# ESA URBAN SOCIOLOGY
## ESA RN 37

HUMBOLDT-UNIVERSITÄT ZU BERLIN

**Georg-Simmel-Zentrum für Metropolenforschung**

# CALL FOR ABSTRACTS
# RN37 V MIDTERM CONFERENCE

## *Seeing Like a City / Seeing the City Through*

Georg Simmel Center for Metropolitan Research
Humboldt University Berlin
OCT 5-7, 2022

Urban citizenship implies a fragmentation of claims that affects rights to the city as universal, all-inclusive ideals: we see a trend towards a diversification of interests, a weakening and separation of movements, and competition about resources rather than more solidarities within groups working as collectives on the pathway to a livable and more just city. Such urban citizenship is always in conversation with modes of governance, which vary greatly among Europe.

Different modes of governance always require categorizations on various scales. Starting from the central argument of James Scott *Seeing Like a State* (1999) that any government means categorization, and any categorization fails to acknowledge the *metis* of locally embedded practices, knowledges, and ways of seeing and doing things, especially on and from the urban margins, this conference seeks to sociologically address this tension. The 'City' as a set of local state institutions imagines, regulates, categorizes, classifies, and intervenes in the urban and shapes citizenship and belonging. Second, however, the city cannot be made nor planned and will always be, as AbdouMaliq Simone formulated in *For the City Yet to Come* (2004), in the making through practices and logics outside of the view of the state which defy standards and categories. Everyday tactics see people through in their daily lives and see through the city: finding new ways to get things done under constantly changing urban conditions. Yet city politics must draw boundaries and categorize, as any political decision implies a categorization. How can 'seeing like a City' and 'seeing the City through' be brought together in new ways, given the current transformations of our cities?

This frames the program of the fifth RN37-ESA Midterm-Conference in Berlin, hosted by the *Georg Simmel Center for Metropolitan Research* at Humboldt University Berlin, in collaboration with the *Sektion Stadt- und Regionalsoziologie* of the German Society of Sociology (DGS) and various Berlin-based urban scholars.

The conference will take place in-person from the 5th to the 7th of October 2022.


## Local Organizing Team

Hosting Organizers: Talja Blokland & Henrik Schultze (Georg Simmel Center, Humboldt University Berlin, Germany)

Advisory Program Organizers: Nihad El-Kayed & Anna Steigemann (Sektion Stadt und Regionalsoziologie, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie, Germany)

Young Scholars Program Organizers: Andrej Holm & Henrik Lebuhn

Technical Support: Matthias Jacob

For questions at the Local Organizing Team please write to: esa-rn37-gsz@hu-berlin.de


## RN37 Organizing Committee (in alphabetical order)

Anna Bednarczyk (Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland)

Gabriele Manella (Alma Mater Studiorum - University of Bologna, Italy)

Jan Üblacker (EBZ Business School University of Applied Science, Bochum, Germany)

Katarzyna Kajdanek (University of Wroclaw, Poland)

Madalena Corte-Real (DINÂMIA'CET – ISCTE-IUL, Portugal)

Niccolò Morelli (University of Genoa, Italy)

Rui Carvalho (Brown University, Providence, United States)

## Call for paper abstract submissions

We opted to follow a double step submission process for this conference. We first opened a call for panels and we decided to accept 27 of them.
This call for paper abstracts is the second step of the process. The final list as well as detailed descriptions of the panels can be found below.

Abstract proposals  but submitted by **May 6, 2022**
through the following link:
https://forms.gle/kiymngod1MBzfRKi7

 Please note that:
- A full copy of the paper is not requested (neither before nor after the conference).
- Abstracts sent by e-mail cannot be accepted.
- Abstracts should not exceed 250 words and must be submitted in English
- Authors will be asked to select just one session to submit their abstract.
- Each person may submit only one abstract for the conference as first author, regardless of the session. In case of multiple submissions, only the abstract submitted first will be considered for review.
- Abstracts will be peer-reviewed and selected for presentation by the panel chairs.
- Accepted authors/co-authors have to register as participants if they want to present their paper at the conference and appear in the Book of Abstracts.
- ESA membership is not mandatory, but members benefit from reduced conference fees!
- Most panels will follow a traditional format based on an open call for abstracts and equal time for each presentation (expectedly 15-20 minutes, in time slots of 90 minutes). Nonetheless, some sessions will be based on other formats (see the description of each panel).
- You can contact the panel chair(s) for further info or the conference organising committee (rn37.esa@gmail.com).

## Important deadlines

March 18, 2022: Opening of the Call for Submission of Individual Abstracts.
May 6, 2022: Closure of the Call for Individual Abstracts.
June 6, 2022: Notification to Abstract authors.
June 6-July 4, 2022: Early-bird rate registration for individual participants and registration for panel chairs.
July 5-July 20, 2022: Full Rate registration for individual participants.
October 5-7, 2022: Midterm Conference of the ESA RN37- Urban Sociology.

## Registration fees

Registration is cheaper for ESA members! To become a member first, click here:
https://www.europeansociology.org/membership/become-a-member

| | ESA Members | | Non ESA-Members | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **EARLY BIRD** | **Band 1 countries** | **Band 2 countries** | **Band 1 countries** | **Band 2 countries** |
| PhD or MA students | 70 € | 40 € | 90 € | 60 € |
| Regular, Non-tenured position | 130 € | 80 € | 160 € | 100 € |
| Regular, Tenured position | 190 € | 110 € | 240 € | 130 € |
| **LATE REGISTRATION** | **Band 1 countries** | **Band 2 countries** | **Band 1 countries** | **Band 2 countries** |
| PHD or MA students | 90 € | 60 € | 120 € | 60 € |
| Regular, non-tenured position | 170 € | 110 € | 200 € | 140 € |
| Regular, Tenured position | 240 € | 180 € | 290 € | 230 € |

Band 1 countries: Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bermuda, British Virgin Islands, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Cayman Islands, Channel Islands, Chile, Croatia, Curaçao, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Faroe Islands, Finland, France, French Polynesia, Germany, Gibraltar, Greece, Greenland, Guam, Hong Kong SAR/China, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Isle of Man, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Rep., Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Macao SAR/China, Malta, Monaco, Nauru, Netherlands, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Northern Mariana Islands, Norway, Oman, Poland, Portugal, Puerto Rico, Qatar, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Singapore, Sint Maarten (Dutch part), Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Martin (French part), Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, Trinidad and Tobago, Turks and Caicos Islands, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Virgin Islands (U.S.).
Band 2 countries: Everywhere else.

**To follow the updates on the V ESA RN37 Midterm please visit:**
www: https://esarn37.hypotheses.org/v-rn37-midterm-conference-2022
FB: https://www.facebook.com/esarn37
Twitter: @Rn37S

# List of Panels

1. Potentials and Challenges of Globalizing Participatory Budgeting

2. The spatial dimension of sustainability of life in cities. Roots, routes, gender, vulnerability and informal arrangements in making up the city "from below"

3. Caring for Urban Nature. Sustainability between Enchantment and Commodification // Urban De/Mobilizations

4. Moving margins: towards a time-sensitive understanding of displacement experiences

5. Beyond the public/civic divide? How PCPs transform urban actors

6. Different gazes on the city. (Re)designing urban accessibility

7. Scrutinizing the trend towards sharing in European cities: between (re)production and combating of socio-spatial inequalities

8. (in)equalities and commons. exploring potentials and limits of taking care of the common good as a strategy to contrast social inequalities.

9. Who is transforming whom? New Municipalism and the relationship between governments, administration and social movements.

10. Street culture meets extremism. Urban in/security in uncertain times

11. Ordinary affects and the everydayness of cities in transition: material and social dimensions of change

12. Shared housing and the city

13. Urban Security as a Battlefield

14. (Re)turning to urban (new) normality, (re)entering (new) urban in/equalities

15. The Creative Paradox of Marginal Urban Citizenship

16. Moving towards others: comparing fleeting solidarities in re/configuring social spaces across Europe

17. The new flâneurs in the urban space: from individualization to collective participation

18. Seeing the City through multispecies perspectives: Mobilizing nature to the city and the city to beyond

19. Food for Thought: Challenges and Potentials of Practices for Urban Socio-Ecological Justice

20. Seeing like a Smart City-Maker: Reimagining Cities through Instruments and Practices

21. Housing, Financialization and Mobility

22. Housing affordability and segregational developments: New Perspectives on neighborhood change

23. Reclaiming the street: understanding residents' mobilisation for security

24. Seeing the city through emotions

25. Solidarity with precarious migrants in the city: alliances, frames and practices

26. Similarities and differences between gentrification cases: do contexts, states and institutions matter?

27. Power articulation in cultural and creative sector in cities

# 1. Potentials and Challenges of Globalizing Participatory Budgeting

**Chairs**
Byeongsun Ahn (University of Vienna, Austria, byeongsun.ahn@univie.ac.at)
Jana Brandl (University of Vienna, Austria, jana.brandl@univie.ac.at)

**Panel Format**
Traditional (call for abstracts and individual presentations of around 15 minutes)

**Conference Stream**
Urban De/Mobilizations

**Summary**
About three decades ago, the Brazilian city of Porto Alegre first set off an innovative process, called Participatory Budgeting, to empower ordinary citizens to determine the city's spending priorities and influence governmental decision-making on the most urgent needs of vulnerable populations. While aimed at promoting greater political representation and resource distribution in theory, the local interpretations and implementations of PB, however, have faced sustained criticism for falling short of proper tools and mechanisms that advance its emancipatory potentials in practice. Such a gap between the ideal and reality reflects the trade-offs between competing principles, methods, and goals of open citizen participation that surround the complexity of joint decision-making in PB. In this regard, extant research has made critical reflections on the differentiated processes and outcomes of PB at the urban scale, which are dependent on the particular level of institutional capacity, financial resources, and structural conditions available in the local environment. Since the global circulation of PB as a loose toolkit for planning concepts and ideas, there is increasing evidence for ambiguities behind its diverging logics, begging the question of the actors (who), motivations (why), and processes (how) behind its localization. There is a need for context-sensitive approaches to PB, of which real-world impact on civil society and policy-making may depend on the distinctive governance conditions that characterize the city under examination.

This panel aims to bring different experiences of PB – or similar participatory practices – in cities around the world into dialogue. It invites contributions across different disciplines of urban studies to consider the place-specific potentials and challenges of activating ordinary citizens in joint decision-making, featuring diverse – and often conflicting – interests of key stakeholders at multiple levels of urban governance. It particularly welcomes research with strong policy implications, providing a comparative lens on different designs, objectives and strategies of 'innovative' citizen participation and new democratic institutions, which may reinforce inclusion or exclusion of vulnerable populations in public decision-making. Submissions may consider the productive synergy between formal government institutions and civil society that broaden the knowledge spectrum in conventional governance arrangements.

**References**

Baiocchi G., & Ganuza, E. (2014). Participatory Budgeting as if Emancipation Mattered. *Politics & Society*, *42*(1), 29–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032329213512978.

Fung A. (2006). Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance. *Public Administration Review*, *66*(s1), 66–75. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00667.x.

Cabannes Y, and Lipietz B (2017). Revisiting the democratic promise of participatory budgeting in light of competing political, good governance and technocratic logics. *Environment and Urbanization* 30(1): 67–84. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247817746279.

## 2. The spatial dimension of sustainability of life in cities. Roots, routes, gender, vulnerability and informal arrangements in making up the city "from below"

**Chairs**

Margarita Barañano Cid (Complutense University of Madrid, Spain, mbaranan@ucm.es)
Marta Domínguez Pérez (Complutense University of Madrid, Spain, mdom@cps.ucm.es)
M. Victoria Gómez García (Carlos III University of Madrid, Spain, mgomez@polsoc.uc3m.es)

**Format**
Traditional

**Conference Stream**
Urban In/securities

**Summary**
Moorings in urban spaces are not only relevant for the identity of these spaces or for the sense of belonging of those who inhabit them. They also play a leading role in shaping the daily arrangements necessary for care and sustainability of life. This is especially important in urban spaces where the participation of states in the provision of welfare, in relation to care or housing, is limited. In these spaces, social bonds of mutual aid and informal arrangements embedded in territories are central (Blokland, 2008; 2017; 2018; Bosi, Zamponi, 2019). They are also gendered spaces, configured by relations that concentrate care tasks on women. Hence the importance of the prevailing gender regime and local welfare (Allen, Barlow, Leal, Maloutas, Padovani, 2004)), and its relationship with roots, routes and with these daily informal arrangements that shape the city "from below".

The importance of this spatial dimension of sustainability is greater in vulnerable neighborhoods and groups. Social dynamics such as the preference for locating the dwelling near acquaintances or relatives; the lower residential mobility or the importance of mobilities that aim to get closer to the people with whom mutual aid relationships are maintained; the concentration of a large part of care activities in nearby spaces, especially in neighborhoods with vulnerability, even if they are articulated with care activities located in other continents, point in this direction. Hence the importance of analyzing, in the first place, how inequality, vulnerability and gender intersect with roots and routes, shaping the city through everyday arrangements "from below".

Secondly, even among these groups and spaces, local roots are frequently combined in complex ways with mobilities, at different scales, shaping translocal localities, transnational households or families, or networks of households, among which a regular flow of exchanges or intimacy unfolds. Hence the relevance to analyze how they combine with mobilities and are being transformed in a context of globalization and expulsions (Sassen, 2007). Following this line, this panel invite participants to reflect on the relevance of this spatial dimension of sustainability of life in cities and its current transformations.

## References

Ahmed Sara; Castaneda Claudia; Fortier Anne-Marie; Sheller Mimi B. (2003). Uprootings/regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration. Berg.

Allen Judith; Barlow James; Leal Maldonado Jesús; Maloutas Thomas, Padovani Liliana (2004) Welfare and Housing in Southern Europe. Blackwell. London.

Arbaci Sonia (2019). Paradoxes of segregation: Housing systems, welfare regimes and ethnic residential change in Southern European cities. John Wiley & Sons.

Barañano Cid, Margarita (2021). "Los hogares como espacios de arraigo en un contexto Global", Encrucijadas. Revista crítica de ciencias sociales. vol. 21, nº 1: 1-29.

Barañano, Margarita y Santiago, José (2021). Rooted lives, vulnerabilities and care. An approach to roots as socio-existential supports and their transformations in a context of globalization. IV ISA FORUM, Sao Paulo.

Barañano, Margarita (2006). "Glocalization, Postmetropolises and Places: New Socioscapes". En R. Rocco y F. García Selgas (eds.), Transnationalism: Issues and Perspectives, UCM, Madrid.

Blokland Talja (2008). Networked Urbanism. Social Capital in the City. Hampshire, Ashgate.

Blokland Talja (2017). Community as Urban Practice. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Blokland Talja (2018). "On roots and routes. The quest for community in times of diversity and inequality", in Ferro Ligia, Smagacz-Poziemska Marta, Gómez, M. Victoria, Villalón Juan José (2018). Moving cities. Contested views on urban life, Wiesbaden, Springer: 29-42.

Bosi Lorenzo, Zamponi Lorenzo (2019). Resistere alla crisi. I percorsi dell´azione sociale diretta. Bologna, Il Mulino.

Blunt Alison, Dowling Robyn (2006). Home. London, Routledge.

Boccagni Paolo (2017). Migration and the search for home. Palgrave, Macmillan.

Deleuze Gilles, Guattari Felix (1986). Nomadology. Semiotext: 52.

Fortier Anne-Marie (2001). `Coming Home´: Queer Migrations and Multiple Evocations of Home, European Journal of Cultural Studies, 4, 4: 405-424.

Friedland Roger, Boden Deirdre (1994). Nowhere: Space, Time, Modernity. Los Angeles, University of California Press.

Gómez M. Victoria (2019) "Cosmopolitanism vs identity and belonging?". In Smagacz-Poziemska Marta, Gómez M. Victoria, Pereira Patricia, Guarino Laura, Kurtenbach Sebastian, Villalón, J. Josè (eds) Inequality and uncertainty: current challenges for cities. London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Kuurne K., Gómez M. Victoria (2019) "Feeling at home in the neighbourhood: belonging, the house and the plaza in Helsinki and Madrid", City & Community, DOI: 10.1111/cico.12368.

Hayden Dolores (1997). The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public Territory. Boston, The MIT Press.

Hooks Bell (1991). "Homeplace: A site of resistance", in Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics. Turnaround Books.

López Villanueva Cristina, Pujadas, Isabel and Bayona Jordi (2013). "Households Within The Residential Mobility Process: The Case of The Barcelona Metropolitan Region". Archivio di Studi Urbani e Regionali, nº. 108, pp. 57-84.DOI: 10.3280/ASUR2013-108004.

McDowell Linda (1999). Gender, identity and place. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Sassen Saskia (2007). Sociology of globalization. Norton Company.

Sorando D, Uceda P, Dominguez Perez M (2021). "Inequality on the Increase: Trajectories of Privilege and Inequality in Madrid". Social Inclusion (ISSN: 2183-2803). DOI:10.17645/si.vXiX.XXX (JCR, Q2).

Urry, John (2007). Mobilities. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Elliot, Anthony and Urry, John (2010). Mobile lives. Routledge.

## 3. Caring for Urban Nature. Sustainability between Enchantment and Commodification // Urban De/Mobilizations

**Chairs**
Irene Becci (University of Lausanne, Switzerland, irene.becciterrier@unil.ch)
Marian Burchardt (Leipzig University, Germany, marian.burchardt@uni-leipzig.de)
Mar Griera (Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain, mariadelmar.griera@uab.cat)

**Panel format**
Traditional (with individual presentations)

**Conference stream**
Urban De/Mobilizations

**Summary**
Across the planet, urban dwelling is increasingly contingent upon cities' abilities to adapt to climate change, urban heating, water shortages and other environmental concerns. In response, we have seen the emergence of a whole range of new ecological activists, from Extinction Rebellion and "Essen Retten Leben Retten" to tree huggers who draw attention to urban nature, point up the urgency of its protection and existential value. All of these actors advance their own cosmological visions of urban nature and spiritual ideas about more-and-other-than-human coexistence.

This panel aims at exploring the ways in which "urban nature" is enchanted by civil and institutional action and the implications such enchantments have in terms of sustainability and its imaginaries. Be it when parks are used for ecological festivals and roofs are greened through guerilla gardening actions, or when trees are defended against construction plans aiming to eliminate them, urban nature is a source of enchantment. Such practices have gained in number, intensity and meaning with the increasing attention paid to environmental concerns.

Recent studies show that urban nature is produced by local civic action as well as by institutional actors implementing economic models and urban planning directives. Considering the crucial importance of current urbanization, it is essential to understand how city dwellers' worldviews are changing with regard to urban nature and what this implies in terms of the narrative about the causes and remedies of environmental degradation in the age of the Anthropocene. While some urban spaces have been carved out to be preserved as wild nature, other urban greeneries are less valued and often hold a provisional status subject to being revoked for construction projects.

This panel invites contributions based on case studies to engage into a discussion that will contrast yet also connect the cases in terms of culture, economy, legal dispositions, geographies and religious diversity.

The panel aims to shed light on such changes and to assess their potential for sustainable urban planning. The focus is on understanding how the visions and practices of urban nature are linked to the concrete environmental issues (waste, air pollution, water, biodiversity and nutrition).

**References**

Becci, I., Monnot, C., & Wernli, B. (2021). Sensing 'Subtle Spirituality' among Environmentalists: A Swiss Study. Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature & Culture, 15(3).

Shi, L. (2021). From progressive cities to resilient cities: Lessons from history for new debates in equitable adaptation to climate change. Urban Affairs Review, 57(5), 1442-1479.

Pink, S. (2009). Urban social movements and small places: Slow cities as sites of activism. City, 13(4), 451-465.

## 4. Moving margins: towards a time-sensitive understanding of displacement experiences

**Chairs**
Raffael Beier (TU Dortmund University, Germany, raffael.beier@udo.edu)
Amandine Spire (CESSMA, University of Paris, France, amandine.spire@u-paris.fr)

**Panel format**
Traditional

**Conference Stream**
Urban In/Equalities

**Summary**
In recent years, scholars in urban studies have slowly started to move away from treating displacement only as a disruptive, one-time moment of dispossession. First, decreasing housing affordability, unequal access to citizenship, and growing socioeconomic inequalities on a global level have rather created a more permanent displacement pressure depending on people's structural position in a neoliberal context. Whereas De Wet (2008) is concerned about 'disemplacement' becoming an integral dimension of urban production in Southern Africa, with marginalised groups being unable to settle at a particular place for a variety of socioeconomic reasons, Yiftachel (2020) has stressed how unequal access to citizenship affects people's likelihood of being displaced ('displaceability'). Second, there is increasing recognition that in contexts where displacement is part of resettlement, experiences of destruction and production – in other words, gain and loss – are overlapping, creating an enduring condition of spatial and temporal in-betweenness framed by nostalgia and future aspiration (Beier/Spire/Bridonneau 2022). Together disemplacement, displaceability, and resettlement create 'moving margins', where aspiration, relegation and constraint constantly shape citizens' unstable ways of building urban futures over time.

Conceptualising displacement less as a one-time moment but as a dynamic and unstable urban condition if not process affecting people's practices of settling, we call for more time-sensitive analyses that emphasise city dwellers' long-term experiences of and exposure to different forms of displacement, forced eviction, and (planned) relocation. We would especially welcome papers that stress the spatio-temporal limbo of (recurrent) displacement experiences. Papers could focus in both conceptually and empirically open ways on one or more of the following questions:
  - How do people experience displacement over time? How and why do experiences differ?
  - How can long-term perspectives on urban displacements help us to understand the production of centrality and marginality?
  - How can methodology account for time in displacement research?
  - How do people cope with 'displaceability', 'disemplacement', and 'moving margins'?
  - In what way could Southeastern notions of 'moving margins' and displaceability stimulate new ways of building urban theory?
  - What are ethical questions when researching recurrent displacement experiences?

**References**

Beier, R., Spire, A. and M. Bridonneau, eds. 2022. Urban resettlements in the global south. Lived experiences of housing and infrastructure between displacement and relocation. Routledge: Abingdon and New York.

De Wet, C. 2008. "Reconsidering displacement in Southern Africa." Anthropology Southern Africa 31 (3–4): 114–122.

Yiftachel, O. (2020) "From displacement to displaceability. A southeastern perspective on the new metropolis. City 24 (1–2): 151-165.

## 5. Beyond the public/civic divide? How PCPs transform urban actors

**Chairs**
Laura Calbet Elias (University of Stuttgart, Germany, laura.calbet@si.uni-stuttgart.de)
Ignacio Farías (Humboldt University Berlin, Germany, fariasig@hu-berlin.de)
Lisa Vollmer (Bauhaus University of Weimar, Germany, lisa.vollmer@uni-weimar.de)

**Panel format**
Traditional

**Conference stream**
Urban De/Mobilizations

In the last decade, European cities have witnessed the timid, but promising emergence of new forms of cooperation between state and civil society actors in different areas of urban infrastructural and service provision. In this cooperation, the involvement of civil society actors in decision-making processes and design processes goes beyond legally prescribed levels of participation. To capture this development, the terms public-civic partnership and public-commons partnership (PCP) have been suggested.

In this panel, we invite contributions focusing not only on the factors contributing to the formation of PCPs, but most importantly on their performative, transformative effects upon the actors involved. How are their practices, knowledge, public discourses and modes of organization being transformed in multifarious ways – precisely by partaking in PCPs and reacting to the specific challenges and opportunities emerging through such cooperation?

Some relevant questions are:
How do the actors involved try to model, analyze and understand themselves?
How are "the state" and "the civil society" performed, imagined and mapped by the actors involved in PCPs?
In which ways are social movements partaking in PCPs experiencing processes of professionalization, institutionalization and diversification?
In which ways are state institutions transformed by the cooperation and what are hindrances in this transformation?
How is seeing like a city being challenged by PCPs?

Thus, we are interested in presentations that go beyond the public/civic binary and pay attention to the proliferation of forms and instantiations of public administration and civic society, thus also providing more nuanced analyses of the multiple conflict lines and controversies arising in and around PCPs. Accordingly, we also welcome contributions discussing how different actors make cooperation under such circumstances possible and how limits to cooperation are negotiated. Finally, we also look forward proposals that address the theoretical question on how PCPs challenge the relationships between 'seeing like a City' and 'seeing the City through'.

**References**

Milburn Keir, Russell Bertie (2021): Public-Common Partnerships, Autogestion, and the Right to the City. In: Andreas Exner / Sarah Kumnig / Stephan Hochleithner (Eds.): Capitalism and the Commons: Just Commons in the Era of Multiple Crises. Abingdon: Routledge, pp.135–150.

Horvat Vedran (2019): Real Democracy in Your Town. Public-Civic Partnerships in Action. Luxemburg:GEF.https://gef.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/GEF-Public-Civic-partnerships-print.pdf.

Ziehl Michael (2020): Koproduktion Urbaner Resilienz. Das Gängeviertel in Hamburg als Reallabor für eine zukunftsfähige Stadtentwicklung mittels Kooperation von Zivilgesellschaft, Politik und Verwaltung. Berlin: Jovis Verlag.

## 6. Different gazes on the city. (Re)designing urban accessibility

**Chairs**
Letizia Carrera (University of Bari "Aldo Moro", Italy, letizia.carrera@uniba.it)
Matteo Colleoni (University of Milan Bicocca, Italy, matteo.colleoni@unimib.it)

**Panel format**
Traditional

**Conference stream**
Urban In/Equalities

**Summary**
Georg Simmel (1890) wrote more than a century ago «women, as such, not only have a different mixture of equality and inequality with historical objects, they have not only the possibility of seeing different things than men; they rather, with their particular psychic structure, also know how to see the same things differently (..) in the same way also the historical world, mediated by the psychological interpretation of women, could acquire a different partial and overall aspect».

The different gaze of women can be an opportunity to try to reread the city and, starting from this, to rethink it giving full legitimacy to other instances and new keys to look at and to reimagine urban design. The idea of the different gaze and the new perspectives that open to new urban mindscapes become a central theme especially at this moment in history in which the right to the city, about which Henri Lefebvre wrote, has become pluralized starting but also going beyond Tovi Fenster's critique of the perspectives of new genres.

Starting from this perspective, also the gazes of other different types of citizens as elderly, children, disabled, and foreigners are potentially able to propose other visions of cities and territories, creating the conditions for a widespread and specific right to design shared spaces. Once built our cities continue to shape and affect social relations, power, inequality. Their form helps to make some things normal and right, while others *out of place* and even wrong. Rethinking urban spaces can be an opportunity and an important strategy to redefine relationships and counteract inequalities.

New perspectives of the gaze can materially and symbolically redefine spaces and practices, offering new frames of meaning.

Crossing the city, enhancing opportunities for slow mobility, is a tool and, at the same time, an important strategy to seize the opportunities of using the city, as well as the potential and critical issues in terms of (re)designing the accessibility and the appropriation of urban spaces.

The panel aims to welcome theoretical or empirical contributions that are confronted with the theme of different gazes on the city and the potential of these differences in order to (re)construct and (re)design processes within urban spaces, especially but not only public, in view of the objective of specific and widespread urban citizenship.

These are some of the possible questions on which the papers could be focused on:

How can the gender gazes or other different ones be taken into account in some urban policies in order to contrast inequalities?

How can urban policies be structured to guarantee to the elderly, children, disabled, women the full right of crossing and accessing the city?

How did the pandemic from Covid-19 transform cities and their social representation among different types of citizens?

**References**

Carrera L. (2021). *Ageing in Europe. Reclaiming a Healthy and Age-friendly City*, in "International Journal of Humanities and Social Science", vol.11, n.8, 2021.

Carrera L. (2022). *La flâneuse. Lo sguardo obliquo sulla città*. In "Fuori Luogo. Rivista di Sociologia del Territorio, Turismo, Tecnologia", n. 1, 15-28.

Colleoni M., Vitrano C. (2020). *Mobility as a Service: Moving in the de-synchronized city*. In Handbook of Urban Mobilities, eds. O.B. Jensen, C. Lassen, V. Kaufmann, M. Freudendal-Pedersen, I.S. Gøtzsche Lange, 357-366. London: Routledge.

Colleoni M., Pucci P., eds. (2016). *Understanding Mobilities for Designing Contemporary Cities*. Springer International Publishing.

Colleoni M. (2013). *Mobility, accessibility and social equity. A comparative and interdisciplinary empirical study in the metropolitan areas of Milan*, Torino and Bologna. In Henckel D., Konecke B., Stabilini S, Thomaier S., Zedda S. (eds), Space Time Design of the Public City. Springer, Berlin, pp. 137-156.

Kern L. (2010). *Selling the scary City: Gendering Fear and Condominium Development in the Neoliberal City*. Social & Cultural Geography, II, n.3, pp.209-230.

Kern L. (2019). *Feminist City: Claiming Space in a Man-Made World.* Toronto: Between the Lines.

Peake L., Rieker M., eds. (2013). *Rethinking Feminist Interventions into the Urban*. London: Routledge.

Shakespeare T. (2017). *Disabilità e società. Diritti, falsi miti, percezioni sociali*. Trento: Erickson.

Simmel G. (1890). *Über sociale Differenzierung*, Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot.

## 7. Scrutinizing the trend towards sharing in European cities: between (re)production and combating of socio-spatial inequalities

**Chairs**
Helena Cermeño (University of Kassel, Germany, hcermeno@asl.uni-kassel.de)
Alexander Hamedinger (Vienna University of Technology, Austria, alexander.hamedinger@tuwien.ac.at)
Emma Holmqvist (Uppsala university, Sweden,  emma.holmqvist@ibf.uu.se)
Carsten Keller (University of Kassel, Germany, carsten.keller@uni-kassel.de)

**Panel format**
Traditional (with individual presentations)

**Conference Stream**
Urban In/Equalities

**Summary**
For a good decade now, the concept of sharing has been gaining importance. The sharing economy is said to be growing rapidly internationally, which is associated with major trends such as digitalization and a change in consumption and value patterns ("use instead of own", "sustainability"). Cities such as San Francisco, Seoul, Amsterdam, and Berlin have adopted programs on sharing or immediately given themselves the label of 'sharing city' to explore and implement sharing as a new paradigm of urban policy. Beyond the officially proclaimed forms of sharing, non-commercial practices of sharing and commoning, predominantly by non-state actors, have emerged as a counter-reaction to neoliberal processes of commodification and privatisation, particularly undergoing in European inner-city neighbourhoods since the financial crisis of 2007/2008.

However, there is so far no consensus in the academic debate on what constitutes a sharing city, and so far, the approaches have remained mostly focused on typifying a wide variety of sharing practices (Sanchez-Vergara et al, 2021). Besides this, there is a lack of empirical research on the effects of sharing practices particularly in housing and public space with regard to socio-spatial inequalities, which still characterise European cities (though differently).

In this context, this session aims to bring together contributions from a variety of theoretical and empirical analyses that explore practices of sharing in urban settings that address directly or indirectly the growing commodification of and contestation over urban resources. The session welcomes papers reflecting on the following questions:

To what extent practices of sharing within their respective political, economic, and social contexts can oppose the trends of growing spatial inequalities, exclusion of marginalised groups and commodification manifesting in European cities?

To what extent and in which contexts is sharing an innovative approach with transformative potential?

When is sharing instead mobilised as an ideology by means of which neoliberal forms of economic activity, such as Uber or Airbnb, can assert themselves under the veil of progressive practices?

Along these lines, the panel invites in particular contributions that explore the conditions under which practices of sharing in public space and housing (re)produce, reinforce, or counteract social inequalities.

**References**

Agyeman J., McLaren D. (2017). Sharing cities. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, 59(3), 22-27.

Sánchez-Vergara J.I., Ginieis M., Papaoikonomou E. (2021). The emergence of the sharing city: A systematic literature review to understand the notion of the sharing city and explore future research paths. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 295, 1-20.

Shareable (2018). *Sharing Cities: Activating the Urban Commons*. Shareable, San Francisco.

## 8. (IN)EQUALITIES AND COMMONS. EXPLORING POTENTIALS AND LIMITS OF TAKING CARE OF THE COMMON GOOD AS A STRATEGY TO CONTRAST SOCIAL INEQUALITIES

**Chairs**
Daniela Ciaffi (Polytechnic University of Turin, Italy, daniela.ciaffi@polito.it)
Emanuela Saporito (Polytechnic University of Turin, Italy, emanuela.saporito@polito.it)
Giulia Marra (Polytechnic University of Milan, Italy, giulia.marra@polimi.it)

**Panel format**
Traditional

**Conference Stream**
Urban In/Equalities

**Abstract**
The dynamics of the (re)production of inequalities in the urban environment (income, health, or educational, cultural, and social opportunities) can be influenced by the unequal distribution of spatial resources. We refer, for example, to the availability and accessibility of public service facilities (like schools, social and healthcare units, public spaces) and social support infrastructures, but also to the environmental quality of the context (i.e., the availability of accessible green areas).
In this panel, we would like to discuss the contribution that urban commons and, in general, the action of caring for common goods in a broad sense (being they spaces, buildings, but also rights and services, like culture, education, health) can give to overcome some conditions of inequality. We consider as urban commons especially spatial resources such as underused public buildings, dismissed factories or shops, green areas, but also abandoned lots, etc that, apart of the property, are recognized by citizens to be functional or potentially functional (after being recovered and transformed by the local community) to the individual and collective wellbeing.
The international theoretical debate and the flourishing of commoning practices argue and try to demonstrate in practice how the self-organized, shared, inclusive and creative use of spatial resources by local communities (Ostrom, 1990; Bollier and Helfrich, 2019) can contribute to redistributing urban opportunities and rights more equitably, pushing cities to redefine rules, perimeters, and functions, overriding the categories of public and private. An example is the multiple experiences that arise around hybrid and multifunctional spaces (i.e., community hubs, but also open schools) which, far from being typical providers of traditional welfare services, function as welfare facilities of proximity, intercepting needs and favoring the construction of bonds, aimed at contrasting social fragility.
Many scholars and researchers acknowledge collective action for the care of common goods as a prerequisite for rethinking citizenship (Fraser, 2016). Through the action of care, the active citizen, as an individual, or gathered in formal and informal organizations, contributes

to the general interest, carrying out an activity that generates rights and benefits for themselves and others.

Can these experiences redistribute citizenship rights even to the most vulnerable inhabitants?

How and to what extent are these processes effective in contrasting structural inequalities?

How can commoning practices (such as those described) be connected with the world of public policies in a logic of co-planning and horizontal subsidiarity?

**References**

Ostrom E. (1990), Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions of Collective Action, Cambridge University Press.

Bollier D., Helfirch S. (2019), Free, Fair and Alive. The Insurgent Power of the Commons, New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island.

Fraser N. (2016), "Contradictions of Capital and Care" New Left Review,100: 99–117.

## 9. Who is transforming whom? New Municipalism and the relationship between governments, administration and social movements

**Chairs**

Andrej Holm (Humboldt University Berlin, Germany, a.holm@sowi.hu-berlin.de)
Bahar Sakizlioglu (Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherland, sakizlioglu@ihs.nl)
Justus Uitermark (University of Amsterdam, Netherland, j.l.uitermark@uva.nl)
Sarah Kumnig (Vienna University, Austria, sarah.kumnig@wu.ac.at)

**Panel format**
Roundtable

**Conference stream**
Urban De/Mobilizations

**Summary**
In many cities, grassroots movements are organizing to achieve adequate and affordable provision of crucial utilities and services (like housing, mobility, education, and health care, etc.) and to demand greater participation in urban policy processes. These mobilizations spawn different ways of doing citizenship, characterized by complex relationships between governments, administration, social movements, and other policy actors. In a growing number of cities, grassroots initiatives are directly involved in shaping urban policy through municipalist platforms and in formal and informal collaborative relationships within politicians, administrators, and government agencies.

The term New Municipalism refers to strategies for the local political implementation of transformative demands of grassroots movements that are consistently oriented toward the common good and overcome exclusions, aim to improve everyday living conditions, and include a democratization of political institutions through expanded co-determination procedures and a feminization of politics. The goal of municipalist political approaches is to transform local political processes, but the grassroots movements themselves are also coming under transformation pressure as they enter into new constellations and find a more sympathetic hearing. In establishing new relationships between grassroots initiatives, administration and traditional politics, the question for us is: who is actually transforming whom?

In the panel we want to discuss municipalist politics and share different experiences of grassroot initiatives in a roundtable format. Contributions are invited that relate in particular to the developments of grassroots movements and civil society initiatives that participate in governments. How are grassroots movements dealing with the challenges of institutionalization? What effects do formal participation in government or informal relations with local administrations have on the initiatives' political agenda, the composition of activists, and the internal structure of social movements? How do relations between social movements change? What strategies do social movements develop to maintain their original goals and grassroots democratic internal structures?

**References**

Feenstra Ramón A.; Tormey Simon 2021: From social mobilisation to institutional politics: Reflecting on the impact of municipalism in Madrid and Barcelona. In: Social Movement Studies 2021.

Kolesas Mara 1998: The Making of Citizenship in Argentinian Local Politics: Between Municipalization and Municipalism. International Political Science Review. 19(2):131-146.

Lima Valesca 2020: The Institutionalisation of Social Movements: Co-Optation and Democratic Policy-Making. In: Political Studies Review 19(2):245-261.

Martinez Miguel A.; Wissink Bart 2021: Urban movements and municipalist governments in Spain: alliances, tensions, and achievements, In: Social Movement Studies 2021.

## 10. Street culture meets extremism. Urban in/security in uncertain times

**Chairs**
Sebastian Kurtenbach (University of Münster, Germany, [kurtenbach@fh-muenster.de](mailto:kurtenbach@fh-muenster.de))
Jeffrey Ian Ross (University of Baltimore, United States, [jross@ubalt.edu](mailto:jross@ubalt.edu))

**Panel format**
Traditional

**Conference stream**
Urban In/Securities

**Summary**
Extremism, as all social phenomena, is related to space and place and some patterns are observable. In Europe, right-wing extremism is often more visible in rural areas (e.g. Schellenberg 2013: 60), whereas jihadism is more concentrated in some urban contexts (e.g. Van Vlierden 2016). In general, urban environments foster numerous social problems, like concentrated disadvantage, actual and perceived racism, etc. Cities also provide a wide range of alternative milieus for people to join or avoid. These conditions are important factors contributing to an individual's radicalization. Why are some people most likely to start or join a radical group, or reject this kind of path, and how do selective aspects of social context influence such a decision? In other words, on the one hand, urban contexts produce opportunities for radicalization, but on the other these environments also promote tolerance or coexistence with other people. For example, recent empirical studies highlight the relationship between a criminal career and jihadi radicalization, especially in Europe, what is called crimeterror nexus (Basra/Neumann 2016, Ilian/Sandberg 2019), but also the differences among those groups (Tutenges/Sandberg 2021).
In the context of the panel we propose, we combine the discussion about spatial dynamics of extremism with the discussion about street culture, defined as the "beliefs, dispositions, ideologies, informal rules, practices, styles, symbols, and values associated with, adopted by, and engaged in by individuals and organizations that spend a disproportionate amount of time on the streets of large urban centers" (Ross 2018: 8). Based on recent research we want to explore if and how street culture is a protective factor towards extremism or not and for whom and why. Undoubtedly, it is an interdisciplinary approach is needed to offer a comprehensive understanding of the given phenomena.
The panel asks the basic question: Is street culture an alternative to radicalization or does it mediate this process? Therefore, we invite theoretical, methodological, or empirical papers to seek the commonalities and differences between the street culture and radicalization process, everyday practices, and personal narratives. It includes all types of radicalizations.

**References**

Basra R., Neumann P.R. (2016). Criminal pasts, terrorist futures: European jihadists and the new crime–terror nexus. Perspectives on Terrorism 10(6): 25–40. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26297703.

Ilan J., Sandberg, S. (2019). How 'gangsters' become jihadists: Bourdieu, criminology and the crime–terrorism nexus. European Journal of Criminology, 16(3), 278–294. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370819828936.

Ross J.I. (2018). Reframing urban street culture: Towards a dynamic and heuristic process model. City, Culture and Society, 15, 7–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2018.05.003.

Tutenges S., Sandberg S. (2021). Street culture meets extremism: How Muslims involved in street life and crime oppose jihadism. The British Journal of Criminology, December, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azab117.

Schellenberg B. (2013). Germany. In: R. Melzer & S. Serafin (Eds.) Right-wing extremism in Europe. Bonn: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, pp. 35-64.

Van Vlierden G. (2016). Molenbeek and Beyond. The Brussels-Antwerp Axis as Hotbed of Belgian Jihad. In: A. Varvelli (Eds.) Jihadist Hotbeds. Understanding Local Radicalization Processes. Milano: Italian Institute for International Political Studies, pp. 49-62.

## 11. Ordinary affects and the everydayness of cities in transition: material and social dimensions of change

**Chairs**
Sonja Lakić (CY Cergy Paris University, France, sonja.lakic@gssi.it)
Graça Cordeiro (ISCTE - University Institute of Lisbon, Portugal, graca.cordeiro@iscte-iul.pt)
Patricia Pereira (NOVA University Lisbon, Portugal, ppereira@fcsh.unl.pt)

**Panel format**
Traditional with a variety of contribution formats (see the summary)

**Conference stream**
Urban De/Mobilizations

**Summary**
This panel calls for an understanding of human lives in urban environments that are undergoing different forms of transition – i.e. post-disaster, post-industrial, post-colonial, post-socialist cities, and/or "instant cities" (Agier, 2020) – and invites authors to examine the dynamic/interchangeable relationship between material and social dimensions of change through the perspective of "ordinary affects" (Stewart, 2007). The latter, hereby understood as "a shifting assemblage of practices and practical knowledges, a scene of both liveness and exhaustion, a dream of escape or of the simple life" (Stewart, 2007) encourages studies that come into contact with real people and their socio-spatial practices, operating from and within "the scale of the everyday" (Tonkiss, 2013). We call for contributions that blend human experience with the alterations of the built fabric and/or shed a light on "people as infrastructure" (Simone, 2004), as well as those related to the politics of reciprocity and solidarity within research (and research/activism).

We look forward to different portrayals of tactics and strategies of doing the urban and exercising the right to the city, and are interested in both traditional formats of presentations, as well as other than conventional contributions. We encourage authors to take different urban scales into account and bring to light diverse (methodological) approaches, while being particularly open for contributions based on a wide variety of creative approaches and visual methods. We, therefore, welcome research papers, as well as research-based videos and short films (up to 15mins), research-based commented photo essays and/or performances, as well as activists' diaries, biographical narratives, storytelling, comic books etc. The topics may include but are not limited to: practices of homemaking and experiences of home life, different forms of informal and extra-legal spatial appropriation, urban imaginaries, urban assemblage, buildings as living archives, cultural production of space, grassroots / DIY / self-organisation and bottom-up initiatives, urban memory, identity and citizenship, urban classifications, naming processes and urban lexiques (Topalov, 2017).

## References

Agier Michel (2020). "Utopie, dystopie, non-fiction. Faires ville, faire communauté". Availableat:https://formes.ca/territoire/articles/les-instant-cities-villes-reimaginees-sans-his toire-sans-avenir; accessed on 01/02/2022.

Simone AbdouMaliq (2004). People as Infrastructure: Intersecting Fragments in Johannesburg. Public Culture, 16(3), pp. 407-429.

Stewart Kathleen (2007). Ordinary Affects. Duke University Press.

Tonkiss Fran (2013). Cities by Design: The Social Life of Urban Form. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Topalov, Christian (2017) "Comment se produisent les classifications urbaines? Le cas des espaces stigmatisés" *Mots. Les langages du politique* [En ligne], 114: http://journals.openedition.org/mots/22860 ; DOI : https://doi.org/ 10.4000/mots.22860, accessed on 01/02/2022.

## 12. Shared housing and the city

**Chairs**
Manuel Lutz (University of Applied Sciences Potsdam, Germany
manuel.lutz@fh-potsdam.de)
Melissa Fernández Arrigoitia (Lancaster University, United Kingdom,
M.FernandezA@lancaster.ac.uk )

**Panel format**
Traditional

**Conference Stream**
Urban In/equalities

**Summary**
Across Europe, shared housing is growing as a strategy to address coinciding crises (Tummers 2016). From intentional communities (co-housing, housing cooperatives and other collaborative housing forms), to compulsory or necessity-driven housing (room shares, sublets and boarding houses) to market-driven co-living arrangements, there is an increasing need and interest in non-mainstream solutions to urban home life. While there are sharp differences between these 'choices' in terms of what makes these shared communities possible, desirable or sustainable (see Lang et al. 2018, Hudson et al. 2019, Harris and Nowicki 2020), divisions of access and experience are more blurred than might initially appear. For example, shared housing can strategically entail social mixing of different incomes while positive and negative effects may be evident in both market and non-profit forms of shared housing (Droste 2015; Ferreri et al 2019; Heath et al. 2018; Arbell 2021).

This panel seeks to delve into that complexity to ask how shared housing in its multiple and divergent social forms relates to city life, and to understand how it reproduces, intensifies or transforms urban inequalities (along class, gender, age, race, sexuality and other forms of privilege).

We are particularly interested in comparative perspectives from across and within cities that interrogate the assumed benefits of intentional communities or shortcomings of market-driven housing alternatives and welcome contributions that highlight how the changing discourses, economics and regulations of different forms of shared housing manifest in the production of socio-material spaces and practices of everyday city-making. Below, we offer some broad provocations around these links as initial questions for inspiration – but we invite themes that move with and beyond them.

Shared housing:
- inserts and resurrects values and practices of connectedness and solidarity in the city;
- transforms urban citizenship into individualized collectivity negotiated by communities;
- demands navigating dependence on the city (for support and to externalize costs of social reproduction) and dealing with (in)hospitability of living arrangements;

- requires compulsory 'job-like' performances of living collectively that increase or exhaust motivation and capacity to engage in the neighbourhood;
- segregates and privatises city life through conditional access to semi-public spaces.

**References**

Arbell Y. (2021): Beyond Affordability: English Cohousing Communities as White Middle-Class Spaces. *Housing, Theory and Society*.

Droste C. (2015): German co-housing: an opportunity for municipalities to foster socially inclusive urban development? *Urban Research & Practice*, 8: 1, pp. 64-78.

Ferreri M., Dawson G., Vasudevan A. (2017): Living precariously: property guardianship and the flexible city. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 101, pp. 165-173.

Harris E., Nowicki M. (2020): "GET SMALLER?" Emerging geographies of micro-living, *Area*, 52, p. 591-599.

Heath S., Davies K., Edwards G., Scicluna R. (2018): *Shared Housing, Shared Lives Everyday Experiences Across the Lifecourse.* London-New York: Routledge.

Hudson J., Scanlon K., Fernández Arrigoitia M., Saeed S. (2019): The wider benefits of cohousing: The case of Bridport. LSE London.

Lang R., Carriou C., Czischke D. (2020): Collaborative Housing Research (1990 - 2017): A Systematic Review and Thematic Analysis of the Field, *Housing, Theory and Society*, 37, pp. 10-39.

Tummers L. (2016): The re-emergence of self-managed co-housing in Europe: A critical review of co-housing research, *Urban Studies*, 53, pp. 2023-2040.

## 13. Urban Security as a Battlefield

**Chairs**
Claudia Mantovan (University of Padua, Italy, claudia.mantovan@unipd.it)
ANNA DI RONCO (University of Essex, United Kingdom, a.dironco@essex.ac.uk)
Xenia Chiaramonte (ICI Berlin Institute for Cultural Inquiry, Germany,
xenia.chiaramonte@ici-berlin.org)

**Panel format**
Traditional (with individual presentations)

**Conference Stream**
Urban In/Securities

**Summary**
Urban security is a contested field whose governance is shaped by a myriad of factors and processes. The latter include the increasing international migratory flows, the climate crisis, the neoliberal restructuring of society, the shrinkage of the welfare state, the rising levels of social exclusion, and the diffusion of zero-tolerance rhetoric regarding the behavior of individuals on the margins of society. All these processes have enhanced the social and ethnic fragmentation of the urban population, producing equally fragmented claims to "security" and to the "right to the city", which are often strikingly specific regarding their thematic focus and the groups for which they speak (Blokland *et al.* 2015).
Alongside claims that conceive security as "safety" and therefore as a defense of one's body and property from subjects conceived as unwanted and dangerous, we also find claims that interpret the concept of security in rather innovative and inclusive ways, such as in terms of caring for people and the environment, thus conceiving security in close connection with social and climate justice. These innovative claims have not only been advanced by the civil society and social movements, but also (in a few instances at least) by local governments, which have interpreted the concept of security in a more articulated and democratic way.
Starting from these elements, the panel welcomes both theoretical and empirical papers that, adopting critical approaches such as critical urban theory (Brenner 2009) and critical criminology (Peršak and Di Ronco 2021), analyze security as a *battlefield*, where a series of local public or private actors mobilize to affirm their ideas and practices around security.
The proposed paper should analyze different - even conflicting - understandings and enacting of security in urban settings located both in the Global North and in the Global South, and highlight the links between the local and the supra-local levels in the shaping of security.
In particular, the panel is interested in papers that consider urban struggles and conflicts over the meaning of security, and which often translate into the criminalization of actors holding an innovative, inclusive and democratic understanding of security, such as social movements and eco-justice movements.

**References**

Blokland T., Hentschel C., Holm A., Lebuhn H. and Margalit T. (2015), "Urban citizenship and right to the city: the fragmentation of claims", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 655-65.

Brenner N. (2009), "What is critical urban theory?", *City*, vol. 13, nos. 2-3, pp. 198-207.

Peršak N., Anna Di Ronco A. (eds) (2021), *Harm and Disorder in the Urban Space: Social Control, Sense and Sensibility,* Routledge, London.

## 14. Urban (new) normality: political visions, everyday practices, and consequences for inequalities

**Chairs**
Marta Smagacz-Poziemska (Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland,
marta.smagacz-poziemska@uj.edu.pl)
Natalia Martini (Humboldt University Berlin, Germany, natalia.ewa.martini@gmail.com)
Marta Klekotko (Jagiellonian University, Krakow, Poland, marta.klekotko@uj.edu.pl)

**Panel format**
Traditional (with elements of a panel debate)

**Conference Stream**
Urban In/Equalities

**Summary**
"I just want things to be back to normal again" – these are the words spoken by people wearied by the consecutive pandemic waves and the uncertainty they bring about. The fear of the virus, periods of lockdown, and strong social distancing measures have destabilized "normal" life in cities all over the world. They have prevented or limited routine activities, and questioned the default rules, rhythms, and geographies of urban life. After seeking out security, and opening up to new challenges, we seem to have entered a stage of embracing "the new normal". This stage opened with the claim of "(re)turning to normality," which can be seen as a(n) (re)entry of a commonly shared and tacitly assumed general understanding of "how can or should members of a society live" (Trentmann 2009: 69). "New normal" urban practices are being envisioned and implemented by cities via urban planning and public policies. They are also being developed and enacted by the city dwellers as they adapt their daily routines to the realities of the (post)pandemic city life. "Normality", however, might mean different things to different actors, all of whom have a vested interest in how new normality is to be defined and enacted. Power to define what is normal and how members of society should live is unequally distributed among social actors. By depriving someone of an opportunity to define normality, social exclusions are being (re)produced and conflicts generated. In this session, we aim to facilitate a debate about "the new normal" in the (post)pandemic cities, emerging from urban political visions and everyday practices, and its (potential) exclusionary effects. The pandemic has revealed the existing urban inequalities. Are the visions and practices of re/turning to normality deepening the existing and/or creating new inequalities? Or maybe, as many would hope, they bring about more equality? We envision this session as a combination of the traditional format and a panel debate. We invite scholars to share observations and experiences from their cities via both individual presentation of specific cases and joint discussion on the session's main theme.
We welcome submissions which address (preferably all) the following questions: (1) How does "the new normal" emerge in European cities (e.g. through urban strategies and

policies, modification of daily routines)? (2) What "the new normal" is/will be (e.g. in relation to housing, public services, leisure, mobility, civic engagement)? (3) Whom (human and non-human) does it not consider or exclude?

**References**

Trentmann F. (2009). Disruption is Normal: Blackouts, Breakdowns and the Elasticity of Everyday Life. In E. Shove, F. Trentmann & R. Wilk (Eds.). Time, Consumption and Everyday Life: Practice, Materiality and Culture (pp. 67–84). London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Sardar Z. (2021). Afterthoughts: Transnormal, the "New Normal" and other varieties of "Normal" in postnormal times. World Futures Review, 13(2), 54-70.

## 15. The Creative Paradox of Marginal Urban Citizenship

**Chairs**
Daniel Monterescu (Central European University, Vienna, Austria, monterescud@ceu.edu)
Merav Kaddar (Technical University of Berlin, Germany meravkaddar@gmail.com)

**Panel format**
Traditional (with individual presentations)

**Conference Stream**
Urban In/Equalities

**Summary**
Contemporary urban spaces have been often conceptualised through the "marginality paradigm".
While this approach rightly stresses the political economy of uneven development resulting in structural inequalities (Wacquant 2008, 2016), it also fails to acknowledge the emergence of urban agency and the creative socio-political engagement. Recognizing the critical power of the marginality paradigm, this panel wishes to challenge it and instead of essentializing these spaces as sites of paralysing victimhood and nebulous resistance, offer a relational theory of creative urban citizenship on the margins (Isin, 2000; Kaddar and Monterescu, 2021). We thus seek to expand our understanding of the dialectic power of disenfranchisement in reconfiguring artistic creativity, social engagement and political mobilisation.
We understand urban spaces of marginality as any peripheries within the city, substantiated by differences in class, race, gender fluidity, religion, ethnicity, life-style and/or nationality, as opposed to the urban hegemony. Urban citizenship is understood as an active engagement with the urban environment, practising one's right to the city by shaping it.
Re-framing exclusion as a radical opportunity for social action, we seek to reflect on how different marginal groups engage with the city. We are especially interested in the intersectional dimensions of marginality – double or multiple marginalities – thus offering a broad spectrum of positionalities.
Departing from an Orientalist view of marginalised minority groups as inherently "traditional" or "conservative," we call for a closer examination of unruly projects of defiant subjectivities and rebel community organising.
Areas of interest for this panel include, but are not limited to, the following questions:
● How to ethnic and ethnonational minorities use the city as a site of communal distinction?
● How does gender and racial intersectionality operate in contested urban spaces?
● How are liberal and radical discourses of diversity, gentrification and the right to the city reformulated in relation to each other?
● How does the "refugee crisis" in Europe and beyond affect the creation of diasporic spaces of resistance and cultural performance?

● Could marginal urban citizenship open new political possibilities and creative practices, while gravitating towards inclusion?

Case studies, comparative analyses or theoretical papers that address one or several of the themes above, or related topics, from different urban geographies, will be considered.

**References**

Isin E.F. (2000). Democracy, Citizenship, and the Global City. New York: Routledge.

Isin E.F., Nielsen G.M. (2008). Acts of Citizenship. London and New York: Zed Books Ltd.

Kaddar M., Monterescu D. (2021). Dancing with tears in our eyes: political hipsters, alternative culture and binational urbanism in Israel/Palestine. Ethnic and Racial Studies. 44:6: 925-945.

Turner J. (2016). (En)gendering the political: Citizenship from marginal spaces. Citizenship Studies. 20:2: 141-155.

Wacquant L. (2008). Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality. Cambridge: Polity.

Wacquant L. (2016). Revisiting territories of relegation: Class, ethnicity and state in the making of advanced marginality. Urban Studies. 53(6): 1077-1088.

## 16. Moving towards others: comparing fleeting solidarities in re/configuring social spaces across Europe

**Chairs**
Lesley Murray (University of Brighton, United Kingdom, L.Murray@brighton.ac.uk)
Liz McDonnell (University of Sussex, United Kingdom, E.J.Mcdonnell@sussex.ac.uk)

**Panel Format**
Lightning talk session

**Conference Stream**
Urban De/Mobilizations

**Summary**
Despite the 'lie of solidarity' illuminated in the unmask[ing of] the hidden systems of inequality that are lost in the mundanity of everyday life' (Nolan 2021: 1), the Covid 19 pandemic has also highlighted the unremarkable ways in which people act together, for one another, in *fleeting and intermittent moments* of solidarity. It has changed the ways in which people come into contact with others as urban space, from the streets to the living rooms, and critically the boundaries between them, has become reconfigured. In challenging the privilege of face-to-face relations, Young (1990) draws our attention to the 'plurality of contexts' in which people act for the good of others. The notion of face-to-faceness has been disrupted as we have been required to change our embodied interactions.

This panel documents the new spatialities of urban-based solidarities across Europe, recognising their transience and mundanity as well as their physical configurations. This can often occur beyond or below established ideas of community or formal aid, such as volunteering, but here we are interested in the more intimate and informal dimensions of such practices e.g., talking with extended family across digital platforms, checking in on neighbours across fences, interacting with people in care homes through windows, or delivering shopping or medication to friends. These myriad relations make urban social space, and can create possibilities for micro transformations, however fleeting. At the same time, it is acknowledged that such relations can entrench social inequality and it is necessary to understand this critically.

This panel will adopt the format of lightning talk session in which six participants will present papers for 7 minutes using 7 slides and allowing for half of the session to be a facilitated discussion that forms an international comparison (Handrais 2009) of fleeting solidarities in re/configuring urban social spaces in Europe, drawing out commonalities and differences across national borders and considering the broader geo-political context.

**References**

Handrais L. 2009. International Comparative Research Theory. Methods and Practice. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nolan R. 2020. 'We are all in this together!' Covid-19 and the lie of solidarity. Irish journal of sociology 29 (1): 102-106

Young I.M. 2022. Justice and the politics of difference. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

## 17. The new flâneurs in the urban space: from individualization to collective participation

**Chairs**

Giampaolo Nuvolati (University of Milan Bicocca, Italy, giampaolo.nuvolati@unimib.it)
Lucia Quaquarelli  (University of Paris Nanterre, France, lquaquarelli@parisnanterre.fr)

**Panel format**
Traditional

**Conference Stream**
Urban De/Mobilizations

**Summary**
The notion of flâneur - in use since the late 19th century to designate writers, poets and intellectuals that critically observed people's behavior while strolling among the crowd, and codified in the Walter Benjamin's influential work on the *Passages* of Paris - is once again of central interest (in sociology, philosophy, literature, and cinema) as a tool for identifying a specific mode of walking and exploring urban places, as a particular type of reflective relationship with people and spaces. The growing process of individualization, the contemporary attempt of people to personalize their relationships with the places, to explore non-conventional urban territories, refusing standard patterns, makes the flâneur a renewed protagonist of our era. Less élitarian than in the past, the new flâneurs or the new practices of flânerie should be considered as emerging figures and activities able to fill the desire of more active or personal biography expressed by the individuals in fighting against the consumerist redundancy. Flâneurs show similarities and divergences with other actors walking in the city: tourists, travellers, social scientists, and other figures performing a sort of flânerie in the urban context. Moreover, linkages between flâneurs and cultural movements like Lettrism, Situationism can be easily found in the literature. In such a framework the flâneur can be considered as the object as well as the subject of the sociological analysis and therefore he or she (flâneur and flâneuse) is an important figure to look at in order to understand urban transformations but also to address urban planning as Amin and Thrift pointed out. Despite (or because) their personal and intellectual way to deal with places, flaneurs assume a particular relevance as new actors of  a kind of civic participation not anymore linked to traditional patterns but open to individual experiences. Potential aspects of the concept of flâneur are linked to psychological, anthropological and sociological perspectives in offering an alternative vision of the processes of citizenship, of closeness to places, of political involvement versus indifference. In particular, flânerie, as a way of living and exploring the space, strongly relates to sociological issues concerning everyday practices performed by different social groups by age, gender, social class, cultural level, ethnicity in urban context. The panel will host papers concerning the evolution of the flâneurs, their possible engagement in collective actions finalized to improve living conditions and identity in urban contexts by walking the city. The illustration of experiences

of individual or shared flânerie sited and finalized to explore, describe and plan specific territories, will be appreciated.

**References**

Amin A. and Thrift N., 2002, *Cities. Reimagining the Urban*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Nuvolati G., 2014, "The Flaneur: A Way of Walking, Exploring and Interpreting the City" in Timothy Shortell and Evrick Brown (ed.), *Walking in the European City*, Burlington: Ashgate.
Nuvolati G. and Quaquarelli L. (eds.), "Flânerie as a way of living, walking and exploring the city", *Fuori Luogo*, special issue: Flânerie vol.10 - n.2/2021.
Tester K (ed.), 1994, *The Flâneur*, London: Routledge.

## 18. Seeing the City through multispecies perspectives: Mobilizing nature to the city and the city to beyond

**Chairs**
Santiago Orrego (University of Antioquia, Colombia, santiago.orrego@udea.edu.co)
Elisabeth Luggauer (University of Graz, Austria, elisabeth.luggauer@edu.uni-graz.at
Indrawan Prabaharyaka (Humboldt University Berlin, Germany,  prabahai@hu-berlin.de)

**Panel format**
Traditional

**Conference Stream**
Urban De/Mobilizations

**Summary**
Nowadays, western urban spaces often appear as anthropocentric arrangements where 'nature' and other living beings are either left out and made invisible or kept in a controlled form. As Jennifer Wolch (2002, p.721) states, "the role of nature has been traditionally neglected in shaping the urban experience." This panel, in relation to the conference stream *Urban De/Mobilizations*, brings together current epistemologies, understanding the city as a biophysical and cultural multispecies entanglement, linked to Donna Haraway's (2003) conception of *natureculture*. Building on sociological and interdisciplinary concepts of the city as a more-than-human realm (Franklyn, 2017), the panel explores what happens when non-human beings, plants, animals, fungi, microorganisms, and so on, are taken seriously as political elements inhabiting and co-producing urban spaces and formations. It focuses on two regards: (i) how encounters and assemblages between human and non-human worlds socially construct the city and are in tension with different urbanism practices, and (ii) the ontological, ethical, and political conditions of those non-human agents in making 'the urban'. Accordingly, the panel proposes two sociological implications of seeing through multispecies perspectives: (i) theoretically, it *respecifies* the agency of social goods in sociology of space (Löw, 2016) and *ecologizes* the bodies in carnal sociology (Wacquant, 2015); and (ii) pragmatically, it *shifts* the other-than-humans from mere objects to constitutive elements of urban advocacy and activism.
We are looking for contributions, expanding urban practices and infrastructures beyond the city limits, understanding urbanization as a planetary phenomenon, mobilizing, involving, affecting, and overlapping the dualized 'urban' and 'wildlife.' We are inviting ethnographic explorations that address multispecies accounts to rethink cities as multispecies assemblages in the formats of 'classical' papers, as well as inventive, multimodal, experimental, and artistic attempts and interventions. There are six dimensions we want to direct, but not limit, the outcoming contributions:
1.    Engagements, confrontations, and cohabitations between 'the urban' and 'the wild.'
2.    Multispecies urban spaces and infrastructures.
3.    More-than-human im/mobilities.

4.     Natureculture ontologies.
5.     Methodological approaches to urban multispecies research.
6.     Multispecies justice and the right to the city.

**References**

Franklin, A. (2016). The More-than-human city. *The Sociological Review* 00. 1-17.

Haraway, D. (2003). The Companion Species Manifesto. Dogs, People and Significant Otherness. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Löw, M. (2016). *The sociology of space: Materiality, social structures, and action*. Springer.

Van Dooren, T. and Rose, D. (2012). Storied places in a multispecies city. *Humanimalia: a journal of human/animal interface studies*, 3(2). 1-27.

Wolch, J, (2002). Anima Urbis. *Progress in Human Geography* 26(6). 721-742.

Wacquant, L. (2015). For a sociology of flesh and blood. *Qualitative sociology*, *38*(1). 1-11.

## 19. Food for Thought: Challenges and Potentials of Practices for Urban Socio-Ecological Justice

**Chairs**

Elisa Privitera (University of Catania, Italy, lizzyprivitera@ucsb.edu)
Noa Cykman (University of California - Santa Barbara, United States, noacykman@ucsb.edu)

**Panel format**

A roundtable that will start from the presentation by the panellists of their work, inviting them to do so either through a conventional lecture or using creative means, such as video or images. Then, the chairs will conduct the conversation around some questions for the participants in order to compare and create a space of sharing and discussion on the thematic nodes.

**Conference stream**

Urban De/Mobilizations

**Summary**

Environmental sociology and urban sociology have recently started to communicate, seeking, among other objectives, to understand cities' ecological conditions, and how they may be improved. The connections between human life and other forms of life are central to this paradigmatic shift that is taking place both in theory (sociological and in other fields) and in practical undertakings. One of the main venues of multispecies interactions is the constant flux of eating and being eaten, and the way in which humans engage with this flux forms food systems. What does it take to feed a city, and what can we learn from practical experiences that seek food justice and ecological regeneration in urban spaces? Over half of the global population currently lives in cities. (Projections by the U.N. point to 68% by 2050:https://www.un.org/development/desa/en/news/population/2018-revision-of-world-urbanization-prospects.html). Such a trend poses a challenge to provide the urban population with equal access to agricultural produce, especially fresh fruits and vegetables. Agriculture has historically been a function of rural communities, and has only barely been incorporated into urban settings. As cities expand without absorbing agricultural sites into their design, croplands are progressively reduced and marginalized. Agribusiness corporations further erode small scale farmers' production, and urban dwellers increasingly face food insecurity.

These previsions open a series of challenges. This panel seeks to explore such challenges by looking at practices of urban agriculture that aim at achieving food justice and spatial justice while, at the same time, improving the quality of space from an ecological point of view. Such inclusive urban regeneration practices include, but are not limited to, community gardens, urban agroecology, urban food forests,  and other community-nature-based solutions.

We want to look at the potential of these practices to project more equal and just futures. In particular, we are interested in addressing the tensions that emerge between

self-organized practices and governmental institutions. Coming from political stances that range from libertarian/anarchism, social-democracy, to institutionalism, these alternative/experimental/pilot urban practices approach and engage differently with state power and with the legal framework.

Participants of these panel, both practitioners and academics, will discuss the following topics:

1) How can concrete practices and local ongoing experiences inspired by principles of socio-ecological justice provide insights to address current urban challenges that we face, including food insecurity? What kinds of movements do we have or need now that allow us to project just futures?;

2) How has the interaction with public institutions been productive or challenging to the development of these projects? What are the main tensions?;

3) How do these practices reveal connections between urban, social and environmental issues?

4) How do these experiences affect/ shift our concepts of "nature" and "society"? What impacts may they have on traditional disciplinary boundaries, on urban studies, and on sociological theoretical frameworks?

This panel welcomes empirical work, grounded on case studies or on comparative studies between cases, as well as theoretical investigation and new conceptualization on these topics. We are looking for contributions coming both from practitioners, academics and activists. We welcome reflections based on practical experiences, as well as innovative theories seeking to bond between social and ecological perspectives. We hope to integrate practices from all over the world, with a specific consideration for distressed areas.

**References**

Heynen Nik; Kaika Maria; Swyngedouw Erik. In the Nature of Cities. London: Routledge, 2006.

McMichael Philip, ed. The global restructuring of agro-food systems. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1994.

Shiva Vandana. Who really feeds the world?: The failures of agribusiness and the promise of agroecology. Berkeley: North Atlantic Books, 2016.

## 20. Seeing like a Smart City-Maker: Reimagining Cities through Instruments and Practices

**Chairs**
Julia Valeska Schröder (Humboldt University Berlin, Germany,
 julia.valeska.schroeder@hu-berlin.de)
Julio Paulos (University of Lausanne, Switzerland, julio.paulos@unil.ch)
Nick Förster (Technical University of Munich, Germany, nick.foerster@tum.de)

**Panel format**
Traditional

**Conference stream**
Urban De/Mobilisations

**Summary**
The so-called digitisation of the city (also referred to as the "Smart City") aims at fundamentally changing how cities are viewed, how they see themselves, and how they see the world. As part of this effort, administration practices are being innovated (through services design, for example), digital tools are being introduced (such as monitoring, analysis, and simulation), and process-oriented planning approaches are being implemented (e.g., co-creation workshops). Therefore, "Smart City" initiatives aim to change not only the way in which cities are seen (or known) but in addition how they are practically envisioned and professionally performed.

Citizen science, innovation hackathons, and the politicisation of urban infrastructures are forcing city administrations to embrace new forms of smartness while also contending with operationalisation issues. The panel will examine the tools, formats, and practices that seek to transform cities into "Smart Cities." The question at stake is how "Smart City" projects practically converge the vision on the ground.

Bringing together discussions on "studies of digitisation" and "critical smart urbanisms", contributions may address (the politics of) performative planning, administrational politics, and related discourses. Contributions that highlight tools of intervention and unconventional policy instruments, as well as efforts that emphasise "digitisation tactics" from within governmental planning, administration, and strategy-making processes, are especially welcomed.

The following questions are thus invited for consideration:
- What are "Smart City" projects made of, and how are they implemented and/or enacted on the ground?
- Which modes of operation, institutional reorganisations, planning formats, and infrastructure prototypes
constitute Smart City initiatives?
- Which synergies and frictions arise from these arrangements? How do these practices, instruments, and tools work together, and how do they conflict or clash?

- In what ways are these instruments and practices of "Smart City" making being institutionalised? To what extent do they interact with existing, established processes and institutional arrangements?

- How do the analyses allow us to explore new perspectives on "Smart Cities"? How can we scrutinise concrete sociomaterial constellations without overlooking the larger formations of politics and economy?

The panel will be organised as a board, with consecutive presentations followed by a moderated discussion.

**References**

Andrew Karvonen: Urban Techno-Politics: Knowing, Governing, and Imagining the City. Science as Culture 2020.

Michiel De Lange & Martijn de Waal (eds.): The Hackable City. Digital Media and Collaborative City-Making in the Network Society. Springer 2019.

Rob Kitchin, Tracey P. Lauriault & Gavin McArdle: Knowing and governing cities through urban indicators, city benchmarking and real-time dashboards. Regional Studies, Regional Science 2015.

## 21. Housing, Financialization and Mobility

**Chairs**
Chiara Valli (Malmö University, Sweden, chiara.valli@mau.se)
Karina Villacura (Malmö University, Sweden, karina.villacura@mau.se)
Myrto Dagkouli  (Malmö University, Sweden, myrto.dagkouli-kyriakoglou@mau.se)
Defne Kadioglu (Malmö University, Sweden, defne.kadioglu@mau.se )

**Panel Format**
Traditional

**Conference Stream**
Urban In/Equalities

**Summary**
Under financialization, i.e., the growing influence of financial markets on the economy, housing becomes an asset that thrives on and fosters mobility of capital and people for the exploitation of trapped value. As capital investments mobility intensifies, the mobility of tenants is circumscribed in novel ways, e.g., by being "squeezed" (August & Walks, 2018) into low-quality rental housing, being confined to certain not-yet gentrifying areas of the city or by having to frequently move due to precarious housing arrangements (Grander, 2021). Studies in the field of housing mobility have typically focused on migration (Artero, 2020), life-course perspectives and events (Feijten & Van Ham, 2010), mobility-as-vacancy-chains (Ferrari, 2011), lower-income mobilities (Wood, 2014), economic outcomes of mobility (Dietz &Haurin, 2003) or hypermobility (Bergan et al., 2020), but they have rarely examined the causal nexus between the mobility (of money and people) and housing financialization.

By relating mobility and housing financialization, we seek to highlight broader causal effects and identify new phenomena that have not been conventionally linked. We welcome papers that address, but are not limited to, the following questions:
-How does financialization drive or hamper housing mobility?
-How does people's mobility act as hindrance or vehicle for capital flow in a financializing housing system?
-What is the role of the (local) state in regulating, directing or facilitating the mobility of people and capital?
-How does the segmentation of the housing market trigger mobility?
-How do novel housing trends link to financialization, such as short-term rentals or new forms of shared housing?
- How does households' indebtedness and over-indebtedness affect mobility patterns?
-How does policy shape mobility patterns in the context of housing financialization, particularly in the context of racialized space politics?
-What are the conceptual and methodological challenges in studying the link between mobility and housing financialization?

**References**

Artero, M. (2020). The mobility of the drop-in: Drop-in centres for migrants as providers of motility. *Cities*, *100*, 102654.

August, M., & Walks, A. (2018). Gentrification, suburban decline, and the financialization of multi-family rental housing: The case of Toronto. *Geoforum*, *89*, 124-136.

Bergan, T. L., Gorman-Murray, A., & Power, E. R. (2020). Coliving housing: home cultures of precarity for the new creative class. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 1-19.

Dietz, R. D., & Haurin, D. R. (2003). The social and private micro-level consequences of homeownership. *Journal of Urban Economics, 54(*3), 401-450. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0094-1190(03)00080-9.

Grander, M. (2021). The inbetweeners of the housing markets–young adults facing housing inequality in Malmö, Sweden. *Housing Studies*, 1-18.

Feijten, P., & Van Ham, M. (2010). The impact of splitting up and divorce on housing careers in the UK. *Housing Studies*, *25*(4), 483-507.

Ferrari, E. (2011). Conceptualising Social Housing within the Wider Housing Market: A Vacancy Chain Model. *Housing Studies*, *26*(1), 95–116. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2010.512786.

Wood, H. (2014). When Only a House Makes a Home: How Home Selection Matters in the Residential Mobility Decisions of Lower-Income, Inner-City African American Families. *Social Service Review*, *88*(2), 264–294. https://doi.org/10.1086/676407.

## 22. Housing affordability and segregational developments: New Perspectives on neighborhood change

**Chairs**
Robert Vief (Humboldt University Berlin, Germany, [robert.vief@hu-berlin.de](mailto:robert.vief@hu-berlin.de))
Kasey Zapatka (CUNY - City University of New York City, United States, [kzapatka@gradcenter.cuny.edu](mailto:kzapatka@gradcenter.cuny.edu))

**Panel format**
Traditional

**Conference Stream**
Urban In/equalities

**Summary**
Over the last few decades, housing affordability has become one of greatest political challenges for many cities around the world (Desmond 2018). Bold and aggressive housing policies have become core platforms for politicians while many state and local governments have passed housing regulation geared towards creating and preserving housing affordability. The global Covid-19 pandemic has reinforced the importance of housing as many have begun working from home and highlighted the centrality of neighborhood context as people spend less time commuting and more time in their surrounding neighborhoods. Finding adequate and affordable housing is an ever more pressing priority than before.

Despite economic hardship during the global financial and Covid19 crises, rents and home values continue to soar to new highs as wages fail to keep pace, significantly sharpening cost burdens not only for low- but middle-income households as well.

Many theories exist to explain how new patterns of ethno-racial and socioeconomic segregation emerge within and between cities and how those trends are linked to other forms of urban inequalities. Further, as the housing affordability crisis expands, local context shapes the diverse forms of segregation cities experience (van Ham et al. 2021).

This panel connects recent trends in housing affordability with divergent forms of segregation to better understand the role of the housing affordability crisis in creating new patterns of spatial mixing and distancing among different urban groups.

We are looking for work that theoretically and/or empirically explores the relationship of housing affordability and segregation. In this context, segregation can include residential sorting in and between neighborhoods or cities (i.e., gentrification, social mixing, spatial concentration of poverty, wealth or racial and ethnic clusters), the interplay of housing conditions and the segregation of institutional settings (i.e., schools, childcare, health facilities, community centers), and segregation within social network formation through both mechanisms.

We welcome both quantitative and qualitative methodological approaches that engage with the topic, as well as contributions from all around the world.

## References

Desmond, Matthew (2018): Heavy is the House: Rent Burden among the American Urban Poor. In International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 42 (1), pp. 160–170. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2427.12529.

Van Ham, Maarten; Tammaru, Tiit; Ubarevičienė, Rūta; Janssen, Heleen (2021): Rising Inequalities and a Changing Social Geography of Cities. An Introduction to the Global Segregation Book. In Maarten van Ham, Tiit Tammaru, Rūta Ubarevičienė, Heleen Janssen (Eds.): Urban Socio-Economic Segregation and Income Inequality. Cham: Springer International Publishing (The Urban Book Series), pp. 3–26.

## 23. Reclaiming the street: understanding residents' mobilisation for security

**Chairs**
Maxime Felder (EPFL - Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Lausanne, Switzerland, maxime.felder@epfl.ch)
Loïc Pignolo (University of Geneva, Switzerland, loic.pignolo@unige.ch)

**Panel format**
Traditional

**Conference Stream**
Urban De/Mobilizations

**Summary**
Jane Jacobs wrote: 'A well-used city street is apt to be a safe street. A deserted city street is apt to be unsafe' (1992: 34). To her, any presence in the public space is a pair of eyes on the street, able to step in if there is a problem, or at least to give a sense of safety to other users. Bringing 'life between buildings' (Gehl 1971) has thus become a challenge for governments and planners who connect 'lively streets' and security. However, not all urban spaces are teeming with life, and not all city dwellers have the time or inclination to be those 'eyes on the street'. Moreover, not all social practices in public spaces bring a sense of safety and security.

Faced with public spaces that they consider unsafe, some residents are mobilising. On the darker side, these mobilisations are about control (e.g. neighbourhood watch) and even violence. On the brighter side, they are about organising block parties or garage sales, in an effort to foster a sense of conviviality, familiarity, and security. In any case, those attempts at 'reclaiming' the street may target specific social practices, people, or public space features that are deemed undesirable.

This panel aims to explore how residents engage in their neighbourhoods to produce a sense of security. We are interested in how they define the problem of in/security, and how they act accordingly to achieve security by enhancing conviviality, familiarity or collective efficacy. Firstly, we seek to understand who engages in those political or symbolic struggles, what is targeted, what sort of actions are taken, and with what effects. Secondly, we aim to uncover the Othering processes and the social representations of (in)security and of (il)legitimacy behind these mobilisations. Thirdly, we are interested in the contexts of such mobilisations, including changes in neighbourhoods (gentrification, precarisation), in neighbour relations, in ways of dwelling, in mobility practices, etc. Finally, we also welcome contributions that explore those aspects in relation to the Covid-19 crisis and its impacts on the use and appearance of urban public spaces.

**References**

Blokland, T. & Serbedzija, V. (2020) Feeling safe, defining crime and urban youth in Berlin's inner city: An exploration of the construction of 'unsafety' and 'youth' as symbolic violence. In: Smagacz-Poziemska M. et al. (Eds.) *Inequality and Uncertainty.* Singapore: Palgrave, 161-183.

England, M. (2008). When 'Good Neighbors' go Bad: Territorial Geographies of Neighborhood Associations. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 40(12), 2879–2894.

Felder, M. (2021). Familiarity as a Practical Sense of Place. *Sociological Theory*, 39(3), 180–199.

## 24. Seeing the city through emotions

**Chairs**
Nina Margies (Humboldt University Berlin, Germany, nina.margies@sowi.hu-berlin.de)
Åsa Wettergren (University of Gothenburg, Sweden, asa.wettergren@socav.gu.se)

**Panel format**
Traditional (with individual presentations)

**Conference stream**
Urban In/Securities

**Summary**
Emotions play a role in the way we see, inhabit and build cities. A city, or a neighbourhood atmosphere is hard to verbalise but is very intensely felt (Sørensen 2015; Barclay & Riddle 2021).
Emotions are vital for questions of dis/belonging (Puwar 2004; Jones & Jackson 2014): who feels at home and who feels out of place? They are essential in processes of urban surveillance and control: who is labelled as particularly fearsome and threatening and therefore more often subject to policing or racism (Hostetter 2010; Binken & Blokland 2012)? The question of emotions and power are also central to protest and resistance in cities. Social movements that bring their claims to the street do not only challenge the social order, they also question existing rules about who is allowed to feel how and where in the city (Flam & King 2005; Wettergren 2009; Wettergren & Jansson 2013). While emotions are indicators of social change, expressions of power relations and inequalities, debates in urban sociology haven´t paid much attention as to how we can see the city through emotions.
This panel seeks for contributions that delve into the relationships between emotions and cities. What do we learn about cities when we look at them through the lens of emotions? How can we study emotions as indicators of urban social change, expressions of urban power relations and inequalities?
Exploring emotions and how they move people and move around in (urban) space can tell us much about how cities work and for whom. Which emotions are heard, justified, elicited, invited and which ones are not? How do people and institutions categorize, draw boundaries and govern through emotions?
We welcome submissions that include the following topics (but are not limited to):
• Urban change and emotions
• Processes of urban in/exclusion and emotions
• Urban dis/belonging and emotions
• Urban governance and emotions
• Affective citizenship
• Urban social movements and emotions

**References**

Barclay K., Riddle J. (eds) (2021) Urban emotions and the making of the city: interdisciplinary perspectives, New York: Routledge.

Binken S., Blokland T. (2012) Why repressive policies towards urban youths do not make streets safe: four hypotheses, The Sociological Review, 60(2): 292-311.

Flam H., King D. (eds) (2005) Emotions and Social Movements, London [u.a.]: Routledge.

Hostetter E. (2010) The emotions of racialization: examining the intersection of emotion, race, and landscape through public housing in the United States, GeoJournal, 75(3): 283-298.

Jones H., Jackson E. (eds) (2014) Stories of Cosmopolitan Belonging: Emotion and Location, London: Routledge.

Puwar N. (2004) Space invaders: race, gender and bodies out of place, Oxford: Berg.

Sørensen T.F. (2015) More than a feeling: Towards an archaeology of atmosphere. Emotion, Space and Society 15: 64-73.

Wettergren Å. (2009) Fun and Laughter: Culture Jamming and the Emotional Regime of Late Capitalism. Social Movement Studies 8(1): 1-16.

Wettergren Å., Jansson Å. (2013) Emotions, power and space in the discourse of ́People of the Real World`. Journal of Political Power 6(3): 419-439.

## 25. Solidarity with precarious migrants in the city: alliances, frames and practices

**Chairs**
Sarah Spencer (Oxford University, United Kingdom, sarah.spencer@compas.ox.ac.uk)
Ilker Atac (Fulda University of Applied Sciences, Germany, ilker.atac@sw.hs-fulda.de)
Simon Güntner (Vienna University ot Technology, Austria, simon.guentner@tuwien.ac.at)

**Panel format**
Traditional (individual presentations)

**Conference Stream**
Urban De/Mobilizations

**Summary**
Access to public welfare services is bounded by various criteria of access and eligibility. A key factor underlying both insurance and rights-based services is a secure right of residence, an often-overlooked dimension of inequality (Pobjoy & Spencer 2012; Güntner et al. 2015). Those who are deprived of this right for whatever reasons - for whom equality is not intended - depend on their own resources, acquaintances, infrastructures of solidarity but also on charities. In large cities, a field has emerged in which individuals, initiatives and organisations team up to provide services that are usually offered through parallel structures and less on a rights basis, thereby relieving the mainstream social system (Kaufmann & Strebel 2020, Ataç et al. 2020). These range from volunteering medical practitioners to housing projects, and often combine direct help and assistance with campaigns for widening access to formal, rights-based services.

To engage in this field and legitimise their investment of resources, the actors find various frames through which they legitimise their practices. Such frames relate to their mission, vision or purpose (e.g. human rights, solidarity, but also pragmatic socio-economic policy goals) and the deservingness of the persons in need and build linkages between them (Spencer & Delvino 2019; Yukich 2013; Kreichauf & Mayer 2021).

This panel invites contributions that shed light on this field of local solidarity beyond formal social rights. Papers could discuss the alliances that are formed, the frames that are applied to legitimise support and the practices that have evolved. We are particularly interested in theoretically grounded case studies from European cities.

**References**
Ataç, I., Schütze, T. & Reitter, V. (2020). Local responses in restrictive national policy contexts: Welfare provisions for non-removed rejected asylum seekers in Amsterdam, Stockholm and Vienna. Ethnic and Racial Studies 43(16): 115–134.
Bosniak, L. (2006). The Citizen and the Alien: Dilemmas of Contemporary Membership, Princeton University Press.

Guentner, S., Lukes, S. Stanton, R., Vollmer, B. & Wilding, J (2016). Bordering practices in the UK welfare system. Critical Social Policy. 36(3):391-411.

Kaufmann, D. & Strebel, D. (2020). Urbanising Migration Policy-Making: Urban Policies in Support of Irregular Migrants in Geneva and Zürich. In: Urban Studies, DOI: 10.1177/0042098020969342.

Kreichauf, R. & Mayer, M. (2021). "Negotiating urban solidarities: multiple agencies and contested meanings in the making of solidarity cities." Urban Geography 2021. Pre-print. https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2021.1890953.

Pobjoy, J. & Spencer, S. (2012). 'Equality for All? The Relationship between Immigration Status and the Allocation of Rights in the United Kingdom'. European Human Rights Law Review 2: 160-175.

Spencer, S. & Delvino, N. (2019). "Municipal activism on irregular migrants: The framing of inclusive approaches at the local level." Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies 17(1): 27-43.

Yukich, G. (2013). Constructing the Model Immigrant: Movement Strategy and Immigrant Deservingness in the New Sanctuary Movement, Social Problems, 60(3): 302–320.

## 26. Similarities and differences between gentrification cases: do contexts, states and institutions matter?

**Chairs**
Gergely Olt (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, olt.gergely@gmail.com)
Adrienne Csizmady (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Csizmady.Adrienne@tk.hu)

**Panel format**
Traditional (with individual presentations)

**Conference stream**
Urban In/Equalities

**Summary**
Gentrification is considered as a ubiquitous phenomenon explained by the same universal laws of urban land rent dynamics under global capitalism everywhere (Smith, 2002). However, this approach was criticised lately by highlighting the necessary contextual factors when these laws actually apply, and that it cannot deal with parallel similarities and differences of gentrification cases (Bernt, 2016). The assumption of neoliberal state and urban policies behind gentrification was also questioned, and different adjectives and prefixes were added to the word neoliberalism (such as radical, authoritarian and post-) altering its meaning fundamentally.

To progress this debate, we invite theoretical and empirical papers to our session situated in the Urban in/equalities stream related but not exclusive to the following issues.

Empirical research shows that, besides the general affordability crisis of urban housing, the extent of this problem, and the political reactions to it are varied (even within Western-Europe, see Christophers, 2021). In many cases around the world (for example in Southern-Europe) demand created by tourism and expats is considered more central in the process than elsewhere. In cities under transformation (for example in Eastern-Europe) privatisation policies, distribution of external funding (i.e. EU funds) and illiberal politics influence the process.

Different political and institutional contexts show variation in how informality can appear in housing opportunities of residents and how political power uses informality (i.e. corruption, cleintelism, disrespect of civil rights and/or private property, etc.) in urban interventions. Informal state practices also influence the opportunities, means and results of political struggles against gentrification.

However, are these assumptions and descriptions about differences superficial and "created"? Why are they created? Do they matter at all theoretically?

Can we find disinvestment-reinvestment cycles and/or neoliberalism as the context of gentrification in every case? Are there other factors at play?

What influences housing strategies of states, local authorities, housing providers, individual landlords and residents?

Do informal state practices affect gentrification and urban investments?

On what depends the extent of gentrification? Is taming gentrification possible? When and why are large international investors involved? When not?

What are the forms and results of resistance against gentrification in different contexts?

**References**

Bernt M. (2016) Very particular, or rather universal? Gentrification through the lenses of Ghertner and López-Morales. City, 20:4, 637-644, DOI: 10.1080/13604813.2016.1143682.

Christophers (2021) Mind the rent gap: Blackstone, housing investment and the reordering of urban rent surfaces. Urban Studies https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980211026466.

Smith N. (2002), New Globalism, New Urbanism: Gentrification as Global Urban Strategy. Antipode, 34: 427-450. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8330.00249.

Chelcea L., Popescu R., Cristea D. (2015): Who Are the Gentrifiers and How Do They Change Central City Neighbourhoods? Privatization, Commodification, and Gentrification in Bucharest. Geografie, 120, No. 2, pp. 113–133.

Sequera J., Nofre J. (2018) Shaken, not stirred: New debates on touristification and the limits of gentrification. City 22(5–6): 843–855.

Kusiak J. (2019) Legal Technologies of Primitive Accumulation: Judicial Robbery and Dispossession-by-Restitution in Warsaw, IJURR, 43, pp. 649–665. DOI:10.1111/1468-2427.12827.

## 27. Power articulation in cultural and creative sector in cities

**Chairs**
Marianna d'Ovidio (University of Milan Bicocca, Italy, marianna.dovidio@unimib.it)
Robert Kloosterman  (University of Amsterdam, Netherland, R.C.Kloosterman@uva.nl)

**Panel format**
Traditional Panel with individual presentations and discussion

**Conference Stream**
Urban (in)equalities

**Summary**
The cultural and creative industries have become a major force in urban change in recent years and research acknowledges their aggregate role in urban economic growth. However, too often the cultural and creative sector is seen like a production unity, without recognizing enough the long network of actors involved in the production of cultural goods. To challenge this categorisation, the panel claims that a meaningful understanding of how cultural and creative industries (CCI) operate cannot do without an exploration of how their dispersed, multi-format activities are simultaneously embedded in local, urban contexts and inserted in larger global network. Encompassing a wide network of both local and global activities allows a new narrative of the urban cultural creative economy, possibly translating into policies able to confront effectively with urban inequalities. In fact, it allows taking into account the dynamics and mechanisms of power and control (which can be both within the economic and/or the cultural sphere) among the different actors involved in the production chain.
This panel aims to address the articulation of power within the network of the cultural and creative sectors and its effects on urban inequalities. In particular, the session will welcome contributions reflecting upon which forms of governance and power distribution can we identify within the wider cultural and creative ecosystem; what accounts for these patterns; what are their implications in terms of socio-economic and cultural impact and policy making.
The panel calls for both theoretical and empirically based contributions leading to critical and innovative thinking focusing on, but not limited to, the following issues:
Which actors are able to decide on what other actors should be doing in the network linked with a particular cultural good? What is the source of power of actors (they concentrate economic power,; they have crucial expertise; they have political power…)? To what end do they use this power? What types of power (financing, cultural legitimation…) can actors exert? What are the spatial aspects of power and its urban effects? Which social, cultural and economic implications derive and how politics can intervene towards a more equal and inclusive society?

**References**

Coe N., Yeung H. (2015). Global Production Networks: Theorizing Economic Development in an Interconnected World. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mbaye J., Pratt A. (2020) Cities, Creativities and Urban Creative Economies: Re-descriptions and Make+Shifts from Sub-Saharan Africa, International Journal of Urban and regional Research, 44 (5).

Pratt A.C. (2011). An economic geography of the cultural industries. In A. Leyshon, L. McDowell, & R. Lee (Eds.), The Sage handbook of Economic Geography. London: Sage, 323–338.