a street-level parking and elevate the park one floor, converting it into an ‘airborne park’ and resulting in an interstitial space. This decision, as locals said, caused the real transformation of the park: people had to climb some stairs, big trees and the vegetation was leafy in its perimeter, reason why people started referring to it as kobayashi (small forest). During the 1980s, Shibuya started to prosper as a commercial area, provoking the increment in tenant buildings. Soon, the residential layer disappeared and soared the land price to business and commerce, changing the number of residents in the area and bringing more temporal users (Img. 31). By the 1990s, the facility was old and neglected, and right after the Japanese economic crisis, as many people lost their houses, some of them started to assemble cardboard houses in the park (Img. 32).

In 2010, Shibuya Ward announced officially a program to help the homeless. They indicated that in 2004, there were around 105 people but this number decreased in 2009 to 30 due to welfare support services: “As of October 8, 2010, the last remaining homeless person in Miyashita Park has voluntarily moved to an alternative site.” Yet, in August 2009, the local police tried to evict over 50 homeless, which caused in clashes with local activists. Yuki Takahashi, manager of Shibuya Ward’s welfare section, indicated that “despite the effort the council has made to relocate the homeless, it has not been 100% effective.” In addition, when the renewal project and the plan to change the name of the park were made public, social groups restarted their campaign against the local government and Nike, with several demonstrations, protests and occupations, and claiming to reintegrate the homeless community in the park.

--

42 Ibid
The dissident park

Fence in the park and lock the doors overnight. You can’t call that a park.

Mendosugiru, blogger. Hima ni makasete

In William Andrews’ book “Dissenting Japan” (Andrews 2016), he explores the dissident character of the Japanese society, disrupting the country’s overview of being “harmonious” and “peaceful.” In the introduction, Andrews takes a journey through Japan’s history emphasising on the post-war time, especially during the 1960s and 1970s, and reveals how students and militant groups produced a general dissident and disobedient state in Tokyo. He indicates that Japan has been historically a conflictive country, and references to the most famous heroes in the Japanese culture, like the rōnin of the Chūshingura. In this Japanese narrative, failure is admired because it involves transparency, sincerity, and fight against adversity (Andrews 2016). Andrews relates it to the protests “Narita International Airport” in 1966, the “Folk Guerrilla” rallies in Shinjuku in 1969, and the “Shibuya riot” in 1971.

In the 1970s, Miyashita Park was the base for demonstrations and gatherings alongside Meiji Park and Shimizuya Park. After the three big catastrophes of 2011: Tōhoku-Kantō earthquake, tsunami

44 The story of the Chūshingura, known in the West as “The Forty-Seven rōnin” is considered a master legend in Japan. It is a group of samurai who were left masterless in 1701, for assaulting a court official whom he felt had insulted him. They succeeded in avenging their master by killing the court official. Although they had committed murder, they had done so in obedience to their duty. As a result, they were allowed an honourable death.
of 11 March, and the Fukushima nuclear crisis, social movements started rising again with general protests and demonstrations, some of them taking place in Miyashita Park. The anti-nuclear power and anti-government demonstrations bound social movement in the streets and open areas, an activism that exposed the hole of the tranquil Japanese society, with public rebellions, demonstrations, protests and occupations.

This dissident character formed a state of protest in the park. Thus, from March to September 2010, people occupied the park protesting against Nike's privatization, an action that activists called "Nikefication." One of the main actions was the consolidation of the social movement “Coalition to Protect Miyashita Park from Becoming Nike Park” in 2008, which consequently created “Artist-in-Residence,” a physical and virtual platform to occupy the park, perform art activities, and generate communal spaces. Many other activist groups from Tokyo and around the country joined this movement and sparked protests around the city, causing a resonance of the occupation. Some of the banners that the group set-up included political and disobedient content against Nike, such like “Nike, don’t steal Miyashita Park,” “the Park is ours” or “Don’t do it” (Img. 33). These protests took place simultaneously in the virtual space, through social networks like YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, and “A.I.R. Miyashita Park” and "Minnanokouenn" blogs. These platforms mobilized people and resources, organized events, coordinated protests, and made the occupation and protests bigger, which attracted the mass media and consequently, the movement became a city’s political matter.

One of the radical images of the movement was the street performance "Fashion Parade" parody, in which protesters, men mainly, walked on their underwear alongside the homeless community from Miyashita Park to Nike’s headquarters in Ginza. During the six-month sit-in, artists, activists and homeless used this space in several ways: to protests, to prevent the eviction of the park, and to perform artistic and community activities. The park was filled with dolls, banners, sculptures, umbrellas, tents, shoes, and many other objects that attached new uses, a situation that was possible only through dissident collective actions. Bicycle wheels were turned into mechanisms that rotated banners; suitcases served as mobile speakers; clothing racks were converted into small shrines; chairs were turned into bookshelves; plastic cones became speakers; blankets were part of greenhouse structures; cords were turned into hammocks; ladders functioned as info desks; umbrellas formed part of the performance stage; benches served as clothing racks; and lamps served as ornamental racks. The backside of a futsal pitch was turned into a 'ghetto' garden. The park's entrance was turned into an art workshop and was filled with paintings and sculptures made of cardboard, fabric, sunglasses, wooden sticks, plastic bottles, and bricks. The playground became a dance floor and next to it, an assembly room was filled with anime and action figures. In addition, there was a common kitchen, a stage on which to play music, an outdoor cinema, and an outdoor karaoke area. There were also spontaneous poetry readings.
Intermittency characterised this occupation, lasting from a couple of days to a couple of hours; serving the intimacy of Miyashita Park. This intimate community produced different *carnivalesque* public performances, events that became mechanisms to appropriate the space, which turned out to be alternative urban tools to produce other spaces. The occupation was the event that interrupted the established order settled by a non-social consensual state, reintegrating the dissidence character design to the park's interstitial feature, remarking the relationship between community and intimacy rather than public and private. This was the moment when the intimacy and the community acted as one body in space and time. This “chaotic” scenario was an opportunity to design new spaces that were performed as T.A.Z. Through a non-hierarchical system, information was the key structure for creating new territories, while dissident spatial practices generating an immediate action of adaptation of the park (Img. 34).

Simultaneously, A.I.R. Miyashita Park platform spawned a digital archive that documented the new spatiality. The radicalization of the objects sabotaged the conventional practices of designing public spaces, giving the chance to anyone to do it. The multiple interstitial layer-level in Miyashita Park “embraces not only such notions as openness, porosity, breach and relationship, but also those of process, transformation and location” (Lévesque 2001). This complex interpolation between the physical space, the aesthetic, the local history, the legislation, the perception of the space, and the personal and collective memory, stand as a mechanism that goes beyond the physical change of spaces. It allows moving around the construction of the urban landscape that in exchange includes different subjects within it. Six months after the beginning of the occupation and one week before the construction of the new project, the occupation was evicted and the park fenced off.
In September 2010, the police evicted the occupation and the month after, the renewal of the project started. Right after the reopening of the park, in April 2011, A.I.R. Miyashita Park sued Shibuya Ward in the Tokyo District Court, claiming that the homeless were treated harshly and that naming the park after Nike was unappropriated to locals. On 13th March 2015, the judge upheld the group's stance by saying that Nike and Shibuya government were neither transparent nor open. The group’s statements can be read as:45

1. According to the renovation plan, Miyashita Park will be converted to a park expressly for sports enthusiasts. This means that a highly public space which people have been able to freely and actively utilize up until now will be turned into a commercial space for the profit of one business. Persons who do not pay for using the park as a service, will be unable to even rest at the park. This will surely have a negative impact on society at large and generally the way in which people come together.

2. For many years, Miyashita Park has been known as a space where many citizens’ groups hold gatherings, or as a starting and ending point for local marches and events. Also, it has stood as life-saving place where many persons forced to live on the streets can stay. This plan would

unquestionably deprive groups and individuals of space for their freedom of expression, and for their daily lives.

3. This project has been forced onto the ward by Shibuya’s mayor and a number of assembly persons in a top-down manner. Neither the ward assembly nor the city planning council has been consulted, and almost no information can be found in materials that have been available to the public. Also, we would like to know how Nike came to be involved in this. Nike is a corporation that gave rise to the grave problem of child labor in a number of Asian countries, which reported instances of management beating and/or molesting workers. It is highly doubtful that Shibuya-ku has undergone democratic processes so as to adequately reflect the will of ward residents with regard to this plan.

Soon, some of the homeless reinstalled their tents and structures adjacent to the north and south sides of the park (Img. 35, Img. 36, Img. 37, and Img. 38).