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Introduction

In 2011, ds4si wrote *Spatial Justice: A Frame for Reclaiming Our Rights to Be, Thrive, Express and Connect*. For many in our network of artists, curators, and organizers, it was their introduction to the term and the set of questions, concerns and opportunities that it raises. Since that paper continues to resonate and circulate, we decided to have some of our allies write responses and/or adjacent papers, adding their voices to the current urgency of spatial justice. This publication brings together a section of our original paper along with an exciting cross-section of perspectives and insights.

First up is the oft-quoted foreword written by Makani Themba, along with our introductory text from the first spatial justice paper. It gives the reader enough of the original ideas to follow the papers that more directly respond to our initial writing.

Next up, we have *Notes on the Siren and Social Space* which interrogates how sound is used by police as a spatial strategy and the ways sounds shape space and social life. This piece was written by Sonic Insurgence Lab’s Josh Rios & Matt Joynt.

In *Justice Scenographics*, Rachel Hann considers “the role scenographics can play in scoring—highlighting, irritating, intervening—the inscribed spatial politics that promote and enforce geographies of power.”

Virginia Noccela’s *Spatial Justice from the Lens of a Xicana in New Mexico* challenges our initial framework, positing that racial justice has to be front and center in our thinking about spatial justice.

In *White Flight/Black Habitation*, Tia Simone Gardner muses on her own personal and theoretical struggles with black space while also highlighting some of the most cutting edge thinkers in black spatial thought.

We add our own updated contribution to this series with *Public Making and Spatial Justice*, an invitation/provocation for activists, artists and residents to activate public spaces in ways that both embody and fight for the world that we want.

University of Orange’s contribution, *I Get Everything I Need on Main Street: Horizontal Development and Orange, NJ*, looks at the planning and real estate development strategies that cities use to further spatial injustice and posits ds4si’s horizontal development as a way to rethink how cities favor corporations over community.

Ceasar McDowell’s new democracy and engagement collective, The Move, offers *Designing Public Dialogues for Spatial Justice*, a framework for how to engage constituencies in conversations around spatial justice.

And finally, in *Spatial Justice: Re-appropriating the Body and Space*, Alvaro Lima follows the body as it inhabits larger and larger spaces: the home, the neighborhood, the city, the nation, and the globalized world, making a case for why spatial justice is so needed and relevant in these times.
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Spatial Justice: a frame for reclaiming our rights to be, thrive, express and connect

Excerpt from the original paper

FOREWORD

As one of my heroes, boundarybuster and cultural provocateur Sun Ra would say, “Space is the place.” Ra transformed space as a way to break way out of the confines of stereotypical Blackness and claim the cosmos as his home. The Design Studio for Social Intervention and this work on spatial justice is an heir to that freedom/that imagination without borders. Their work provides what George Clinton, another heir of Ra’s, would call “our chance to dance our way out of our constrictions.”

Perhaps our most tangible, tactile understanding of freedom, of liberation is in the physical space to move about as we please. Maybe because freedom at its most basic level is experienced in doing and, conversely, oppression/repression is experienced in what we are made to believe we cannot do. You would think that given the critical importance of space to just about all the justice work we do, space and spatial justice would be “the place” where more intentional organizing would happen in the us. But it’s not. Many of us have a hard time understanding what this frame requires of us. We can get stuck at the single issue level, like housing policy or gentrification, relegating space to the narrow place where we reside.

As ds4si clearly lays out here, it is so much more. Space is a place of intersecting struggles/oppression/opportunities. How we move or not move through it, adapt to it, monitor it, buy or borrow it, claim or cut it off shapes everything we do and big parts of who we are.

I think what I like most about this work is that it encourages us to explore our relationships to space, power and justice with our whole selves—body, heart, mind, memory. It walks us through practical ways of understanding and engaging work that goes from analysis to storytelling to step by step “how.” So, don’t think of this as a report, a study or a white paper. It’s more of a weapon/ a window/ a window into and out on the many ways spatial politics shapes our work, our bodies, our psyches and how organizing to listen to and reclaim and transform space is a game changer. I hope you’ll come outside and play.

In fellowship,

— Makani Themba

INTRODUCTION

We are in a spatial moment... starting in December, 2010, arab people from all walks of life started to take over town squares and city plazas across the arab world. We now know this phenomenon as the arab spring. Citizens took to public space to show their demands for radical political change in leadership, leading to the overthrow of the long-standing rulers of tunisia, egypt and libya.

Starting in September, 2011, people set up shop and started living in Zuccotti park, across from Wall street in new york city. We now know this phenomenon as occupy Wall street. This quickly led to hundreds of other occupy gatherings across the U.S. and the world. Participants took to creating new kinds of space, ones that simultaneously stood watch to the exponential inequality being produced globally through forces at play on Wall street and modeled practices of democracy as the number of people grew and began to make temporary communities. Space is currently functioning as one of the most important resources for the expression of disapproval and outrage in this political moment, and although we are incredibly excited to see space being used as it is for political expression and change, we are convinced that we can use it even better. This paper outlines our ideas for that, as well as putting them in the historical context of spatial justice and injustice.

Design Studio for Social Intervention
Kenneth Bailey, Lori Lobenstine and Kiara Nagel

Foreword by Makani Themba, Higher Ground Change Strategies

We are an artistic research and development outfit for the improvement of civil society and everyday life. The Design Studio for Social Intervention (DS4SI) is dedicated to changing how social justice is imagined, developed and deployed here in the United States.
HISTORICAL SPATIAL INJUSTICE

Spatial justice, most simply, is the intersection of space and social justice.¹ As Henry Lefebvre first pointed out forty years ago, human societies organize spaces, and when we inspect these spaces, we can see how justice and injustice are played out in the visible and invisible structural arrangements of space. (an example of a visible arrangement would be looking at the history of a town and seeing who got to use the most and best land areas. Researching further, we might find invisible arrangements like the fact that women weren’t allowed to own land or the richest land owners also owned slaves to work their land.) With a stronger understanding of the relationship between space and justice, we can create counter-moves to fight spatial injustice and also begin to answer the question, “how can we create spaces that promote equity, access, health, and justice?”

Historically, there were many ways in which different peoples made sense of space. Some people saw space and place as opportunity, and they created practices for moving through space. Some people saw space as an anchor, settled down and developed roots in place. But what happens when one set of people want to determine and create grids of truth for everyone about what space is and isn’t? Practices of domination, subjugation, and resource depletion have been historically honed and brought to bear through space. The taking of land, the massive capturing of bodies and taking them from one space to another, environmental exploitation, forced movement through economic deprivation; all of these practices of injustice tend to have a fairly clear spatial dimension to them. Most wars, conflicts and genocides have at their core spatial claims and have resulted in distinct spatial power and consequences. In fact, it is clear that any and every marginalized group has had space itself used as part of the terrain through which they experience injustice in their day to day lives.

In fact, it is clear that any and every marginalized group has had space itself used as part of the terrain through which they experience injustice in their day to day lives.

SPATIAL JUSTICE AS STRATEGY

"Thinking spatially about justice can uncover significant new insights that extend our practical knowledge into more effective actions to achieve greater justice and democracy.”

— from The City and Spatial Justice Edward J. Soja

If we demand the reworking of spatial arrangements, we are demanding the reworking of all other arrangements—those of nation, ownership, class, race, gender, etc. This document is primarily meant to support activists in thinking more expansively and boldly about ways in which we can use space as a platform for achieving justice and see spatial considerations in ways that can help us imagine new strategies and points of leverage.

We also believe that spatial justice can function as a lens that can help diverse social justice struggles find common ground and offer a way of thinking across traditionally siloed sectors. A spatial justice perspective allows us to recognize links between cultural rights, housing and economic rights, rights to a public, and rights to health. This connecting between threats of removal across physical, social, cultural, and economic realms can allow for a more scalable and organized response.

Part of our jobs as activists in this moment is to make strange, even ridiculous, many of the norms of injustice exacted in space. Why should any of these things look normal?

• Spatial property is more important than the people who occupy it, so families can be forced out of their homes.

• Dollars are free to move across constructed borders of nation states, but bodies are hunted down, terrorized and labeled “illegal” for the same movement.

• Vehicles for traversing space are so important that our cities and nations are arranged around their needs at the expense of people’s physical health and safety and the health of the environment.

“Borders: Scars on the Land”, Nogales, gringaurasamericana.wordpress.com
Notes on the Siren and Social Space

Josh Rios & Matt Joynt

I.
Etymologically connected to ἑρός (hērōs “rope, cord”) and ἔτρεω (étreo “to tie, join, fasten”), the siren is a binder, an entangler, a narrative, a song, an event transforming human relations in social space. The siren is a signifier that also enacts a future. It is marked by danger and by crisis. There is a suddenness to the siren giving it a temporal order.

II.
In the late 1700s, Scottish natural philosopher, John Robison developed a method for generating a consistent sonic frequency by periodically interrupting the flow of air through a fixed disk with a rotating disk. The invention was intended for incorporation in musical instruments — namely, the pipe organ. When it was discovered that early models of the instrument could also produce sound underwater, it received its Greek mythological name, the siren.

III.
“Who so in ignorance draws near to them and hears the Sirens’ voice, he nevermore returns…”

_The Odyssey — Homer (XII.39ff.)_

In the instance of “Sirens/Busy” from Care for Me, the 2018 album by Chicago-based musician, Saba, the conditions surrounding the siren are reproduced with such regularity that they are known and deeply coded for self-protection. Afterall, the siren does not signify safety, but a precarious event, a coming encounter, in which black and brown people must successfully predict and manage the racial imagination of the police. Referring to the police as “one time”, the artist draws upon the practice of only looking at officers quickly, one time, so as to not reinforce their racially-predetermined presumption of black criminality or allow them any room to mistakenly read the black gaze as aggressive. He’s well aware, “They don’t know me but they fear me.”

In Sirens/Busy the siren’s diffractions, reflections, and refractions are as much social phenomena as they are physical. Their fragmentation of social space — their implication of a perpetual state of never being able to return — echoes further in the song through the voice of theMIND, who dodges calls and avoids friends as a means of coping with his greatest fear:

“Sirens/Busy”,
_Saba (ft. theMIND), Care for Me (2018)_

These admissions end abruptly, in the liminal and precarious space around the siren, as theMIND sings “I want you to know”, leaving the thought half-finished to drift, indeterminate, disappearing into the space fractured by the event of the siren, what it might mean and what it has always-already meant.

_This quote references the siren and the danger of its song, but also ideas of knowing and not knowing, of being ignorant to the effects of the siren, which include a perpetual state of never being able to return, a disappearance and a nevermore. One is drawn to the siren at first, but also learns quickly to avoid its sources, to go around its power, to escape its authority._
In the distance, the siren blared in the distance. The performance continued. The whole room listened, the audience and the performers. Here, the siren appears as a phantom, a part of some adjacent scene, unseen, but heard all the same. Our listening, its sounding, are all part of the territorialization of authority, the demarcating of spatial power. The sound fades and the performance continues.

As Jackie Wang points out in Carceral Capitalism, we might think of the siren as a kind of carceral apparatus: an apparatus with the body of the spectator enacted by an isolated individual. It requires the apparatus with the body of the spectator and the body of the observed installed into the architecture of surveillance, incarceration, and the rule of law. The Panopticon’s surveillance-based geometry, as conceived by Bentham and described by Foucault, produces an unseen observer in a central tower monitoring the always-visible disciplined body forced to exist in a peripheral auditorium of silhouette and shadow - always on the outside, but never out of view. The individual cell becomes a theater of authoritarian looking. Because the disciplinarian is ensconced in a tower that obscures being seen, it is never known, nor does it matter, who the disciplinarian is or if there even is a disciplinarian. It would seem that any individual taken almost at random can activate the architectonic techno-apparatus of visual regulation. Discipline is assumed to be in place. The exterior apparatus of observance becomes internalized by the person under surveillance. Can one also internalize the effects of sonic discipline? As Foucault briefly discusses in a footnote, Bentham’s prison also included a network of pipes leading from the cells of the Panopticon to its central tower. The pipes were meant to serve a dual function. They would provide a way for centralized power to listen in on the prisoners, as well as a way to make centralized announcements to the prisoners. To listen in without being listened to. To be heard without having to hear back. The acoustics of power are against dialogue. They flow in one direction at a time, never back and forth. The siren not only signifies, but enacts a future. It does not precede state-sanctioned violence, the physical manifestation of repression and control, but predicts it. Welcomes it. Unveils the reality of power’s effects on the body.
It could be any summer night in 2016 or 2017 or 2018. It’s approximately 3AM and a sonic, sub frequency blasts, rumbling through the east side of Chicago’s Pilsen neighborhood, shaking windows, setting off car alarms, and waking up area residents. The blast occurs almost every night, loud enough to be jarring when heard from within an apartment a block away. It feels phenomenologically similar to an 808 dropping at the very core of the body. It gives the sensation of waking up right after an earthquake. It is not aimed at the neighborhood’s residents living within stable housing. The fact that they experience it is a mere concomitant of its aim. It is aimed directly—pointed, actually—at the neighborhood’s residents living in tent encampments, precariously navigating homelessness under the 90/94 overpass.

In 1964, Ramon Dones of El Cerrito, California patents the first known subwoofer, the Octavium. The speaker, a portable sound enclosure capable of high fidelity reproduction of low frequency sound waves, is intentionally designed to envelope bodies through dense material, walls and cars. It is rapidly incorporated in urban police departments across the U.S. What the The Octavium offers to the collecting socio-political space of the dance floor is subsumed into a private corporation’s technology for socio-spatial fragmentation through the militarization of sound. The Rumbler marks a transition from hearing the police coming to feeling the police coming— the blurring of the space between soft and hard power. What is promised in The Octavium’s name, an extension of the limits of the audible, octaves to stretch, room for more, abundance, an expanded sense of the possible, is reduced to violence in The Rumbler’s shake, an earthquake that breaks down, subjugating the public with the same technology that helped— and continues to help— articulate subcultural resistance and exuberant jouissance.

One night, I am walking home from the train at approximately 3AM and witness the occurrence from a block away. It is fast. The police blast “The Rumbler”. No one emerges from the encampment tents. The police don’t get out of their vehicles. They scream something loud but incoherent at the encampment through a megaphone, then drive off. The event occurs with such frequency throughout that summer and the summers to follow that it becomes mundane, normalized.

All around the encampment, the neighborhood is being rapidly gentrified. Developers that don’t live in Pilsen, or even in Chicago, are running property value equations that account for the encampment as a hazard, a depreciating eye-sore. The sonic blasts continue. Is the hope that the encampment will disband? Go somewhere else? Where? Magically disappear? Be literally atomized by sound? Whatever the case, The Rumbler is enacted as a future.

A siren can be silent, but felt. A rumbling can be a siren. A siren can predict the arrival of the police and can also be the tool that enacts social control. It can be the police. A siren churns in the distance, almost unheard in one way and occupying all sonic space (even the interior space of the body, be it psychological or physical) in another. A siren can be...

In 2007, Federal Signal Corporation releases “The Rumbler”, a sub octave frequency siren for police vehicles that can be felt in the body and heard through dense material, walls and cars. It is rapidly incorporated in urban police departments across the U.S. What the The Octavium offers to the collectivizing socio-political space of the dance floor is subsumed into a private corporation’s technology for socio-spatial fragmentation through the militarization of sound. The Rumbler marks a transition from hearing the police coming to feeling the police coming— the blurring of the space between soft and hard power. What is promised in The Octavium’s name, an extension of the limits of the audible, octaves to stretch, room for more, abundance, an expanded sense of the possible, is reduced to violence in The Rumbler’s shake, an earthquake that breaks down, subjugating the public with the same technology that helped— and continues to help— articulate subcultural resistance and exuberant jouissance.

In 1964, Ramon Dones of El Cerrito, California patents the first known subwoofer, the Octavium. The speaker, a portable sound enclosure capable of high fidelity reproduction of low frequency sound waves, is intentionally designed to envelope bodies through dense material, walls and cars. It is rapidly incorporated in urban police departments across the U.S. What the The Octavium offers to the collectivizing socio-political space of the dance floor is subsumed into a private corporation’s technology for socio-spatial fragmentation through the militarization of sound. The Rumbler marks a transition from hearing the police coming to feeling the police coming— the blurring of the space between soft and hard power. What is promised in The Octavium’s name, an extension of the limits of the audible, octaves to stretch, room for more, abundance, an expanded sense of the possible, is reduced to violence in The Rumbler’s shake, an earthquake that breaks down, subjugating the public with the same technology that helped— and continues to help— articulate subcultural resistance and exuberant jouissance.

One night, I am walking home from the train at approximately 3AM and witness the occurrence from a block away. It is fast. The police blast “The Rumbler”. No one emerges from the encampment tents. The police don’t get out of their vehicles. They scream something loud but incoherent at the encampment through a megaphone, then drive off. The event occurs with such frequency throughout that summer and the summers to follow that it becomes mundane, normalized.

All around the encampment, the neighborhood is being rapidly gentrified. Developers that don’t live in Pilsen, or even in Chicago, are running property value equations that account for the encampment as a hazard, a depreciating eye-sore. The sonic blasts continue. Is the hope that the encampment will disband? Go somewhere else? Where? Magically disappear? Be literally atomized by sound? Whatever the case, The Rumbler is enacted as a future.

A siren can be silent, but felt. A rumbling can be a siren. A siren can predict the arrival of the police and can also be the tool that enacts social control. It can be the police. A siren churns in the distance, almost unheard in one way and occupying all sonic space (even the interior space of the body, be it psychological or physical) in another. A siren can be...

In 2007, Federal Signal Corporation releases “The Rumbler”, a sub octave frequency siren for police vehicles that can be felt in the body and heard through dense material, walls and cars. It is rapidly incorporated in urban police departments across the U.S. What the The Octavium offers to the collectivizing socio-political space of the dance floor is subsumed into a private corporation’s technology for socio-spatial fragmentation through the militarization of sound. The Rumbler marks a transition from hearing the police coming to feeling the police coming— the blurring of the space between soft and hard power. What is promised in The Octavium’s name, an extension of the limits of the audible, octaves to stretch, room for more, abundance, an expanded sense of the possible, is reduced to violence in The Rumbler’s shake, an earthquake that breaks down, subjugating the public with the same technology that helped— and continues to help— articulate subcultural resistance and exuberant jouissance.

In 1964, Ramon Dones of El Cerrito, California patents the first known subwoofer, the Octavium. The speaker, a portable sound enclosure capable of high fidelity reproduction of low frequency sound waves, is intentionally designed to envelope bodies in sound without offering audible indication of the direction from which the sound emanates. With its creation, sound inhabits spaces in ways that few have experienced. It hovers and pulses within the body, introduc-
Dr. Rachel Hann

Dr. Rachel Hann is Senior Lecturer in Scenography and Deputy Associate Dean (Doctoral College) at the University of Surrey, UK. Rachel’s research in cultural geography and performance focuses upon the material cultures of scenography, climate crisis, and architecture. She is author of ‘Beyond Scenography’ (Routledge 2019) and in 2013 co-founded the research network Critical Costume. From 2014-2018, Rachel was an Executive Officer for Theatre & Performance Research Association (TaPRA) having previously co-convened the Scenography working group (2010-2013).

Justice Scenographics: Preparing for civilization change in a time of ‘Anywheres’ and ‘Somewheres’

It’s 2019 as I write this opening statement. In the UK, we have just experienced the hottest February on record with temperatures as high as 26°C. This is one year on from what the UK media termed ‘The Beast from the East’, which saw average temperatures fall to -1°C in the same calendar month. At the same time, the east coast of the United States has just experienced a cold snap with warnings not to leave your home unless obdurately necessary. Climate scientists have warned that, based on an analysis of trends over 50 years, the increasing regularity of extreme weather conditions across the planet will become the norm. While this has a direct impact on our living patterns and infrastructure, it also impacts the seasonal cycles of insects, plants and migratory birds that human food chains are reliant upon.

Social and climate justice movements will need to act in unison if resources become increasingly regulated, hoarded and re-allocated. The need to prepare humanity for, what the anthropologist Arturo Escobar (2018) calls, ‘civilization change’ would have to occur as much through cultural and social interventions as via political reorganisation.

Crucial to this shift will be challenging how ‘the world’ is imagined, deliberated, and practiced within social and political discourses.

To afford focus to this discussion, I approach the political rupture known as ‘Brexit’ (the name given to the process for the UK’s exit of the European Union) as a symptom of a broader set of spatialized ‘worldviews’. The journalist David Goodhart (2017) has proposed that the Brexit process has revealed two new ‘political tribes’ that do not align with the established left-right dichotomy of Western politics. Goodhart calls these tribes the ‘Anywheres’ (minority, mobile, global) and the ‘Somewheres’ (majority, located, national). Four months after Leave won the Brexit referendum, this alignment of the Anywhere-somewhere model with voting behaviours was implied in the British Prime Minister Theresa May’s speech at the Conservative Party conference in October 2016. May declared that ‘if you believe you’re a citizen of the world, you’re a citizen of nowhere’. While the anywhere-somewhere dichotomy is not without its critics, I propose that this spatialized tribal model aligns with distinct conceptions of ‘world’ that pits two speculative futures against one another. I summarize these two speculative futures thusly:

**Future 1**

Humanity has transcended the geo-politics of nations to operate as a race of globalized post-human travellers, which build unity through large scale political unions and overcome resource issues through technological invention. The terminal goal of this worldview is to transcend planet Earth itself and explore the galaxy; e.g. the politics of Star Trek and the United Federation of Planets provide an apt example of this worldview’s imagined future.

**Future 2**

With the nation-state as a stable reference point, humanity acts as curators of place-based communities that build strong cultural bonds and share finite resources in fair and just ways, while also giving preferential access to those who have been socialized in that place. The terminal goal of this worldview is to sustain shared cultural values, memories and practices with a sense that community and family legacies will be maintained; e.g. the model of a commune is reflective of this focus on cultural familiarity and sharing finite resources.

Central to the doughnut model is the introduction of a ‘social foundation of well-being’ that no one should fall below and an ecological ceiling of planetary pressure that we should not go beyond (Raworth 2017: 24). Doughnut economics, therefore, affords a model in which to imagine new collective futures, but it also, as Raworth stresses, underlines how ‘Visual frames […] matter just as much as verbal ones’ (Raworth 2017: 24).

Future 1 is aligned with the Anywheres – maytalist determinism, but the purposes of this chapter is aligned with the Anywheres – may be a future impossibility if the growth model of the Twentieth Century is unsustainable.

Economist Kate Raworth echoes this reading and argues that for ‘over 70 years economics has been fixated on GDP, on national output, as its primary measure of progress. That fixation has been used to justify extreme inequalities of income and wealth coupled with unprecedented destruction of the living world’ (Raworth 2017: 25). Rejecting the ‘growth addicted’ model of economics as represented by the familiar curved incline graph, Raworth proposes that a ‘doughnut model’ (see figure 1) might afford a more sustainable and just future.

Doughnut economics (Raworth 2017)

Escobar has argued that the first of these worldviews – which he terms ‘techno-capitalist determinism’ – but the purposes of this chapter is aligned with the Anywheres – may be a future impossibility if the growth model of the Twentieth Century is unsustainable.

Figure 1: Doughnut economics (Raworth 2017)
with scenographic orientations (bottom).

Figure 2: Stock images of looking at ‘the scenic’ (Hann 2019: 134; emphasis in original). The act of being with scenographics stresses the ways in which our worldly connections – as enacted as a distinctive atmosphere or feeling of place – moves beyond the strict ontological binary of nature and culture (Bailey, Lobenstine and Nagel 2015: 20). In this regard, justice scenographics reveal how these power-geometries seek to draw upon the ethical principles of ecology to create recyclable, biodegradable, restorative and/or regenerative performance spaces (Beer 2017: online). Justice scenographics seeks to draw upon the ecological ethos of ecoscenography and focus this potential to broader issues of how worlds are felt, experienced and ordered by systems of power.

Building on practices of ‘speculative design’ (Dunne & Raby) and ecological argument on dualist ‘design imaginaries’ (Escober 2018), I assess the potential for scenographics to reveal the spatial injustices embodied within the politics of the anywhere-somewhere dichotomy. I argue that these two political tribes are representative of two distinct, but equally problematic, philosophies on humanity’s relationship with world, resource, and mobility. While there are certainly other positions and ways of conceptualising this issue, the provocation of the anywhere-somewhere binary affords insight into how the political projects of neo-liberalism and globalization have been built without an ecological ceiling. For ease of reference, I describe this intersection as ‘justice scenographics’.

My proposal for justice scenographics exists in the potential of ‘situated practices’ to queer, reveal, and highlight how discourses of power are placed, literally as well as metaphorically. In particular, I reject the notion of space as abstract or empty – the tableau rasa or ‘blank slate’ ideology adopted by Modernist artists. Indeed, I argue that the systems of power that produce spatial experiences are nullified through an ideology that presents space as open and ethereal. Likewise, Marxist philosopher and spatial theorist Henri Lefebvre (1901-1995) argued that the idea of space as articulated only through writing led people to believe ‘for quite a time that a revolutionary social transformation could be brought about by means of communication alone’ (Lefebvre 1991: 29). Lefebvre, instead, argued that physical space was critical to the manifestation of power. Michel Foucault (1926-1984) echoes this position arguing that ‘space is fundamental in any exercise of power’ (cited in Soja 1989: 19). In that regard, justice scenographics draw upon similar methods to Jane Bendel’s argument for Critical Spatial Practice where she considers ‘criticism to be a spatial investigation and production of the various intersections between theory and practice, art and architecture’ (Bendel 2010: 193). With particular regards to climate justice, theatre designer Tanja Beer’s proposal for ‘ecoscenography’ offers a dual focus on making sustainable theatre and scenographic practices that highlight ecological issues (see figure 4 for example). Beer argues that ecoscenography ‘entails incorporating principles of ecology to create recyclable, biodegradable, restorative and/or regenerative performance spaces’ (Beer 2017: online).

I argue that acts of theatre isolate the worlding expressions of scenographics, which in turn complicate orders of world. Scenographics have the potential to enact speculative worlds that afford new insights into what it means to be worldly or how to be with worlding orientations. It is this potential that opens out the study and practice of scenography into the borderless disciplinary positions occupied by performance studies. (Hann 2019: 136; emphasis in original)
that complicate the assemblages of world/place/nation/stage by enacting renewed human-world relations that afford insight into other pragmatic relations and other ways of living with place.

As implied by the Republic of Molossia’s affirmation of its nationhood as a feeling of place, the combination of scenographics and spatial justice invites new speculative relationships to world that also ask us to act differently, feel differently, and be part of a different human-world ecology that celebrates con-nectivity between human and non-human agents. Crucially, scenographics foreground the ability to enact new cultures of worldly relations that can exist alongside but also replace, the strict ontologies of subject and object, human and world. Environmental philosopher Rupert Read argues that what is needed are the cultural seeds for a new kind of civilianization, which embraces a ‘new radical localism’. Likewise, Escobar calls for tools ‘for reimagining and reconstructing local worlds’ (Escobar 2018: 4). The model for a radical localism, albeit with regard to radical devolution of power to cities would be good for democracy, Hunt suggests that: ‘Look around the world. Everywhere but Britain, Hunt says. People want power’ (Hunt 2016). Hunt cites the need to manage energy and food resources in ways that are more locally responsible and accountable with the large political unions – such as the United Kingdom – often being unresponsive to the change needed for local communities to thrive.

Whether radical localism becomes a necessity is, arguably, secondary to the need to first imagine a future that embraces an ecological ceiling as a realistic possibility. Raworth argues there is a need to go ‘beyond new economic thinking to new economic doing’ (2017: 292).

When it comes to new economic thinking, draw the change you want to see in the world too. By combining the well-known power of verbal framing with the hidden power of visual framing, we can give ourselves a far better chance of writing a new economic story – the one that we so desperately need for a safe and just twenty-first century. (Raworth 2017: 293; emphasis in original)

Raworth’s proposal to ‘draw the change you want’ and for ‘new economic doing’ directly informs my own approach to justice scenographics. Escobar equally states that the notion of ‘translocal design’ can re-imagine a region of Colombia’s southwest to transform ‘from the ecologically and socially devasting model that has been in place for over a hundred years to a codesign process for the construction of a life-enhancing regional pluriverse’ (Escobar 2018: 4). The notion of the pluriverse is a result of the transition from the ‘hegemony of modernity’s one-world ontology to a pluriverse of sociocultural configurations’ (Escobar 2018: 4). In speculating new future relationships to world, this extends to imagining new daily practices and life trajectories that may be radically different to the ones sustained by a culture predicated on growth, technolog-ical savours and neo-liberal models of individual responsibility. The political rupture of Brexit, as well as the nationalist agenda of Trump in the US, highlight a lack of preparedness for imagining new social geographies that go beyond the worldviews of the Anywheres and the Somewheres. In both political tribes, world is a ‘platform’, ‘background’, ‘scenery’ for humanity’s ingenuity and/or exclusivity to resource. Echoing Escobar’s argument that ‘we design our world and our world designs us back’ (Escobar 2018: 4), the invitation to speculate new human-world relations affords a degree of cultural preparation should the necessity arise to re-imagine how our civilizations sus-tain humans alongside–and with–world.

I argue that justice scenographics act as provocations on how worlds are encoun-tered, processed and manifested through intervention. Moreover, I propose that scenographics afford a shift in thinking for social justice movements. Scenographics emphasize the methods for installing count-er-places, worlds and atmospheres which, in turn, complicate the mainstream spatial orders that place humans as near or far, fa-miliar or foreign, friend or foe. In a historical movement that the disagi has termed a ‘Social Emergency’, there is a need to challenge the assumed orthodoxies of power relations and consider how future models of civilization may be increasingly governed by the ‘super wicked problem’ of climate change. Building on Rittel and Webber’s (1973) articulation of ‘wicked problems’, climate scientists Kelly Levin at all, argue that ‘Super wicked problems comprise four key features: time is running out; those who cause the problem also seek to provide a solution; the central authority needed to address them is weak or non-existent; and irrational discounting occurs that pushes responses into the future’ (Levin et al. 2012: 144). Approaches to codesign and a radical localism afford potential methods for responding to these super wicked contents. Indeed, this chapter adopts the position that ‘super wicked problems point to codesign and a radical localism afford potential methods for responding to these super wicked contents. Indeed, this chapter adopts the position that...’
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Spatial Justice from the Lens of a Xicana in New Mexico

Dr. Virginia Necochea

INTRODUCTION

In 2012, the Design Studio for Social Intervention (ds4si) published “Spatial Justice: A frame for reclaiming our rights to be, thrive, express and connect.” This critical framework provided a much-needed overview of how spatial justice is defined, what it entails, how it was being enacted across the US, and most importantly, how activists and organizers could better understand how to continue to frame injustices from a spatial lens. As Makani Thamba stated then, “You would think that given the critical importance of space to just about all the justice work we do, space and spatial justice would be ‘the place’ where more intentional organizing would happen in the US. But it’s not.” (2012, foreword).

As we find ourselves in 2019, where are we in relation to framing and understanding our community work in terms of spatial justice and what are the ways that spatial (in)justice continues across our communities? These are important questions to ask, especially given the contentious political moment we are living in. In 2012, ds4si first published their Spatial Justice Framework, we were functioning under a different moment, the US was still under the leadership of President Barack Obama and now, we find ourselves in a much different time. As community workers and members, we must ask how the Presidency of Trump has impacted the need to frame our understandings of continued structural and systemic inequities using a spatial framework.

In 2012, many critical scholars were pointing to a historical moment that was being defined by progressives and liberals alike as a supposed ‘post-racial’ era. The election of President Barack Obama used by many as a most definite sign that the nation was finally ‘beyond race.’ But, for those who remained in the trenches, even under the leadership of President Obama, the idea of being in post-racial times was an absurdity. This was just another strategic move by those in power to continue to silence the oppressed and minimize their racial claims.

Flash forward to today, life and times feel very different, especially for People of Color across the US and what we are currently experiencing is far removed from any liking of a post-racial society. If anything, President Trump with his own racist rhetoric has worked to heighten the witnessing of greater overt racist ideologies coupled with an increase of hate crimes across the nation.

Thus, now more than ever, it is vital that there is a greater understanding of what spatial justice entails and how we can continue on our paths to achieve it across our communities.

SPATIAL JUSTICE TODAY

Given the precarious political moment we find ourselves in, it is imperative that activists, organizers, community workers, and People of Color understand continued inequities and oppression using a spatial justice framework for space remains one of the fundamental ways that our lives are controlled.

But, before we discuss the struggles happening across our communities, we must start this conversation from a shared understanding of what spatial justice means. What exactly is spatial justice and why is it important?

“Spatial justice, most simply, is the intersection of space and social justice” (ds4si, 2012). Meaning, space and social justice are very much connected, intertwined, and most importantly, they define and impact the lives of all human beings. But, in the context of spatial justice, it is felt even more so by oppressed and marginalized people in the US and across the globe.

It can be readily argued that the claiming of space has always been part of the human condition, whether that took the form of being rooted to a specific place or inhabiting areas for long periods of time. But, with conquest and colonization, space and especially the claiming of space became a much different construct. With the European ideologies proclaiming Manifest Destiny, or the supposed ‘God-given right’ to take by any means the rightful spaces and places belonging to Others by the white body, arrived spatial injustice.

The term ‘spatial justice’ experienced a drastic increase in use as a result of the heightened activism taking place during the 1960s and 1970s (see Neely & Samura, 2011). With the rise of People’s movements against social injustices across the US, the idea of spatial justice took a rise, especially as connected to race, class, and gender (see Neely & Samura, 2011 for an overview of key literature connected to the theorisation of space).

Here, I argue that an important element that needs to be emphasized in the ds4si’s framework on Spatial Justice, is race, or better stated, the racialization of space needs to be at the forefront (see Lipsitz, 2007; Soja, 2000), especially how race and space are the major constructs that are used to regulate our bodies.

SPATIAL JUSTICE AND RACE

The major impact of race cannot be ignored when we are talking about space. This is not to say that class, gender, ability, etc. are not important social constructs connected to spatial (in)justice, for all are heavily connected to space.

But, as People of Color, who remain the most oppressed and marginalized in this society, the deepest understanding of spatial (in)justice connects to race. Space and race are interrelated and exist in a dialectical relationship. One does not exist without the other for all space is racialized in some form. It is as Lipsitz (2007) argued a decade ago, space is racialized and race is spatialized.

It is clear that all spaces in the US, whether public or private and across all sectors (education, health, housing, government, etc.) are clearly racialized. This spatialization of race and racialization of space (Lipsitz, 2007) is true regardless if it is the City or beyond, urban spaces, rural spaces, and everywhere in between.
As activists, organizers, educators, and community members, there is much power when we are intentional about pointing out that race is the primary organizing factor across all systems and structures in society. There is power because using a racial lens expose the work we do to all its residents. Whether one is a wealthy white person with given privileges or on the opposite spectrum, space impacts lives and it is this understanding of where we do or do not belong and is used as a regulating force. Black and Brown bodies are quickly reminded of the lives of the two Guatemalan children claimed by this extreme border, spatial injustices. As individuals who are engaged in the understanding of who plans, designs, and then enforces the law of who plans, designs, and then enforces the law, the police force was activated and immediately move in close proximity to the ‘unruly’ or ‘noncompliant’ community member, sometimes physically escorting them away from the podium.

Again, spatial (in)justice continue strong in terms of who plans, designs, and then decides the building of cities and the creation of spaces across communities in the US. The majority of planners, designers, and elected officials serving on city councils and county commissions continue to be white bodies who hold the ultimate power in the control of where we live, how we live, and how resources will be utilized.

As in every other state in the US, New Mexico has long been a place where spatial (in)justice is present in every corner of our state. However, as we see from many examples where individuals who do not belong and are used as ground cover and that once rooted, has the tendency of becoming invasive. Santolína is a proposed urban sprawl development to be built across 1,400+ acres of what is known as the Artisco Land and is considered closed to the descendants of the Spanish who settled and lived in that particular region. At buildout, the proposed development will span across 1,400+ acres of land and will be home to over 90,000 residents, or 10% the projections claim. Since its proposal by developers in 2014 representing none other than Barkley’s Family Fuels, New Mexico has held strong opposition to the development. Major issues have been raised and include the major water demand the development would place on our state for both children died in detention centers located in New Mexico. Given the proximity of the US/Mexico border to the state of New Mexico, especially for those residents who live close to the border, spatial regulation and policing is highly evident and strongly felt.

URBAN SPRAWL AND THE REGULATION OF SPACE

Another example that is telling of the spatial injustices that continue in the Land of Enchantment (i.e. New Mexico), is a massive sprawl development appropriately named Santolína, after a non-Native plant species often used as ground cover and that once rooted, has the tendency of becoming invasive. Santolína is a proposed urban sprawl development to be built across 1,400+ acres of what is known as the Artisco Land and is considered closed to the descendants of the Spanish who settled and lived in that particular region. At buildout, the proposed development will span across 1,400+ acres of land and will be home to over 90,000 residents, or 10% the projections claim. Since its proposal by developers in 2014 representing none other than Barkley’s Family Fuels, New Mexico has held strong opposition to the development. Major issues have been raised and include the major water demand the development would place on our state for both children died in detention centers located in New Mexico.

Given the proximity of the US/Mexico border to the state of New Mexico, especially for those residents who live close to the border, spatial regulation and policing is highly evident and strongly felt.

THE BORDER

Under the presidency of Donald Trump, issues surrounding the border, specifically between the US and Mexico, have intensified. Border police have reasserted clear representations of the demarcation of space and the regulation of territories, are used to further spatial injustices by the regulation and control of the movement of bodies across constructed boundaries. This control often at extreme costs to the bodies regarded as inferior or in need of regulation by those with the power to decide who is worthy of crossing the border at will.

What greater evidence do we need to understand that the border serves as a continuation of spatial (in)justice across the US than the lifelessness of Jakelin Caal Maquin and Felipe Alonzo-Gómez, the innocent children claimed by this extreme controlling of space and territory by those in power? Although this matter that impacts the entire nation is currently happening in Mexico, it is another painful reminder of the regulation of space occurring across our state for both children died in detention centers located in New Mexico.

It has become all too common to hear the well-intended white body that they are far removed from a history that took place so long ago and should be forgiven and forgotten. But, how can any of this history be forgotten when present day representations are a continuous reminder of the spatial injustices committed then and whose impacts continue until now?

New Mexico, touted as the harmonious tri-racial state, i.e. of Whites, Hispanics, and Native Americans, is far removed from being a racial utopia as depicted by Kenneth Adams found in the Zimmerman Library, located on the campus of the largest higher education institution of the state, the University of New Mexico.

The murals, painted back in 1993, send a telling message to any who views them, that the white male body is superior, while the Hispanic New Mexicans and Native Americans are considered inferior, their bodies intended for the creation of art for dominant white society. (To view the Zimmerman Library murals and to hear an informative presentation on the topic, visit the following site, http://www.kumm.org/post-class-explorations-contemporary-artyaround-library-murals).

One example readily comes to mind that was brought to our attention when participating in a graduate level education course at the University of New Mexico. During a discussion on how the mistreatment of a Person of Color can be forgotten and ignored in education institutions across the board, the police force was activated and immediately moved in close proximity to the ‘unruly’ or ‘noncompliant’ community member, sometimes physically escorting them away from the podium.

The preceding examples were just a few of the many that continue to highlight the continuation of spatial injustices taking place in New Mexico. The harsh truth is that we remain controlled by systems that cross all sectors of society as evidenced by:

•   Disparities that exist in the educational opportunities and resources provided to those who hold the greatest financial resources and those who do not;

•   Vast differences in the quality and quantity of healthcare provided that varies according to who community you live in;

•   Housing made available determined largely by your zip code;

•   The continuation of reservations where Native American bodies can be confined;

•   Increased control of who can and cannot cross the border;

•   Continued existence of the School to Prison Pipeline, among many others.

Spatial (in)justice continues strong in terms of who plans, designs, and then decides the building of cities and the creation of spaces across communities in the US. The majority of planners, designers, and elected officials serving on city councils and county commissions continue to be white bodies who hold the ultimate power in the control of where we live, how we live, and how resources will be utilized.

To view the Zimmerman Library murals, located on the campus of the largest higher education institution of the state, the University of New Mexico.

There is no better example to understand that race is the primary organizing factor across all systems and structures in society. There is power because using a racial lens expose the work we do to all its residents. Whether one is a wealthy white person with given privileges or on the opposite spectrum, space impacts lives and it is this understanding of who plans, designs, and then enforces the law of who plans, designs, and then enforces the law that gives power to understanding the lives of the two Guatemalan children claimed by this extreme controlling of space and territory by those in power? Although this matter that impacts the entire nation is currently happening in Mexico, it is another painful reminder of the regulation of space occurring across our state for both children died in detention centers located in New Mexico.

Provided by Kenneth Adams found in the Zimmerman Library, located on the campus of the largest higher education institution of the state, the University of New Mexico.

This racialization of space and territories, and send strong messages to any who gaze upon the murals? How can any of this history be forgotten when present day representations are a continuous reminder of the spatial injustices committed then and whose impacts continue until now?

New Mexico, touted as the harmonious tri-racial state, i.e. of Whites, Hispanics, and Native Americans, is far removed from being a racial utopia as depicted by Kenneth Adams found in the Zimmerman Library, located on the campus of the largest higher education institution of the state, the University of New Mexico.

The murals, painted back in 1993, send a telling message to any who views them, that the white male body is superior, while the Hispanic New Mexicans and Native Americans are considered inferior, their bodies intended for the creation of art for dominant white society. (To view the Zimmerman Library murals and to hear an informative presentation on the topic, visit the following site, http://www.kumm.org/post-class-explorations-contemporary-artyaround-library-murals).

One example readily comes to mind that was brought to our attention when participating in a graduate level education course at the University of New Mexico. During a discussion on how the mistreatment of a Person of Color can be forgotten and ignored in education institutions across the board, the police force was activated and immediately moved in close proximity to the ‘unruly’ or ‘noncompliant’ community member, sometimes physically escorting them away from the podium.

The preceding examples were just a few of the many that continue to highlight the continuation of spatial injustices taking place in New Mexico. The harsh truth is that we remain controlled by systems that cross all sectors of society as evidenced by:

•   Disparities that exist in the educational opportunities and resources provided to those who hold the greatest financial resources and those who do not;

•   Vast differences in the quality and quantity of healthcare provided that varies according to who community you live in;

•   Housing made available determined largely by your zip code;

•   The continuation of reservations where Native American bodies can be confined;

•   Increased control of who can and cannot cross the border;

•   Continued existence of the School to Prison Pipeline, among many others.

To view the Zimmerman Library murals, located on the campus of the largest higher education institution of the state, the University of New Mexico.
Given these realities, what must we do as organizers and activists to continue the battle against spatial injustices?

First of all, as stated in the ds4si Spatial Justice Framework back in 2012, we must be intentional about strategizing across space. As organizers and activists we must understand that the concept of space connects us all regardless of the issue we focus our work on - e.g. immigration, education, health, housing, environment, etc. What do all of these issues have in common? They all involve space, that is, the controlling of space. When we understand that we have a shared starting point and a common ground, we will be more willing to align our work in more intentional ways.

As an individual who focuses on the protection of land and water, I have witnessed other activists and organizers distance themselves from our organization and work because they do not see the connection between their work and ours. But, if we use a spatial justice framework to frame our struggles and we understand that all of our issues connect back to the controlling of space and of our lives, maybe then we will be moved to stand with one other regardless of the issue and will no longer succumb to divide and conquer tactics that have been successfully used against us.

Once we understand that we can connect all of our work using a spatial justice framework as put forth by ds4si, we have to continue to organize ourselves and to continue to bring People together to discuss spatial (in)justice issues that impact our communities and then plan continued action and resistance.

Now more than ever, do we find ourselves in a pivotal moment where we must continue to demand equity and justice for all. Although we are currently experiencing heightened animosity against us and a greater use of force attempting to control us, we must remain on the battleground fighting against oppressive systems.

As People of Color, we have known no other way of life than one filled with challenges, but the long legacies before us have taught us to be resilient, even under the greatest of oppressors, we remain standing.

CLOSING THOUGHTS

I want to close by thanking ds4si for inviting me to share my thoughts on the need for our communities to continue to define themselves and their work through a shared spatial justice framework. As a long time educator, it is always an honor to share my ideas with others and it is my hope that these words helped to expand on how spatial (in)justices continue to impact the lives of People across New Mexico.
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Tia-Simone Gardner

Tia-Simone Gardner is an artist, educator, and Black feminist scholar. Her creative practice engages drawing and photography through ideas of ritual, iconoclasm, and geography. Merging drawing with fragments of film and video, Gardner’s work attempts to collapse and expand the time and space of everyday encounters with race, space, and architecture. Gardner grew up in Birmingham, Alabama, and received her BA in Art and Art History from the University of Alabama in Birmingham. In 2009 she received her MFA in Interdisciplinary Practices and Time-Based Media from the University of Pennsylvania.
Alabama is an assemblage of haunted zones of spatial violence. I grew up in these spaces and understand it differently because of the intimacies of family, community and connectedness I bring to bear on this place. I understand its legacies of territorial secession, rundown towns, and building bombings as intimately connected to the antebellum US and Modern Civil Rights Movements, Black, feminist, and Latinx movements. The hegemonic representations, particularly of Birmingham, as a place of intense fear and viciousness, keep often this racial landscape incarcerated by mass media images from the 1950s and 1960s, which then overshadow the ongoing struggle to inhabit spaces and geographies of the present. In this place justice must be understood through its space-time relationships to new forms of power over place. This short text describes my encounter with a single home, in one neighborhood, in Birmingham, Alabama. My mother’s home, in fact, in the Belview Heights subdivision of the Ensley neighborhood of West Birmingham. Ensley began as a suburb of Birmingham, gaining its incorporation in 1899, some twenty-eight years after Birmingham itself was founded. The house that my mother now lives in is in a neighborhood that as a child, she was not allowed to trespass. My mother is Black and she is not a neighborhood for Black people. And yet, she lives there now. She lives there because this part of the city was largely abandoned by white folks beginning in the 1980s through strategic flight and economic divestment, in houses.

The late Edward Soja writes “...justice, however it might be defined, has a consequent geography, a spatial expression that is more than just a background reflection or set of physical attributes to be descriptively mapped...the geography or ‘spatiality’ of justice is an integral formative component of justice itself, a vital part of how justice and injustice are socially constructed and evolve over time.” I draw on Soja’s thinking to look at the spatiality of justice and geography in relation to this house. Think about my mother’s house is to think about space, justice, and architecture. How do we live justly in this place? One with the yet unnamed Black domestic worker and this child. We live here. And yet, we grow up in less than a mile away from this house. It is different precisely because it was Design. It was pre-packaged architectural plan, intended to fit within colonized and caged architectural models that fit white middle class aesthetic values. It was Design to fit within the visual field of this white-segregated, middle class neighborhood, so the design is also a political signifier. My mother’s house was built in 1951 and on a recent trip home she and I visited one of the local archives to mine the pasts of our current neighborhood. I expected to find maps and names, perhaps images produced by city governance. However, what we did find was more unimaginable that we expected, yet not a surprise. A photograph. A document of a new structure recently built on this lot, and in the right middle-third of the frame, a Black domestic worker and, possibly, her small white charge. Produced during the same period of time when we see images of Black protests and militarized police forces being captured in photographs for a national audience, this rather banal image was mapped by a local surveyor to document this slightly new structure. The woman pays no regard to the camera, while the small white child, clad in only a diaper, peers boldly into the lens. The image has captured an anything profound about the sociopolitical landscape of this place. It has ruptured the regulations of racial space. As it has made a particular kind of black presence visible in a space-time location in which it should be invisible, and it has materialized particular kinds of economies and conditions of black life that have stuck, for more than half a century to this place, and to what is now ‘our’ house. We live here. And I wonder how do we live justly in this place?

To talk about this place is to talk through the flesh, and architecture and flesh, have to be thought together. To touch a place is to touch all of the bodies that labored to bring it into being, whether those bodies were happy to do so, or they labored in terror. This condition of the psyche of the built environment, informs my orientation to the house of my mother, and the racial exclusions or exceptions which formed its foundation. These conditions are hard to know, hard to inventory, hard to enumerate, but there are moments when the past makes itself known and we can touch something that we hadn’t even realized was there.

My mother’s house was built in 1951 and on a recent trip home she and I visited one of the local archives to mine the pasts of our current neighborhood. I expected to find maps and names, perhaps images produced by city governance. However, what we did find was more unimaginable that we expected, yet not a surprise. A photograph. A document of a new structure recently built on this lot, and in the right middle-third of the frame, a Black domestic worker and, possibly, her small white charge. Produced during the same period of time when we see images of Black protests and militarized police forces being captured in photographs for a national audience, this rather banal image was mapped by a local surveyor to document this slightly new structure. The woman pays no regard to the camera, while the small white child, clad in only a diaper, peers boldly into the lens. The image has captured an anything profound about the sociopolitical landscape of this place. It has ruptured the regulations of racial space. As it has made a particular kind of black presence visible in a space-time location in which it should be invisible, and it has materialized particular kinds of economies and conditions of black life that have stuck, for more than half a century to this place, and to what is now ‘our’ house. We live here. And I wonder how do we live justly in this place?

The woman pays no regard to the camera, while the small white child, clad in only a diaper, peers boldly into the lens. The image has captured an anything profound about the sociopolitical landscape of this place. It has ruptured the regulations of racial space. As it has made a particular kind of black presence visible in a space-time location in which it should be invisible, and it has materialized particular kinds of economies and conditions of black life that have stuck, for more than half a century to this place, and to what is now ‘our’ house. We live here. And I wonder how do we live justly in this place?

This is a space abandoned by majority white populations and then made available to non-white, majority Black populations through state apparatus such as the Housing and Urban Development Program, and Section 8 programs, it is a reconfigured space where “state and family are woven into the same fabric of kinship, reproduction, and death.” (Blash 21). Belview Heights, once an affluent developing suburban neighborhood, a spatial potentiality for whites, is now a “‘incarcerating’ mechanism of segregation.” It maintains a spatial racial and economic difference and control, at least for one side that produced an economic and social value for the population white out-migrants, who financially benefit from the increased rental market of Black and Brown inhabitants, while also allowing those same migrants to recuperate social value by benefiting, through better schools, more plentiful housing options, and overall better quality of life resources, from not living in minoritized space. Providing an illusion of upward mobility for the other, keeping white supremacist, anti-black geographies of power intact.

We photograph ourselves in our home, outside of our home so we are producing a counter-archive of Black life in this house. It is regulated by power geometries we can feel but may not necessarily be able to name. Our counter-archive will rest beside our inherited one with the yet unnamed Black domestic worker and this child. We live here. And yet, I wonder, how do we live justly in this place?
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Public-Making and Spatial Justice

Design Studio for Social Intervention
Kenneth Bailey and Lori Lobenstine

PANIC, ANXIETY AND PUBLIC ATMOSPHERE

The producing of terror is a production of atmosphere. It remains between us and inhabits space. Terror is meant to have social and spatial effects, to make social life feel a certain way, to affect society and space. The space we inhabit and the atmosphere we affect and are affected by is political. The shootings are extreme examples of atmospheric politics, contestation and power. These contestations happen in smaller ways every day, when multiples forms of social life butt heads over things like who gets to be, thrive and express themselves in the public realm, who gets to perform the ownership of public space and public life, what sounds are condemned and what sounds are condoned, whose public presence is policed and whose is celebrated, whose is represented and whose is erased.

When we wrote our Spatial Justice paper in 2012, we broke down spatial justice into our rights to be, thrive, express, and connect in and through space. Those rights are more vulnerable now than ever, whether it's the spiraling rise of white supremacist violence, the tearing apart and caging of immigrant and refugee families at our border, the increase in surveillance and spatial control tactics, the displacement caused by gentrification in our cities, or the fascist actions, policy and rhetoric coming from the White House. What's at stake is literally our rights to be, thrive, express and connect at every level.

What happens when most or all of what we experience is the experience of injustice? What happens if we succumb to the atmospheres of despair, anxiety, isolation and fear with no atmospheric balance or counterpart? On August 8th in Times Square, motorcycles backfiring triggered a panic, with people running in all directions from what they apparently thought were gunshots. Later police confirmed that there was no active shooter involved. This scene was just two days after the back-to-back mass shootings in El Paso and Dayton.

RELATIONAL AESTHETICS AND SPATIAL JUSTICE IN THE PUBLIC REALM

PANIC, ANXIETY AND PUBLIC ATMOSPHERE

The producing of terror is a production of atmosphere. It remains between us and inhabits space. Terror is meant to have social and spatial effects, to make social life feel a certain way, to affect society and space. The space we inhabit and the atmosphere we affect and are affected by is political. The shootings are extreme examples of atmospheric politics, contestation and power. These contestations happen in smaller ways every day, when multiples forms of social life butt heads over things like who gets to be, thrive and express themselves in the public realm, who gets to perform the ownership of public space and public life, what sounds are condemned and what sounds are condoned, whose public presence is policed and whose is celebrated, whose is represented and whose is erased.

When we wrote our Spatial Justice paper in 2012, we broke down spatial justice into our rights to be, thrive, express, and connect in and through space. Those rights are more vulnerable now than ever, whether it’s the spiraling rise of white supremacist violence, the tearing apart and caging of immigrant and refugee families at our border, the increase in surveillance and spatial control tactics, the displacement caused by gentrification in our cities, or the fascist actions, policy and rhetoric coming from the White House. What’s at stake is literally our rights to be, thrive, express and connect at every level.

What happens when most or all of what we experience is the experience of injustice? What happens if we succumb to the atmospheres of despair, anxiety, isolation and fear with no atmospheric balance or counterpart? On August 8th in Times Square, motorcycles backfiring triggered a panic, with people running in all directions from what they apparently thought were gunshots. Later police confirmed that there was no active shooter involved. This scene was just two days after the back-to-back mass shootings in El Paso and Dayton.

RELATIONAL AESTHETICS AND SPATIAL JUSTICE IN THE PUBLIC REALM

We leave too much of our social lives up to the market sectors—mainly the malls, restaurants, shops and movies that shape the qualities and contours of our daily exchanges. The logics of the market sector can’t account for the robustness of our lives, nor will they be accountable to our demands to be, thrive, express and connect.

Even for those of us who are activists—spending much of our time fighting the status quo—it is hard to avoid the pervasive corporate aesthetic and capitalist opportunities that shape our social lives. We fall into them in many quotidian ways. Looking in the windows of stores, wearing sports paraphernalia, going to the movies, etc. These are the social affordances and cues we always already have at our disposal. These kinds of affordances and spaces take up so much of our local landscapes that it’s hard to imagine otherwise. And those opportunities
PUBLIC-MAKING, SOCIABILITY AND SPATIAL JUSTICE

We situate what we call public-making—the collective creation and activation of public spaces for interaction and belonging—as a way to organize and take on new forms of sociability. This is not to say that all public-making is radical or transformative. Indeed, the market sector engages in its own forms of public making. They make places to drink and socialize, for example, like the current trend of outdoor beer gardens, complete with “cornhole” games or adult swings. However, these spaces look public yet are extensions of business, corporation and their logics of market exchange.

How might we move beyond this kind of established, rehearsed relating in space to still less explored spatial and relational imaginaries? What would happen if people had places that connected public space and public discourse, outdoor play and collective healing, pop-up performances and shared food, movie nights and performance art? What if we used public space for the collective creation of opportunities for interaction, laughter, dialogue, learning and surprise? We imagine the possibilities for multi-textured and joyous counter-atmospheres that challenge this moment of increased isolation, tension and repression. We believe public-making—especially by those who regularly experience spatial injustice—is both radical and transformative. Our informal “Public Making Manifesto” goes like this:

We are the public. We belong in public space. We can create our own public life.

PUBLIC-MAKING can change the future. We can create our own public life. We belong in public space. When and where can we talk about things and practice learning how to engage with people we haven’t met? These kinds of practices are a major part of civic engagement, but those opportunities aren’t often situated in the public in such a way that they are permeable. And when events that have a focus on discussion happen in public places like libraries, they are often only attended by those already on some list to find out about them. In that sense they are only permeable for a pretty limited public, one that is seeking that kind of space.

Perhaps public making that lends itself to more low-threshold dialogue and conversation with strangers would be a draw for people that haven’t identified themselves as such. If we built it, who would come? We want informal, public community conversations and exploring collective authority over spaces and re-imagining them together. Here’s one test this way:

DJ Keith Donaldson starting playing old soul and house music and feet began to move. As more Dance Court participants showed up and filled up the “basketball court”, the music became more intense...that energy cast a net that eventually caught up some of the regulars around the park. Many of the folk who hang around the park in the daytime can be seen drinking their days away. They are usually the ones who society casts off as hopeless. But on this day they were dancing their days away. They brought some of the most intense dancing. Dance Court participant Terry Marshall described one test this way:

Claudio Prado’s “Rua Augusta” Project, Sao Paolo, Brazil

SPECIFIC WAYS OF EXPLORING PUBLIC-MAKING

We’d like to propose some areas of investigation for those of us concerned with spatial justice, public culture, urban and placed experience, and the aesthetics of social life.

1. More public discourse in space

How might we explore the production of public discourse in space? When and where can we talk about things and practice learning how to engage with people we haven’t met? Those kinds of practices are a major part of civic engagement, but those opportunities aren’t often situated in the public in such a way that they are permeable. And when events that have a focus on discussion happen in public places like libraries, they are often only attended by those already on some list to find out about them. In that sense they are only permeable for a pretty limited public, one that is seeking that kind of space.

Perhaps public making that lends itself to more low-threshold dialogue and conversation with strangers would be a draw for people that haven’t identified themselves as such. If we built it, who would come? We want informal, public community conversation and sense-making; we imagine things like Claudio Prado’s whimsical “Rua Augusta” project in Sao Paolo, where he’d bring his living room furniture out to the street every Saturday night to make his living room furniture out to the street every Saturday night to make his living room furniture out to the street every Saturday night to make his living room furniture out to the street ever Saturday night to make his community’s own version of Saturday Night Live—complete with audience participation, star cameos, humor and information sharing.

2. More opportunities to dance, sing, and play together

Most of the dancing we see in the streets in the US context tends to be street performers with routines they run in tour areas for tips, along with the occasional one-off more produced event. The most inviting “jump in and join us” experiences tend to be limited to annual celebrations like Carnival, Caribbean Festival and Gay Pride events. How might we explore and create different spaces and increased opportunities for collective participation in singing, dancing, acting and playing?

One intervention we created and tested was Dance Court, where we posed the question: “What if Dance Courts were part of the ubiquitous landscape, like basketball and tennis courts? How would you use them?” Dance Court participant Terry Marshall described one test this way:

“Jump in and join us” experiences tend to be limited to annual celebrations like Carnival, Caribbean Festival and Gay Pride events. How might we explore and create different spaces and increased opportunities for collective participation in singing, dancing, acting and playing?

3. More opportunities to make and learn

When do we get to make things together in public? And what would we make? There’s fabulous float-making culture related to Carnival, but that is still fairly enclosed. There is sand-castle making culture at beaches, but that is also enclosed, usually by family. We explored using co-creation as a tool for both co-imagining a space and exploring collective authority over micro-spaces in a community that felt little authority to be, let alone to express themselves in public. With Street Lab: Upham’s, we invited residents to choose small public spaces and re-imagine them together. Here’s an alley that they turned into a temporary art gallery and a hand knitted railing they made to show the city that a real railing was needed:
What other play affordances might appeal to adults or to families? How can play mix up the delineations between mine and yours, ours and theirs?

But making can look all kinds of ways—from collective cooking to learning how to do t-shirt printing, carpentry and construction, bike-fixing, button-making and more. Making events could build a collective form of expression, like a mosaic or barn-raising, or perhaps the shared nature of the event is more in the multi-directional flow of knowledge.

What about creating other porous opportunities to learn and share knowledge? The internet has largely turned into an echo chamber, so views and new information are narrowly shared amongst circles of users. Could we use physical opportunities in space and time to better democratize the kinds of insights that one might come across? How could we democratize information, whether it’s health insights like healing uses of honey, knowledge about products or practices that are earth-friendly, or new ways to engage in our state’s budgeting or policy-making? What new conversations and friendships might arise over a found passion for cooking with purple peas or debating the latest pop craze?

These are just a few examples of what public-making might include. There are many others already out there, and many still to be imagined. As we consider public-making as a strategy for spatial justice, it’s important not just have a diversity of content but a diversity of scale. To us, there’s no such thing as “too much” public-making. If our next Public Kitchen bumps up against someone else’s collective reading event, which is down the street from a block party, that’s across from a mobile pottery kiln next to the neighborhood skate park, we are creating not just individual spaces of belonging and connection but a whole web of it. Similarly, if one event is a one-off, while one happens monthly and one happens every day or night, we have another type of web of duration and frequency. We believe that the more instances of public-making that folks bump into, the more they will also feel the authority and inspiration to create their own.

PUBLIC-MAKING CAN CHANGE THE FUTURE

What can the production of counter atmospheres through public-making do to public culture and spatial justice? We’d argue that public-making from a place of self-determination and spatial justice can create spaces of connection, belonging and joy for people who are made to feel fearful or alienated by spatial inequities and spatial domination. We’d argue that these kinds of enactments charge social space with another kind of world, one with compelling and attractive intensities and qualities of life. And when the switch from feeling alienated to feeling connected happens, it does many things to those experiencing it. One way to cut it is to say it can feel like collective healing. When the world seems set on being a certain way that leaves you out of it, it’s easy to forget the possibility of another world. The brief experience of alterity reorients, it reassures and encourages those attracted to it to fight for it, to make it so. In this sense public-making is where the political, aesthetic and social making of our future all meet. Done well, it can foreground the immediacy—and frankly the urgency—of what being in a sample of the desired world does for our ability and hope to create and sustain that world. It can create an embodied experience that helps us see (and feel, hear and sense) what is possible. Public-making can create temporary spaces of being, thriving, expressing, and connecting that mobilize our imaginations towards greater instantiations of spatial justice.

WE ARE THE PUBLIC.
WE BELONG IN PUBLIC SPACE.
WE CAN CREATE OUR OWN PUBLIC LIFE.
PUBLIC-MAKING CAN CHANGE THE FUTURE.

How might more porous opportunities to find out about things you never thought about create or produce a public?
In Orange, New Jersey there is a network of backyard soccer fields, a community center that hosts monthly potluck dinners, and a free school where neighbors share their skills with each other. There is also luxury housing advertised on the sides of former factory buildings. The residents of this housing enjoy close access to the midtown direct train with a 30 minute ride to New York City, a recently day lit section of the Rahway River, and new street lights. Large infrastructure projects and relationship building are essential parts of making a city. Yet, we see larger privately developed projects as the main focus of many city plans. We are investigating Horizontal Development and Vertical Development, concepts developed by the Design Studio for Social Intervention, as terms to describe the processes that are actively shaping our neighborhoods and cities. Readers will be familiar with the conditions and activities we use to characterize both of these terms. We use the word development because development is valued and prioritized in a way that relational growth is not. We’re taking back the term and using the qualifiers of “vertical” or “horizontal” to expand the meaning, precisely describe our conditions and open up possibilities for action.

Vertical development looks to maximize profits for real estate developers or to increase land values for city or local government. This form of development is often facilitated by real estate developers, planners and public administrators, and various types of consultants. Vertical models of development are almost always organized as private ownership models or opportunities. Vertical development limits not only ownership of resources but especially limits access to “the ability to derive benefits from things” and encourages the consolidation of both access and ownership to a small, very wealthy section of global population.

We are a collective of researchers with the Cities Research Group in the Urbanism Department of the University of Orange, a free school in Orange, NJ. When we started our free school in Orange, NJ it was our aim to learn how to mend physical and social fracture that have resulted from Serial Forced Displacement while also keeping our eye on the current forces causing instability. At the UoFo we say that anything you want to know about the American city you can learn in Orange, NJ. The city is a university. To graduate from the University of Orange and earn a Be Free Degree, students have to take two courses, vote (in any type of election), volunteer, attend a city meeting, and have fun with their neighbors. Students can graduate every year. All of our classes are offered for free and led by volunteers. Past courses have included guitar playing, beer making, civics, and courses have included guitar playing, beer making, civics,
requires a growing surplus of land. The pressure is under pressure. Vertical Development may look different from place to place. It is bottom up, diverse, place specific and resident-focused. Horizontal development includes this scale of support. In some cases this land is held in common or owned publicly, and managed collectively. These robust horizontal networks come under threat as land is acquired and privatized with the promise of “development.” We can see this pressure expressed clearly in the field of affordable housing, and the cost burden effect this has on all other realms of city-dwellers lives and stability.

People are “making” the cities they live and work in everyday. They are investing in their neighbors and building systems together that benefit their neighborhoods. The human chain of Serial Forced Displacement has held land inhabited by working class communities and communities of color at a low value. Residents in these places often needed to engage in Horizontal Development to create their own infrastructure and systems of support. In some cases this land is held in common or owned publicly, and managed collectively. These robust horizontal networks come under threat as land is acquired and privatized with the promise of “development.” We can see this pressure expressed clearly in the field of affordable housing, and the cost burden effect this has on all other realms of city-dwellers lives and stability.

Current in Orange as in the rest of the US, we are faced with what we have described as “an extraordinary affordable housing crisis.” The July 2019 issue of Harper’s Magazine indexes states that there are only 23 counties in the United States where a person with a full time, minimum wage job can afford a one bedroom house; there are zero counties where they can afford a two bedroom. This housing predicament has led to a situation where a higher proportion of low-income people are paying a large share of their income for shelter. The 2006 Orange City Master Plan measured 30% of homeowners and 40% of renters as cost burdened. A 2017 United Way study shows 65% of Orange homeowners are cost burdened. That means the number more than doubled in the last ten years. This is the highest level in Essex County and in northern New Jersey. That is a rapid increase. The state of affordable housing is a byproduct of the mechanism of Vertical Development. During periods of potential economic recession, State-led initiatives to provide fair and affordable housing are continually rolled back, and risky financial products linking housing to the private market are rolled out. The strategy is simple: offset the risk to government and onto individuals and families. Raquel Rolnik, UN Special Rapporteur on adequate housing, claims that this offset of risk was taught to cities by the World Bank and that it was a strategic maneuver to inflate real estate prices in a moment of stagnant wages, creating new homeowners, staking out risky loans, predicated on capital that is their homes. But as we’ve seen, bubbles burst, bad mortgages come due, and now we continue to live through the largest eviction crisis the world has seen.

Two Two Ton Tony Galento Plaza and the Connection to Main Street

In 2008, when we founded the University of Orange, we were hired by a local Community Development Corporation to write a plan for a part of the city we called, “The Heart of Orange.” This neighborhood includes a historic, thriving Main Street, a train station, businesses that have been in the same family for generations, public housing, large single family homes, businesses that serve the city’s many immigrant communities, a Colonial Era graveyard and more. But Orange has also suffered from the effects of Serial Forced Displacement. Many residents and community institutions were displaced to make way for the construction of an Interstate highway that slices through the neighborhood. Once an industrial center, the last factory closed in the 1980s. In 2008 the foreclosure crisis was hitting Orange hard, and the city has yet to recover. Because the city is only 30 minutes by train to midtown Manhattan, gentrification in the form of transit-oriented development is now a threat.

We invited the French urbanist, Michel Cantal Duprat, to consult with us on the development of the plan. Cantal’s work uses the built environment to promote equity. During his visit to Orange he met with elected officials, residents of all ages, restaurateurs, firefighters and many others. He toured all around Orange and the region. He taught us that what we need to do was create connections in the city. A key place for this was at our train station. The Orange station is just a block off of Main Street, but when you exited the station you would never know. People got in their cars and left. How could we connect our station to our Main Street to improve the flow of the area? The area at the time was mostly used for parking, but Cantal told us it could be a vibrant plaza and place for gathering. There was nowhere in the station to buy a cup of coffee or a newspaper. We decided we could enact it as a fantastic public space. We would show a possibility for how the space could be used that was not yet in existence – an Adjacent Possibility. The plaza had been named for a famous boxer from Orange named Tony Galento known as “Two Ton Tony.” He was a local legend and larger than life. He had boxed a bear. We hosted a day called “Two Ton Tony Galento Plaza Day.” We surprised commuters with free coffee and newspapers on their way to work. In the evening we offered handmade benches to sit on, mini Jamaican parties and homemade lemon ice from local eateries, produce from a local garden and the chance to pose with marals of Tony and the Bear.

Soon we learned the City was going to designate a developer for this area. We were excited to check our plan to see if it could connect our train station to Main Street and neighbors to each other. We made plans to host a bench making contest at the station to teach people about public space as they were creating it. The City denied our permit to host our event at the station. We were told that they didn’t want public comment on the plans for the train station area. We went ahead with our contest on the nearby library lawn. We continued to try to influence the outcome of the area design but little was done to use the public space. To this day if you step off the train in Orange you still might not know the way to Main Street even though it is right there. The mixed-use building, constructed where the plaza might have been, curves protectively around the station. Rather than creating spaces and places in the built environment that welcome train passengers to the city of Orange, guiding their way to Main St., the building blocks the city’s defining features and discourages flow outside of the station plaza.

Recently the City of Orange released a new plan for Main Street and a new Master Plan. Our Urbanism Department wanted to analyze these plans through a lense of Horizontal Development and Vertical Development so we could understand who was going to benefit from proposed developments. We built a team to study Orange planning
documents. There were hundreds of pages to go through, so we divided them up and shared back what we read. In reading through the Main Street planning documents, we learned that the planning firm was proposing the city use eminent domain to take control of properties on Main Street. The eligible properties had to fit certain criteria for “condemnation” but many of these criteria were misleading. For instance, using sewer infrastructure older than 50 years could qualify a location. Almost all of the City of Orange would fit into this criteria. Once eminent domain was used, the properties would be given to a developer. The proposed development in some sections called for 5-10 story buildings, which is incredibly different than the existing character of Main Street. Most importantly, Orange’s Main Street is a bustling commercial area and vital part of the city’s fabric - far from the “underutilized” area described in these plans.

We dedicated our annual UofO April Placemaking event to gathering people together to analyze the Main Street plan and explore our ideas about Horizontal Development. As people arrived at our event we asked: What gives a place value? What makes a place matter? What makes a place matter to you? We were joined by many longtime colleagues and friends as well as some newcomers, including a group of high school students. We asked participants to consider these responses as they walked Main Street in teams to see what was being condemned. Then we reflected on what we saw and the importance of Main Street. As one youth said, “I get everything I need on Main St.” The day reminded us of what we value on our Main Street and taught us that characteristics of Vertical Development include a lack of transparency. Almost no one we spoke to on our walks knew about the proposed plans.

ADJACENT POSSIBILITY

As we continue our research, we are developing case studies about Horizontal Development in different sectors, geographies and at many levels of scale. Examples include land trusts, cohousing, community potlucks and more. We are hoping to encourage investment at all levels in Horizontal Development. In doing so we are moving towards Adjacent Possibilities. The “adjacent possible” is a concept shared with us by the Design Studio for Social Intervention, created by theoretical biologist Stuart Kauffman. In the Design Studio’s paper Redlining the Adjacent Possible: Youth and Communities of Color Face the (Not) New Future of (Not) Work, popular science author Steven Johnson is cited in describing the term, “The adjacent possible is a kind of shadow future, hovering on the edges of the present state of things, a map of all the ways in which the present can reinvent itself.” With each case study we are mapping the existing assets, and bringing them together to reveal a full landscape of adjacent possibility.
Designing Public Dialogues for Spatial Justice

The Move
Misael Galdamez & Julia Curbera

On October 30, 2018, we had the opportunity to lead a conversation at DSgSL’s Design + Spatial Justice event around public dialogue. If spatial justice is the right to be and become, the right to thrive and to express, and the right to access and connect, then the role of public dialogue is to interrogate the ways in which our physical environment and society are unjustly organized, and to facilitate their redesign through inclusive and intentional conversation.

During the activity, Ceasar introduced the practice of civic design as a way to allow members of a diverse and complex public to be in conversation with one another, and struggle with their shared histories and traditions. In addition, this practice allows the public to grapple with those interests that often bring them into conflict. Civic design asks: how do we ensure everyone has both a seat at the table and a voice? And how can we have difficult conversations in a way that unites us?

As Wendell Joseph, a City Planner in Cambridge explained in our podcast, “...regardless of how great a design you have, so long as the baseline remains what it is, you’re always going to have a problem with the design. And the baseline is one that’s mired in racism and classism. Until you shift the baseline to something that is closer to what it ought to be, then every design case you come up with is still going to have the same issue.” We must not only recognize past failures and inequalities, but also co-create and re-create a more equitable and just democracy.

THE SIX TYPES OF PUBLIC CONVERSATIONS
How we talk with one another is central to our ability to redesign these baseline conversations. The techniques or processes we use to talk with one another are of course an essential aspect of building conversational relationships among a demographically complex public. Just as important as the processes of a dialogue, however, are the purposes of a particular public dialogue. We suggest six types of dialogue that the public needs to struggle over, each of which has a specific purpose and asks the public to engage in a different cognitive or affective task. The six types of purposeful conversations are framing, ideation, prioritizing, selection, implementing, and monitoring. Framing conversations as most fundamental for building these dialectical relationships.

Framing
How we frame an issue has direct impact on which actions may or may not be appropriate in a given situation. As Kuypers points out, frames “define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments, and suggest remedies.” Moreover, frames are mostly narrative-driven and as such serve to organize our thinking around an issue. The public is seldom provided opportunities to frame issues, yet framing conversations are perhaps the most important conversation for a demographically complex public.

There are two parts to framing conversations. The first requires each person to name their own lived experience with an issue. The second happens when, after hearing the individual stories, the public creates a shared narrative from the experience that contains the individual stories as well as what is known from other sources of knowledge. Once this shared narrative is created, then the public can decide how to frame a particular issue so it attends to the complexity of the shared narrative. It is collective meaning making that enables the public to construct a more inclusive framing of any issue.

Framing conversations are also among the most difficult to establish. For people to engage in framing conversations, they need the authority (both internal and external) to speak to their own lived experiences. Yet much of what we have done in this country through our education system, media, and our structure of public dialogues is to constantly reinforce an image that the general public is not to be trusted and does not have the capacity to understand the intricacies of issues. Structural racism makes this particularly true for African Americans and other communities of color.

Structural issues are not the only things that impede the public’s participation in framing conversations. For example, some people are reluctant to give voice to their lived experience, because they have lived for decades under totalitarian regimes where lifting your voice could sentence you or your family to prison or death. Others have lived (or are living) within the restrictive confines of a patriarchal family in which the voices of girls and women are constrained. And then there are those who, when in a room with people who are older, defer speaking out of respect for those who have lived on this earth longer than they have.
Design for Systemic Change Here are a few more design principles: Designing for systemic change means helping the public look beyond or beyond the event that has triggered the need for dialogue; the public needs to understand the underlying structures and mental models that created the conditions for that event or issue.

Design for Ecological Solutions When we design for ecological solutions, we employ natural principles such as the interconnection of life to judge our desired outcomes.

Design for Analog and Digital Systems It’s also important today to design for what we often call analog and digital realities. In other words, we want to help people to interact effectively both online and in person, and ideally these modes will reinforce each other. Howard Gardner famously observed that, “Anything that is worth teaching can be presented in many different ways. [And] these multiple ways can make use of our multiple intelligences.”

Design for Multiple Ways of Expression Creating spaces that successfully support the building of a dialectical relationship in demographically complex communities means supporting multiple ways for people to express themselves. These might include art, music, signing, even sitting in silence.

Design for Healing Finally, for many people, and especially those at the margins of society, participation in political processes has been a repeated story of betrayal. This repeated betrayal erodes trust between members of the public, the public and its institutions, and between those within institutions and the public.

As trust erodes, our ability to peacefully struggle together diminishes. Healing from betrayal requires acknowledgment of past harms and establishment of processes for attending to them. Through deliberate, grounded in restorative principles, will the public be able to build a new relationship with itself and its institutions.

Group Reflection on the Challenges of Civic Design Following Caesar’s remarks on the different civic design conversations and guiding principles, participants of the breakout session reflected on the challenges and opportunities for civic design within their own practices. Using the design framework as a matrix, including the civic design principles and the various phases/conversations as six different rows. We asked participants to place a sticker in a cell on the matrix which either best represented their practice, or in which we found that it worked in the way we thought they might.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, in each of the two breakout sessions, participants highlighted framings conversations that oriented to the public and its interests, values, and goals. It is in these framings that it works for those in the middle, then more likely than not the failures in the systems will remain unaddressed, and those at the margins will continue to be left out. This concept applies as readily to product design as it does for designing engagement campaigns.

One clear example of this is the curb cut on sidewalks. Conceived fifty years ago to meet the needs of wheelchair-bound patients, it has also benefited bicyclists, parents with strollers, and people rolling food carts, just to name a few.

Design for Collaboration It is also critical that we design processes that require participants to work collaboratively and to imagine solutions that can be achieved through collaboration — most notably collaboration among the demographically complex public and with the institutions that are there to serve the public. Perhaps one of the clearest examples of this is the current effort to address opioid addiction. The best solution that is being put forward requires collaboration between police, schools, emergency rooms, etc. Contrast this with the response to the AIDS epidemic, which had one, non-collaborative solution: criminalization.

Design for Equity Another of the most important principles is to employ equity as a lens for evaluating the design of the space/structure/process. It is also critical to employ equity as an outcome measure for determining the feasibility of possible solutions or effectiveness of adopted solutions. Of course, one of the first challenges in considering equity is agreeing on a definition. While definitional clarity is required for each of the principles, defining equity is fraught with potential for disagreement. For many dialogue efforts, engaging the public in a framing conversation around equity is often a necessary first step.

Through purposeful design, it is possible to create conditions that enable people, even in the face of these challenges, to participate in framing conversations. This in turn implies that solutions we can imagine and choose to implement. 

Idéation Conversations around idéation ask the public to imagine possible and improvable solutions to a particular issue, challenge, policy. To engage in an idéation conversation, the public draws on its individual and collective creative energy in a realm some to tap into his or her creative energy varies. For some, it is drawing, for others, it is poetry, still others, storytelling. Accordingly, idéation conversations are designed to support multiple forms of expression. Moreover, these conversations are generative. They are not the place for decisions to be made, but the place where people can witness their collective intelligence and creativity.

Prioritizing Here the public is asked to weigh the value of particular options. These options can come from what was generated through the conversation or they could be options that have emerged from another process. It is in the prioritizing conversation that the public is directly asked to struggle with traditions, interests, values, and goals. It is in these conversations that other forms of knowledge, research, experts, etc., are considered. Prioritizing conversations are not about making a final choice or the actions to take. Instead these conversations identify an array of options, of which any one would result in an equitable improvement.

Deciding When we are faced with choosing one option from among a set of viable options, we in fact are weighing trade-offs based on our values. When the public is able to have open conversations about these trade-offs, it is more likely that more members of the public can live with the final decision even if it was not what they would have chosen. For a demographically complex public, this understanding helps people stay connected when the unintended consequences of choosing a particular option adversely impact a particular group or population.

Implementing The public’s role does not end in deciding (voting) or influencing decisions made in the public’s interest by others. In a democracy, the public also has an integral role in implementing decisions that impact the public. Yet, the public is seldom provided an opportunity to be in this type of conversation.

Monitoring After a decision is implemented, the public also has an integral role in monitoring the results of the decision. Monitoring conversations create opportunities for the public to reflect upon and monitor the decision. Monitoring conversations create opportunities for the public to reflect upon and monitor the decision.
**Spatial Justice: Re-appropriating the Body and Space**

**Alvaro Lima**

Alvaro Lima was born and raised on an island full of enchantment, mysteries, and magic called Upaon-Açu by the Tremembés, later baptized São Luís by the French. After working in the south of Brazil on economic development projects with low-income communities, he travelled to Mozambique to serve as a economist for the Frelimo Government, the first socialist government in Africa. In the United States, he worked as the Senior Vice President and Director of Research of the Initiative for a Competitive Inner City (ICIC). Prior to ICIC, he was the Director of Economic Development at Urban Edge, a Boston-based community development corporation. Presently, he is the Director of Research for the Boston Planning & Development Agency.

“Amy revolutionary ‘project’ today, whether utopian or realistic, must, if it is to avoid hopeless banality, make the re-appropriation of the body, in association with the re-appropriation of space, into a non-negotiable part of its agenda.”

— Henri Lefebvre, *Production of Space.*

As Makani Themba, Executive Director of The Praxis Project observes in her foreword to the paper, “Spatial Justice: A Frame for Reclaiming Our Rights To Be, Thrive, Express and Connect,” the authors Kenneth Bailey and Lori Lobenstine of the Design Studio for Social Intervention encourage us “to explore our relationships to space, power and justice with our whole selves - body, heart, mind, memory ... [that is], the many ways spatial politics shapes our work, our bodies, our psyches and how organizing to listen to reclaim and transform space is a game changer.” They urge us to come outside and play.

In October of 2018, a gathering at the Boston Society of Architects occasioned just that: an opportunity to engage in a playful and open exploration of spatial justice. The event comprised a series of conversations/play-organized around themes such as community development, cultural space, scenography, performance, urban design and civic arts. The short text that follows is a summary of the re-appropriation of social justice. The body is itself: a set of rights that together illuminate the concept of spatial justice. They are as follows: the right to be and become; the right to thrive and express; the right to access and connect. Implicit in these rights are concepts and phenomena through which the self and collective are inextricably linked to space and place: nothing is or becomes, no one thrives or expresses themselves, no one can access opportunity or connect with their neighbors if not in a place. In other words, there is always a locus (or loci) for the expression of these rights. In the comments that follow, I explore some of these loci, starting with the most intimate: the body. We can then follow the body as it inhabits other spaces: the home, the neighborhood, the city, the nation and, in the age of the Anthropocene, the geographies of globalization.

If we understand the rights mentioned above as spatial rights, we can start by conceptually framing spatial justice as a fundamental right over the control of our own bodies, which carry with them the marks of race, ethnicity, gender (and others) and provides the locus for the politics of identity, sexuality, and sexual reproduction. The body is also a fundamental expression of “value.” The body is itself a commodity in the slave mode of production, an appendage of the land in feudal society, and the commodity “labor power” in a capitalist society. The body-as-value is likewise fundamental to other social systems.

As the Western legal system, in particular, injury law in the United States, given our litigious legal culture, constantly and necessarily valuates the body as it attempts to determine what a “fair” compensation for the damage sustained by the body. The body is also the site of sexual, reproductive, family, and mobility rights and politics. These are rights over the meaning, control, and disposition of our bodies as a primary locus of identity.

Now, as the infant body starts to explore space, s/he starts to construct a spatial frame of reference that moves beyond the parent as his/her primary “place” to other dimensions, slowly building distinctions between home and outside, familiar and strange, self and other. As a child grows, the idea of place becomes more specific and geographic. Home, becomes the first answer to the question “where do you live?” before a street name or the name of a town is given. (Yi-Fu Tuan, 2003)

Home, the place of family, love, and friendship, is also a primal site of control, repression, violence - a site of profound ambiguity. It is also the site that provides the most immediate context for the body. It is in the home that private and public spaces are differentiated and authority is exercised over our bodies in the process of social reproduction. But a “home” is at the same time, a use-value and an exchange-value. As a use-value, it provides shelter. As an exchange-value, it is a commodity that can be bought, sold, leased, expropriated, foreclosed and a place from which people can be evicted. Homelessness may be the ultimate expression of the contradiction inherent in a system where exchange-values dominate over the right to home or shelter. Deprived of a private space, they are constantly made invisible, harassed, and criminalized by vagrancy, squatting, begging, and sleeping rough. Examples of “radical” urban design abound (Davis, 1990).

The neighborhood, which begins as an undifferentiated space, becomes a place as we come to know it more intimately and endow it with meaning and values. They can be places of exclusion as well as powerful places of social cohesion and political organizing for local control and ownership. Struggles against urban renewal, displacement, and gentrification are a few examples of struggles to maintain the sense of community, to avoid the loss of personal friendships, familiar faces and places, history, and collective memories that are “emptied out” in the neighborhood. Indeed, gentrification and displacement, are defined by Tom
of belonging i.e. who belongs and who doesn’t. Repression and de-humanizing discourses become important tools of state affirmation, they construct the “other” and exercise social control by narrowly defining the boundaries of the “self”.

National spaces become bordered, fenced and walled spaces preventing people from passing through, whether they are refugees, asylum-seekers, internally displaced persons, or migrants. In this context, urban spaces become essential to a radical planetary political movement centered around spatial justice as a frame. By articulating an understanding of the dynamics of capital accumulation and the uneven transformation of spaces and places at various scales, a powerful movement can be formed. An important aspect of this process is what Harvey (1982) calls the “dynamics of accumulation by dispossession”, its impact on people’s everyday lives and its capacity of being politicized by social movements across places, territories, and scales (Brenner, 2013).

The co-presence of non-citizens and dispossessed citizens challenges the boundaries of inclusion and the legitimacy of democracy when the subjects of democracy are circum-scribed to citizens of a place. Migrants and in particular refugees appear today as primary figures of exclusion when “rights to have rights” are under attack.

Finally, the politics of space and place increasingly play out on a global scale. Spatial inequality is a vital concept when attempting to describe the phenomena whereby earthly resources are inevitably distributed across space. As an analytical construct, it helps us to see the consequenc-es of concentrated economic advantages and disadvantages highlighting the role of space in determining who has access to what and the real consequences to the human experience - segregation of the poor its slums and auto-segregation of the rich in gated communities.

It is clear, at least for me, that a spatial frame is of great importance and necessity because it connects issues together. As I mentioned before, it “encourage us to explore our rela-tionships to space, power and justice with our whole selves - body, heart, mind, memo-ry.” The question I leave to us is: How will we articulate a critique of the system, imagine its superation, and outline a program capable of mobilizing grassroots movements, political parties, governments, and civil society at large? What is the shape of this coalition?

Who objectively and subjectively is likely to support fundamental change? What do we want? Quick fixes? Adjustments here and there? What would be different? What we have to offer today besides specific strug-gles to say no to this or that intervention? Without answers to these questions, our framework vanishes and our power to mobilize weakens. To transform our marches and protests into a sustainable political move-ment capable of bring about social change it is necessary to bring people to think about alternatives—feasible or utopic.
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THANK YOUs and an INVITATION

First, many thanks to all of our contributors! Your work in this short anthology reflects so many of the diverse and nuanced ways you have inspired us to think about spatial justice. Thank you! We hope this collection helps cross fertilize the ideas for you as well.

Also, thanks to all of you who are reading/deploying/growing/teaching these ideas! Please do let us know how you use it in your work on social change, strategy or education.

Our initial hope for this body of work was to help the concept and thinking behind spatial justice find more homes within the social change sector and the growing field of socially engaged art. But as these kinds of publications travel, they often take on lives of their own, including ones that the original authors didn’t imagine. We’d love to receive any notes from out there, to see how it’s moving about and being used in the world.

You can reach us at ds4si@ds4si.org or @ds4si.
We are an artistic research and development outfit for the improvement of civil society and everyday life. The Design Studio for Social Intervention (DS4SI) is dedicated to changing how social justice is imagined, developed and deployed here in the United States.