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On the one hand, the historian or the man of action can proceed from ideas to men [...] But it is equally possible to follow this link in another direction, taking real life as the point of departure [...] In this way we can arrive at a criticism of life by ideas which in a sense extends and completes the first procedure.

— Lefebvre, Critique of Everyday Life, Volume One, p. 145.

This paper concerns two questions. One, Can the Critique of Everyday Life by Henri Lefebvre be read in terms of production (rather than consumption)? And, Can this reading provide the methodological basis of a historical practice as construction?

Through interpreting the early papers and volumes of Lefebvre’s work Critique of Everyday Life, it will be argued that a theory of production in general is developed that can be used as the basis of a specific theory of construction. The concept of ‘alienation’ is examined, particularly with regard to the relationship between concrete and abstract, and form and content, first explored by Lefebvre in Dialectical Materialism (1939). The paper will support a particular interpretation of alienation in Lefebvre by examining his use of the metaphor of the ‘seashell’ in ‘Notes on a New Town’ (1961) and Critique of Everyday Life, Volume Two (1961) in which Lefebvre treats production as a process of conflict resulting in abstraction and ‘concretion’.

This interpretation of Lefebvre’s critique is brought to bear on epistemological problems in the field of construction history, challenging the notion that construction is discursively neutral and contributes only to a material building process. Drawing on archival research concerned with the construction of the London South Bank in the period 1948–1951 the paper shows the extent to which construction practices and processes can be treated as the ‘real life’ available to critique by the ‘ideas’ that reflect it.

Nick Beech received an MSc Architectural History (with distinction) from the Bartlett School of Architecture in 2005. He has subsequently lectured and acted as invited critic at the Architectural Association, University of Nottingham, and Oxford Brookes University. He is a Teaching Fellow at the Bartlett and the University of Westminster. He recently (2007) organised the annual PhD Bartlett/Slade conference ‘Telling Places: Narrative and Identity in Art and Architecture’, and edited the special issue of Multi: The RIT Journal of Diversity and Plurality in Design (forthcoming) derived from that conference. He is currently researching his PhD ‘Everyday Production: Constructing the South Bank, 1948–1951’ at the Bartlett, for which he received a full-time AHRC Award (2006–9).
In April 2008, the future of the airport Tempelhof was put to the public vote in Berlin. Formally, the closure of the airport had already been decided in 1996: Tempelhof was not to jeopardise the future of the ‘Berlin Brandenburg International’ Airport at Schönefeld. The referendum was enforced by a coalition of the conservative party (CDU) and business elites, who wanted to keep Tempelhof open and managed to mobilise a considerable turnout. The campaign ‘For Tempelhof’ was mainly run on a nostalgic theme, repeating images of the past line, the Berlin Air Lift. It had, however, also an economic underpinning, playing with the promise of possible future jobs near the airport and Tempelhof as a gateway for business. The current city government, the green party and environmental citizens’ associations campaigned for the closure of the airport in 2008. At least on the part of the NGO, they focused on the question of who was profiting from the airport.

In this paper, I will analyse the conflict concerning Tempelhof Airport using the concepts of Lefebvre as they were reconstructed by Christian Schmid. Of the three interlinked aspects of the production of space—‘espace perçu’, ‘espace conçu’ and ‘espace vécu’—the third aspect is the source of a certain ambiguity in the interpretation. On the one hand, Schmid argues for a three-dimensional dialectics, according to which a transformation of social space should be possible through a shift in any of the aspects. On the other hand (and in line with other interpreters of Lefebvre), it is the ‘espace vécu’, the ‘lived space’, which is singled out as key to revolutionary change.

Focusing on this contradiction, I will conceptualise the struggle about Tempelhof with regard to the aspects of social space. It then becomes clear that the struggle covered all interlinked fields (the campaign against the airport brought the realm of spatial practice into the struggle) but focused on the third aspect, the meaning of Tempelhof for the people. This has to be understood as a struggle about affect—affect produced by a PR campaign, not developed in a lived experience. ‘Espace vécu’, therefore, can be interpreted as the space of affect, a space that allows for imagination, but that can be influenced and mobilised in urban struggles by the elite. By the business elites, Tempelhof was constructed through a free-floating nostalgia unconnected to spatial practice or representations of space. Tying the notion of affect into Lefebvre’s dialectics also helps to problematise the celebration of affect in recent cultural geography. ‘Espace vécu’, the space of affect, is not only a potential space of freedom, it is also a potential space of control.

Ulrich Best studied geography in Heidelberg and Berlin and received his PhD from the University of Plymouth. His research themes are urban politics, particularly urban identity politics, and issues of inclusion/exclusion. He worked on stigmatizing discourses in Berlin and neighbourhood policies and is currently working on a project that looks into the relation of Berlin maps with power and politics. A second research interest is international relations in Central and Eastern Europe. He teaches European Studies at TU Chemnitz.
In the introduction to the text submitted to the International Competition for the New Belgrade Urban Structure Improvement in 1986, the text's authors, Henri Lefebvre and architects Serge Renaudie and Pierre Guilbaud, state that socialism has not been capable of creating 'The Socialist City'. In the lines concluding this introduction, however, the authors claim that Yugoslavia, at the time still a socialist country, is "perhaps one of the rare countries to be able to concretely pose the problematic of a New Urban".

Taking these two propositions as its point of departure, this lecture will explore both paradigms, i.e., that of the socialist city and of the new urban, through looking at New Belgrade, a modern, functional city constructed in socialist Yugoslavia in the second half of the twentieth century. What were the outcomes of the socialist city paradigm in the planning and architecture of New Belgrade? Has Yugoslav socialism, as Lefebvre asks, produced a space of its own? Was the total space of a 'socialist society' conceived of as a ‘New Urban’ in New Belgrade?

The inquiry will focus on the critical analysis of the text and urban planning scheme put forward to the New Belgrade competition by Lefebvre, Renaudie and Guilbaud. In addition to its significance as a critique of functional city, and of the two planning paradigms which were deemed dominant in the 1980s, namely 'neo-rationalism', and 'post-modern historicism', this competition proposal calls for an analysis of its central thesis of the 'right to the city' for the concrete case of New Belgrade. The lecture will conclude with a discussion on the relevance of Lefebvre's theory for understanding the spatialisation of current processes of socio-political and economic transition in New Belgrade.

URBAN SPACE AND POLITICS: THE INSTRUMENTAL SPACE IN FRENCH ‘POLITIQUE DE LA VILLE’

This paper applies the Lefebvrean perspective to an analysis of the political actions on the city in France since the end of the ‘Glorious Thirties’. At that time urban space was characterized by Henri Lefebvre as a ‘political space’, that is to say as a support, instrument and stake of conflicting strategies and struggles. A focus on the questions of political representation of space and of urban ideology allows interrogating the instrumentality of urban space in political ideology: What is the strategic role of urban space? Do French contemporary political representations of space mobilize the city simply as an instrument of strategic and tactical changes in public policies or rather as something more fundamental?

The paper analyses the instrumental space in French political discourse and practice of the ‘politique de la ville’. It is the dialectics between the critique of space and the project of space—its representations and practices—which allows analyzing the instrumentality of space and studying the relations between space and politics. Thus, an analysis of the context which Lefebvre himself was a part of but which he was unable to analyse; and a study of concrete examples and projects in Paris and its suburbs, will open up a discussion about the impact that Lefebvre’s work, critical urban sociology, and criticism of urbanism have had on urban and social policies.

Grégory Busquet, geographer and sociologist, holds a PhD in urbanism. He completed the thesis Urban ideology and political thought in France between 1958–1981, at the Centre de Recherche sur l’Habitat (UMR CNRS LOUEST) where he is now a post-doctoral researcher. His current research activities deal with French ‘politique de la ville’ (ideology and practices), the genealogy of participatory democracy, and the relationships between town, housing and environment. He teaches urban sociology and town-planning at the School of Architecture of Paris-Val de Seine and has published several articles on Lefebvrian, situationist and “French new left” thinking on the city and urbanization.
Lefebvre’s triadic conception of conceived, perceived and lived space is at the heart of his spatial Marxism open to the creative and revolutionary possibilities in everyday life. His formulation contains an awareness of ‘biopolitics’—expertise, intervention and subjectivity with respect to the means of life—but always in relation to the politics of space, class, and state. I use Lefebvre to understand urban planning, habitation, sentiment and the remains of urban revolt through two neighbourhoods in Durban, South Africa, in their wider connections. As elsewhere, residents here wrestle with the jagged, discontinuous infrastructural remains of colonialism, segregation and apartheid. In a partitioned landscape in which language, historiography and party politics remains segregated, Lefebvre provides tools to question the spatial means through which people have sought to bridge diverse constituencies and tactics in daily life, and in activism. I explore the ways in which implicitly anti-racist intentions are compromised and challenged by racial infrastructure, but also the ways in which everyday life continues to provide resources for new biopolitical and spatial justice struggles for clean air, medicine, and adequate housing. These arenas of politics are simultaneously about spatial justice in the post-apartheid city, as well as about access to the means of life for all. The recent spate of xenophobic attacks against other African migrants to South Africa calls for a wide-angle lens to understand spatial biopolitics as a differentiated, fraught, and yet a crucial challenge, in Durban as elsewhere. Spatial biopolitics poses a Lefebvrean challenge to actual democratisation and decolonisation in contemporary South Africa. This Lefebvrean approach to biopolitics also challenges the spatial myopia of ‘alternative globalisation’ and ‘anti-neoliberal’ frameworks that cannot comprehend the effects of post-apartheid space, let alone the challenge of spatial justice that lies ahead.

Sharad Chari is a human geographer at the London School of Economics, and Honorary Research Fellow in Development Studies at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (ZA). He is the author of Fraternal Capital: Peasant-Workers, Self-Made Men, and Globalization in Provincial India (Stanford University Press, 2004), co-editor of The Development Reader (Routledge, 2008), and articles in Comparative Studies in Society and History, The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, The South Atlantic Quarterly and other journals. He is working on a monograph on spatial politics and the remains of racial capitalism and Apartheid in past and present Durban, South Africa.
This paper proceeds from the empirical observation that the dynamics of economic, social, political and cultural change in the contemporary world are increasingly shaped by the pursuit and promotion of capitalist competitiveness. We argue that Marx's Capital remains the most appropriate point of departure from which to understand and critique these dynamics; however, Marx's dialectic—which correctly, in our view, affords critical primacy to the question of time in capitalist social relations—can fruitfully be complemented by Lefebvre's work on space. The paper therefore affirms the essential continuities between the two thinkers' work and seeks to critique pervasive forms of ideology and state strategy through a mode of inquiry that is attuned to the contemporary politics of global competitiveness. The paper briefly engages with key policy and planning literatures which formally acknowledge the spatial determinants of competitiveness. It demonstrates the extent to which they are reflective of the content of actual policy design efforts involving close harmonization between organizations, such as the OECD, and national and regional governments; efforts reinforced through 'surveillance' of the latter by the former. The paper then focuses empirically on the global competitiveness strategies of key planning and policy agencies in Barcelona—strategies that have strong backing from agencies operating at the global level. Drawing upon Lefebvre's various polemics against planning, formalism and systemic rationality, we argue that such strategies derive from—and constitute—a form of urbanism which, when operationalised, betray the violence (understood both in abstract and concretely) inherent in the production of competitiveness. We demonstrate this using examples of city regeneration policies in the Barcelona metropolitan area and community-level responses to them, reflecting upon the continuing and synthetic relevance of Marx's critique of political economy and Lefebvre's critique of the production of space by means of conclusion.
GRENoble 1974: EUROCommUNISM Meets URBANISM

The divorce between Henri Lefebvre and the French Communist Party happened in the late 1950s, yet some of the ideas he developed in the realm of urbanism were to find their way into a transforming communist culture in the early 1970s. The most striking evidence of a new awareness of the city in the Party's discourse was the organization of a conference entitled Pour un urbanisme..., which took place in April 1974 in Grenoble, since 1965 a showcase for the Socialist Party's reformist urban policies. Under the aegis of the intellectual monthly La nouvelle critique, the conference assembled for the first and last time architects and planners, social scientists, elected officials and political activists, in order to frame a new policy no longer reducing the communist program to a purely economical realm. Although the Party was to return to a more sectarian attitude three years later, the Grenoble episode would leave lasting marks on a generation of intellectuals and architects, and has profoundly recast the attitudes of scores of the then still numerous communist mayors.

LEFEBVRE AND THE QUESTION OF CENTRALITY

Considering approaches towards urban centrality in different texts of Lefebvre—synthesized in phrases such as: “each globality is linked to the creation of a centrality” or “centrality is a form […] of gathering, meeting and simultaneity”—we try to put this theorization to the test: on the one hand as regards the sociological and political evolution of urban centers in France for 40 years, on the another as regards recent urban theories. More precisely, we will put the emphasis on Lefebvre’s modes of thinking, how they are able to take over disciplinary views, to link theory and practice in a perspective which combines Marxist paradigm and a theory of moments which bear resemblances to—what a paradox—Althusser’s considering random materialism in the 1980s.

Lefebvre is an intellectual crossing borders rather than an author considering in details a special field; he has written a great analysis of the production of space. Bearing this in mind, how can current researchers, partially embedded in the pragmatic turn, use this theory? How can they renounce it? Is it a tool box, a general frame, a manner of doing?

Laurent Devisme, born in 1972, is a researcher at the Laboratory for Architecture, Urbanism and Planning (LAUA) and is concerned with urban practices and languages. He teaches urban sociology, geography and planning (Nantes School of Architecture). His main research focuses on planning practices, urban theories and new metropolitan territories. He is author of Actualité de la pensée d’Henri Lefebvre à propos de la centralité (1998, MSV ed., University of Tours) and La ville décentrée. Figures centrales à l’épreuve des dynamiques urbaines (2005, L’Harmattan, Paris).
Lefebvre understands differential space as a critical register that is embedded in a sense of political and historical deviance from social norms. Therefore, the production of differential space entails not merely the reworking of life conditions for certain neglected locales, neither the appropriation of space entails merely survival practices. Rather, the production and appropriation of space amount to oppositional practices.

However, Lefebvre does not delineate the conditions and steps necessary to translate the production of space into transformative political power. Based on an empirical research of community gardens in New York City within Lefebvre’s framework of the production of space, this paper unearths the particular practices and processes entailed by the production of space of community gardens. The analysis of community gardens offers three dimensions of understanding. The first dimension unpacks the relations of production of the space of community gardens in New York City. The analysis of the space of community gardens is used here as a lens into macro processes and power relationships acting in the urban environment. The second dimension analyzes the space of community gardens as a differential space that takes the concrete form of the (modern) commons. It shows how such differential space is being produced, maintained and in turn affects the surrounding environment, and proposes some concrete insights into the ‘blind spots’ of the Lefebvrean framework. The third dimension supplements the analysis of urban political economy with an interdisciplinary analysis of political practices. It analyses the interaction of space with the political practices that take place in community gardens and shows how individual and collective spatial practices of “survival” are in effect being translated into politically charged consciousness and actions. The result, I suggest, is new urban subjects that are constantly engaged with the production of space and are in turn politicised.

Efrat Eizenberg is a research fellow at the Institute of Technology and Society, Tel Aviv University. She graduated from the Department of Environmental Psychology at the City University of New York in 2008. Her research interests include sustainable urban redevelopment, the politics of space, urban identities and the development of political consciousness, the production of space, and collective action.
LEFEBVRE'S USE OF SPACE IN THE PUBLIC PLACES OF CONTEMPORARY DOWNTOWN SÃO PAULO

This paper aims to explore the theoretical possibilities that Lefebvre’s conception of the use of space offers for a sociological characterisation of the social processes involved in the everyday uses of public streets and squares of contemporary downtown São Paulo. An important statement of Lefebvre’s theory on the production of space (1974) is the idea that the “use of the body”, the “practical basis” of “perceived space”, is mediated by the dialectic co-existence of space lived by the “lived body”, and of space conceived according to “body representations”. This framework makes it possible to characterise social life in the São Paulo downtown public places as a peculiar street society in social-historical terms. An ethnography of the different uses of the city’s political and symbolical main square, the Praça da Sé, between 9 am and 7 pm on weekdays—when this public place shelters an absolutely broad scope of simultaneous uses of space by passers-by, street vendors, homeless, policemen, street preachers, beggars, etc.—reveals a street society composed, in Lefebvrean terms, of the contradictory co-existence of “users” and “‘utilisers’”. On one hand, there are people who live space as a lived space (“unfavoured users” and “marginalised inhabitants”, who productively consume the amusement of space); on the other hand, people who productively consume the plus-value of space (“capitalist ‘utilisers’”). But there is also more than this—hence a theoretical conclusion one can draw from submitting Lefebvre’s use of space to contemporary São Paulo downtown reality: users utilising the public square, and utilisers using it—in situations of more or less tacit conflicts. This social-spatial reality can be traced back to social-historical cum cultural processes linked to the production of (public) space in São Paulo which are a heritage of the (only apparently) overcome slaveholding past of the 19th century.

Fraya Frehse (São Paulo, 1971), MA and PhD in Social Anthropology from the University of São Paulo (USP), is lecturer at USP’s Department of Sociology and associate researcher of its Núcleo de Antropologia Urbana. Since her undergraduate studies Frehse has used Lefebvre’s theories and method in sociological and anthropological research mainly on everyday life in the public spaces of downtown São Paulo. She is the author of O Tempo das Ruas na São Paulo de Fins do Império (2005), and has contributions in edited books and peer-reviewed journals in Brazil, the United States, France, Mexico and Portugal.
KEYNOTE SPEAKER

JEAN-PIERRE
GARNIER

Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS)
Paris, France

THE ‘URBAN REVOLUTION’ IN TIMES OF GLOBALIZATION:
BETWEEN DENIAL AND MISAPPROPRIATION

At the beginning of this new century, the work of Henri Lefebvre enjoys a paradoxical status among French intellectuals. This thinker had been considered—not in the least by the theorists and researchers studying and questioning the future of the city—as one of the major theoreticians aiming at “an understanding of the world in order to change it”. However, a look at the French intellectual scene could suggest that that his thinking is in no way relevant for an understanding of the evolution of contemporary urban societies, while the meaning of some of his formulations is twisted and misappropriated in order to legitimate the development of a world that is more than ever submitted to capitalism.

One would search in vain for an echo of Henri Lefebvre’s critique of the capitalist mode of spatialization in the writings of the majority of the French urban researchers. A silence which results, on the one hand, from a generalized doubt towards the “grand narratives that explain the world” and, on the other, from the “new and profound mutations of our societies” which made these narratives obsolete—including, supposedly, Lefebvre’s Marxist vision.

Against this background it is forgotten that, far from being outdated, a number of Lefebvre’s questions, hypotheses, and analyses anticipated with remarkable precision capitalism becoming worldwide and the world becoming capitalist. At the same time, several urban researchers popular in French academia today deserve a prominent place among what Lefebvre called “ideology”. Clearly, renowned French researchers and architects borrow from him—without mentioning his name—questions or concepts such as ‘the right to city’, ‘the right to difference’, ‘reappropriation of public space’, ‘the ludic’, ‘concrete utopia’, ‘the global’ [le mondial], ‘citizenship’ and even ‘the urban revolution’. Deprived of their initial meaning and thus void of any subversive content, they are, rather, used to celebrate the ‘new age’ of capitalist urbanization.

One has to question and study the specificity of the historical, sociological and political context which brought about this posthumous disaffection on the part of his compatriots.

Jean-Pierre Garnier is researcher at the Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS). Graduate of the Institut d’Études Politique de Paris, he obtained a doctorate in Urban Sociology and in City Planning. He worked in Urban Development and Planning departments in France and Cuba. He lectured at various universities and architecture schools. Supported by Marxian and libertarian theories, as well as his political involvement, his research focuses on the spatial forms of social domination. Among his numerous writings is his latest book Le nouvel ordre local. Gouverner la violence urbaine (1999).
HENRI LEBEVRE AND LOS ANGELES: URBAN SPACE, GLOBAL CAPITAL, AND THE MYSTIFIED CONSCIOUSNESS OF EVERYDAY LIFE

Los Angeles has figured prominently in various attempts to understand the contemporary city, especially with regard to the relations between image and reality of urban life in global capital. While many of these belonging to the so-called Los Angeles School have questioned the very distinction between image and reality, following Jean Baudrillard and kindred spirits, perspectives critical rather than symptomatic of what used to be called postmodernism have posed the question concerning the relationship of space to ideology in more researchable terms. Theoretically, highly suggestive among the latter has been Fredric Jameson’s adaptation of Kevin Lynch’s classic work *The Image of the City* into a Marxist problematic of ‘cognitive mapping’ or political consciousness. In my own contribution to these debates in the essay ‘The Urban Sensorium’ (*Anitpode* 37.1, 2005), I argued that Jameson’s path-breaking conception of cognitive mapping stands to benefit immensely from Henri Lefebvre’s pioneering work on urban experience and political consciousness in Los Angeles, which I carried out following the rebellious event inaugurated in that city in April 1992.

Kanishka Goonewardena was trained as an architect in Sri Lanka and now teaches urban design and critical theory at the University of Toronto. He is working on two books, *The Future of Planning at the “End of History”* and *The Urban Sensorium: Space, Ideology and the Aestheticization of Politics*, exploring cities, imperialism, and ideology.
LEFEBVRE, URBANISM, AND INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS

“What is specific about the approach of institutional analysis towards a reality of an institution is the aim to define this institution in a dialectical way and, first at all, to suggest its analysis based on an intervention. The institutional analysis is thus at the same time a theory and a practice of institution which is inscribed into the tradition of action-research.”

Remi Hess studied sociology and philosophy. He is professor of Sciences of Education at the University Paris 8—Saint Denis. He has extensively published about institutional analysis, sociology, education, anthropology of dance, philosophy, and sociology. He is editor of the books by Henri Lefebvre, and author of *Henri Lefebvre et l'aventure du siècle* (1988).
CITY FOR SALE: METROPOLIZATION IN PERIPHERAL CAPITALISM

To whom does the city belong? This question only superficially refers to the past when at least some of cities were in fact law-making, autonomous communities of citizens. Unlike in the past, the contemporary city is a random collection of individuals gathered in a space with no clear boundaries, the majority of whom have a weak sense of identification with the place of their — shorter or longer — residence. The residents of such a city are not citizens but merely users of space that has become a commodity. Taking Warsaw as an example, the paper shows the process of selling out the city space, which is driven by globalization and metropolization processes. The consequence of this is privatization and fragmentation of space leading to the evaporation of public space in the city.

Bohdan Jałowiecki is sociologist, full professor. He works at Warsaw School of Social Psychology and at the Centre for European Regional and Local Studies of Warsaw University. Head of UNESCO chair for Sustainable Development. Author of approximately 300 scientific works about the urban sociology and sociology of regional and local development. Visiting professor at Paris I University and at Paul Valéry University in Montpelier. Co-author of the master plan of Algiers (1970-74).
THE THIRD DIMENSION
PROJECTING URBAN SPACE

The problem of the city was regarded by urban theorists up to the 20th century as a problem of the urban surface, of the distribution of places on the ground. Helmholtz’s research into the physiology of the eye, his theories of vision, and ideas of the visual perception of space turned the attention during the late 19th century toward the spatial perception of art, architecture and the city and called for consequences in design. Shifts in the terminology of urban design show the recognition of the “third dimension” in the most concrete sense of shaping streets and squares as volumes (Sitte, Maertens, Brinckmann). However, the recognition of the spatial qualities of the city was soon juxtaposed with the notion of urban space as the projection of non-optical—e.g. social, political or economic—relations. A connection between the optical and non-optical concepts was established by Simmel’s theory of social forms as well as by the idea of the third dimension as “excavated” or “secreted” by an animal or social organism. This idea, which emerged already in the 19th century was taken up later in Edward T. Hall’s Proxemics (“Hidden Dimensions”) and influenced Lefebvre’s triad of social spaciality.

As goes for all projections, urban space as a projection allows urban theory to focus on issues which the projection-makers wish to render visible. But, like all projections, it is also an ideological tool which hides its own constructedness. If the concept of urban space is taken as self-evident, without being relentlessly doubted, questioned and defended, it could become a rhetorical device which conceals, and even mystifies the basic two-dimensionality of the territory, the urban land and its ownership, and the socio-economical “production of surface” for work, retail or dwelling.

Ákos Moravánszky is Professor of the Theory of Architecture at the Institut gta (Institute for the History and Theory of Architecture) of ETH Zurich. Born in Székesfehérvár, Hungary, he studied architecture at the TU Budapest. He received his doctorate at the TU Vienna in 1980. He was a Research Associate at the Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte in Munich and at the Getty Center in Santa Monica, California. From 1991 until 1996 he was Visiting Professor at the MIT (Cambridge, Mass.). In 2003–2004 he was Visiting Professor at the University of Applied Art in Budapest. The main areas of his research are the history of East and Middle European architecture in the 19th and 20th centuries, the history of architectural theory, and the iconology of building materials and constructions.
A REFLECTION ON HANOI’S ARCHITECTURE AND SENSE OF PLACE

Henri Lefebvre’s theory of the production of space has been a framework for studies on architecture and urbanism, including those related to sense of place. The significance of referring to Lefebvre is his dialectical interpretation of space as a contestation of three modes of spatial construction: the first defined by professionals (the representations of space), the second through economic and everyday practices (the spatial practice) and the third as meaning and imagination (the space of representation).

Hanoi, the capital of Vietnam, has been examined and understood as a place where the built environment is characterised by dynamic transformation. More than 1,000 years of Chinese domination, almost 100 years of French colonisation, and several decades of independence with support from the former Soviet Union, have created different layers to the built environment of the city. Over two decades of Doi Moi (economic reform) and opening up to global market have led to rapid transformation of the built environments that seem to bring another urban coating to Hanoi.

How do the multiple layers of architecture and their dynamic conformation come together to create a sense of place? Perhaps, more importantly, how can the implications of this congregation be built upon or change our interpretation of the production of space and epistemology of the place, hence the process in which Hanoi’s characteristics are conserved. This paper looks at the interaction between local culture and Hanoi’s layered architecture. Firstly, it presents an empirical search for place identity through firsthand observation and interpretation of everyday life and architecture in specific places representing different layers of Hanoi’s architecture. This includes further manifestations of the places’ characteristics through paintings of Hanoi’s built form. Secondly, the paper presents an inner search for place meaning through ‘phong thuy’ (wind and water), a spiritual dimension of built place popularly practiced in Hanoi. The paper ends with a reflection on Lefebvre’s forms of spatial production and relevant literatures on place studies.

Dinh Quoc Phuong is finishing his PhD thesis at the Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning, the University of Melbourne. It is involved in understanding and maintaining the identities of place in Hanoi, Vietnam. Phuong worked as an architect in Hanoi before coming to Melbourne to study and obtained a Master of Architecture in 2001. Phuong’s research papers have been presented and published in several international conferences and journals. He works as a guest lecturer and tutor at the University of Melbourne.
In his theory of Production of Space, Henri Lefebvre (1993) defines absolute space as: (i) a space which has three levels: surface, heights, and depths; (ii) it assumes meanings addressed not to the intellect but to the body; (iii) it is ‘lived’ rather than conceived; (iv) it is a representational space rather than a representation of space; (v) and is exemplified by tombs and funerary monuments. Whereas for abstract space, he defines the concept as: (i) a space where the ‘mental’ is ‘realised’ in a chain of ‘social’ activities; and (ii) a space where ‘imaginary’ is transformed into the ‘real’.

The above propositions of Lefebvre seem to have an empirical evidence in the case of Parangtritis of Yogyakarta of Indonesia. Parangtritis is a settlement in the coastal area of Yogyakarta. As an absolute space, Parangtritis is characterised by a cluster of vernacular settlements. With its unique beach, Parangtritis attracts people from all over the country to come and enjoy the seaside. Another exclusivity of Parangtritis is that there are two stones which are believed to indicate the place where Ratu Kidul (Goddess of the Southern Ocean) and Senapati (the founder and the first lords of the Mataram Kingdom) had a meeting and made an agreement that Ratu Kidul would help and protect the kingdom from the enemies. This agreement then became a myth which later transformed into a spiritual power, similar to what Lefebvre called ‘imaginary’. These two stones then create an abstract space in the minds of people who regularly (weekly, monthly, and yearly) come to Parangtritis in order to get spiritual powers and find answers and solutions for their personal problems. In the minds of people, Parangtritis is perceived as an unseen kingdom, which in reality appears in cultural, spiritual, and social spaces.

This paper aims to present some evidences and conceptual findings where an engagement of absolute space and abstract space appears in the case of Parangtritis settlements of Yogyakarta of Indonesia.

Sudaryono Sastrosasmito was born in Yogyakarta (ID) in 1956. He graduated as Ir in architecture at the Department of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta in 1982. He holds a Master of Engineering (M.Eng) in Urban Planning and Housing from the Asian Institute of Technology in Thailand since 1988. In 1993 he became Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Urban Planning and Housing at the same institute. He is currently Chairman of Study Program of Urban and Regional Planning, Department of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta (ID).
TROUBLE WITH HENRI: FROM THEORY TO RESEARCH

In the past years, many efforts were made to develop a more precise and sophisticated understanding of Henri Lefebvre’s writings. However, there remains an important gap between Lefebvre’s theoretical concepts and their application in concrete empirical research. As a consequence, empirical research on a Lefebvrean basis is still in an early stage.

To work with Lefebvre’s theory is no easy task. Its complexity and dialectical structure generates all kind of troubles. As in Alfred Hitchcock’s famous film, unexpected problems can arise at almost every moment. Thus, this theory cannot be applied in a schematic manner. Rather, the challenge is to develop creative and innovative translations or transpositions of this theory. In Lefebvre’s own words, the theory has to be dipped in concrete social reality.

This contribution presents some concrete experiences with Lefebvre’s theory in urban research in Switzerland and in Havana.

Christian Schmid is lecturer for urban sociology in the Department of Architecture ETH Zürich and senior researcher at ETH Studio Basel, Switzerland. He is the author of Stadt, Raum und Gesellschaft: Henri Lefebvre und die Produktion des Raumes as well as numerous publications on urban politics, social movements, regulation theory and urban social theory.
GLOBALIZING LEFEBVRE:
SEEKING SPATIAL JUSTICE AND THE REGIONAL RIGHTS TO THE CITY

Lefebvre's writings have been playing a central role in the 'spatial turn' and the extraordinary diffusion of critical spatial thinking throughout the humanities, arts, and social sciences. Most recently, his promotion of struggles over spatial injustice and ‘le droit à la ville’ helped to take spatial theory and empirical analyses into actual political practice. At the global scale, there is now a World Charter of the Rights to the City and, emanating initially from Los Angeles, a national movement is growing in the US around an expanded notion of regional rights to the city. In March of this year, the first international conference on Spatial Justice and Injustice was held in Paris-Nanterre on the 40th anniversary of the irruption in 1968, with the opening session held in an auditorium named after Lefebvre. I will discuss these developments within the frame of my current work on Seeking Spatial Justice.

Edward Soja is Distinguished Professor of Urban Planning at UCLA and Visiting Centennial Professor of Sociology in the Cities Programme at the London School of Economics. His empirical work has focused on urban restructuring in Los Angeles and the political economy of urban and regional development. For the past thirty-five years, he has drawn inspiration and ideas from the work of Henri Lefebvre to develop a radical retheorization of space and social spatiality. His analyses of urban restructuring and interpretations of spatial theory and Lefebvre’s insights are contained in three books, *Postmodern Geographies* (1989), *Thirdspace* (1996), and *Postmetropolis* (2000). Extending these works into more practical applications to urban politics and struggles over the right to the city is *Seeking Spatial Justice*, to be published in 2009.
Lefebvre denounced the intention of planning to reduce reality in the interest of power through the institutionalization of absolute, technical requirements as an imperative of moral necessity. Taking his critique as a point of departure, we will attempt to disclose the cryptographic key to decode what appears to be random in the contemporary city (i.e. informality, contradictions, discontinuities, etc.). Challenging the traditional conception of the urban plan, we will empirically explore different readings of the city that take into account transgressions, conflicts, probability and unpredictability. Planning framed as a random process follows non-describable deterministic patterns transcending biases and correlations.

Lefebvre represented planning as an instrument of power, violence and division, which aims to suppress contradictions, prove coherence and reduce the dialectical to the logical. The present proposal explores alternative maps as different ways to approach the city aiming to echo Lefebvre’s call to generate a “sense” or orientation rather than a systemic solution to urban issues. The random — and multidimensional — strategy proposes seven cognitive maps which draw from Lefebvre’s theory and reflect as well the contradictions, conflicts and ambiguities of the urban space: (1) Signs and symbols of the built environment; (2) Discontinuities, fringes and edges; (3) Transitional spaces (residual, in-between spaces); (4) Contradictions, conflicts and differences; (5) Domination/appropriation of space; (6) Emotions and sensibilities; (7) Attribution (private/public/mediational spaces).

The case study will take place in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas in Mexico City. The plaza represents a crossroad among the Mesoamerican, colonial and modern eras (with vestiges of each), but also where the 1968 students’ bloodshed events took place. The site is one of a complex nature and the surroundings will prove ideal for the development of the present explorations.

Alfonso Valenzuela-Aguilera is Professor of Urban Planning at the State University of Morelos (MX). A postdoctoral Fellow at the French Institute of Urbanism in Paris he was later a visiting Fulbright scholar at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of Tokyo, Oxford Brookes University and was appointed the Alfonso Reyes Chair at the Institute of High Studies for Latin America (IHEAL) at the University of Paris-Sorbonne. Dr Valenzuela-Aguilera was recently awarded the 2008 Guggenheim Fellowship for Latin America and the Caribbean and is currently a visiting scholar at the Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California at Berkeley.
URBAN RHYTHMS—A RHYTHM-ANALYTICAL APPROACH TO CONTEMPORARY URBAN EVERYDAY LIFE

Lefebvre’s late writings on rhythms and rhythm analysis (2004) are being read as the fourth volume of *Critique of Everyday Life*. Therefore it is important to focus on recent transformations of everyday life from a spatiotemporal perspective and to ask if these changes contribute to a production of space that expand the possibilities of urban life. This is particularly worthwhile since Lefebvre sometimes calls space itself “space-time-formation” and his notion of an urban revolution applies to changes in everyday life. The transformations I will analyse include above all two simultaneous processes that influence everyday rhythms and therefore the production of space. On the one hand, boundaries between different spheres of life and particularly between work and life are blurring. On the other hand, the organisation of everyday activities is becoming increasingly individualised and flexibilised.

Within this framework my presentation will be structured around the following questions: What is understood by rhythm and rhythm analysis? How should rhythms be structured to contribute to a production of differential space? What are the predominant transformations of everyday life in the contemporary city? Do implicit rhythms anticipate an urban revolution or do they reflect new forms of alienation?

Starting with Lefebvre’s theoretical analysis I will seek to answer these questions by referring to empirical studies that I have conducted in the cities of Hamburg and New York. I will show how the interlinkages of spatial and temporal perspectives can be translated to critical social research as well as suggest current dimensions of alienation in everyday life. Thereby I aim to update aspects of Lefebvre’s critique of everyday life as well as provide a critical perspective on developments in contemporary urban spaces.

Anne Vogelpohl, 1979, holds degrees in geography, soil science and sociology. Currently, she is DFG doctoral fellow at the Transatlantic Graduate Program Berlin–New York at the Center for Metropolitan Studies, TU Berlin. From 2005 to 2007 she was a research assistant as part of the BMBF Project “VERA – Verzeitlichung des Raumes” (Timing of Space) at the University of Hamburg. Her research interests include urban and cultural geography, theories of time and space and local social relations. The PhD thesis is concerned with processes of spatio-temporal dislimitations, e.g. flexibilisation of everyday life, and the production of urban quarters in Hamburg and New York.
RURAL CITIES AND CARACOLES: THE DIALECTIC OF ABSTRACT AND DIFFERENTIAL SPACE IN CHIAPAS, MEXICO

Lefebvre’s concepts of abstract space and differential space have primarily been employed by himself and others in relation to the urban centres of the core capitalist states. To what extent can these concepts be developed through their application to rural, peripheral geographies, and what are the implications for political practice? The paper addresses these questions through a comparison of two opposed processes of rural urbanisation currently underway in Chiapas, Mexico. ‘Rural Cities’ is a state project aiming to concentrate the dispersed peasant communities of Chiapas in new towns, integrating them into disciplinary health and education systems, and reorienting their mode of production from semi-subsistence agriculture towards commodity production for export. The project can be interpreted not only in terms of primitive accumulation and the colonisation of everyday life, but as an element in the state’s counter-insurgency strategy against the Zapatistas, who control large areas of Chiapas, in which they are developing a radical form of what Lefebvre described as ‘territorial autogestion’. Central to this process is the construction of the ‘caracoles’, small urban centres within the Zapatista territories, in which their autonomous government, health and education services, and cultural projects are located. The caracoles constitute a radical alternative to the model of rural urbanisation proposed by Rural Cities — autonomous rather than state-imposed, based on socialist rather than neoliberal principles, and organised as public spaces of direct democracy, rather than as planned centres of social control.

The paper reads the contradiction between Rural Cities and the caracoles through the lens of Lefebvre’s dialectic of abstract space and differential space. The Rural Cities constitute an abstract space, understood as a space planned and produced by the capitalist state, subordinated to productivism and exchange value, and tending towards the regulation and normalisation of everyday life. The caracoles, by contrast, represent the potential for a differential space, produced through an intensive process of autogestion, in which use is prioritized over exchange, difference over homogeneity, the lived over the conceived, ‘dwelling’ over ‘habitat’.

Japhy Wilson is a PhD candidate in Politics at the University of Manchester. His research project develops a reinterpretation of Henri Lefebvre’s theory of abstract space through a critique of the Plan Puebla Panama, a regional development project currently being implemented in Mexico and Central America. He recently completed his fieldwork in Mexico, and is now writing his thesis and preparing articles for publication.