

SEVILLA

IDA

**IDA: ADVANCED  
DOCTORAL RESEARCH  
IN ARCHITECTURE**



**Margarita de Luxán García de Diego**-Universidad P. de Madrid  
**Madelyn Marrero**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Juan Jesús Martín del Río**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Luis Martínez-Santamaría**-Universidad Politécnica de Madrid  
**Ángel Martínez García-Posada**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Mauro Marzo**-Università IUAV di Venezia  
**Pilar Mercader Moyano**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Antonello Monaco**-Università degli Studi di Reggio Calabria  
**Marta Molina Huelva**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**José Morales Sánchez**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Eduardo Mosquera Adell**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**María Teresa Muñoz Jiménez**-Universidad Politécnica de Madrid  
**Jaime Navarro Casas**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**José Joaquín Parra Bañón**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Víctor Pérez Escolano**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Francisco Pinto Puerto**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Mercedes Ponce Ortiz de Insagurbe**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Juan Luis de las Rivas Sanz**-Universidad de Valladolid  
**Carmen Rodríguez Liñán**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Javier Ruiz Sánchez**-Universidad Politécnica de Madrid  
**Joaquín Sabaté Bel**-Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya  
**Victoriano Sáinz Gutiérrez**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Santiago Sánchez Beitia**-Universidad del País Vasco  
**Domingo Sánchez Fuentes**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**José Sánchez Sánchez**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Juan José Sendra Salas**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Julián Sobrino Simal**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Federico Soriano Peláez**-Universidad Politécnica de Madrid  
**Rafael Suárez Medina**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Miguel Ángel Tabales Rodríguez**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Antonio Tejedor Cabrera**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Jorge Torres Cueco**-Universidad Politécnica de Valencia  
**Elisa Valero Ramos**-Universidad de Granada  
**Manuel Vázquez Boza**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Narciso Vázquez Carretero**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Teófilo Zamarreño García**-Universidad de Sevilla

SEVILLA



**IDA: ADVANCED  
DOCTORAL RESEARCH  
IN ARCHITECTURE**

Antonio Tejedor Cabrera, Marta Molina Huelva (comp.)

IDA: Advanced Doctoral Research in Architecture  
Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, 2017.

1.408 pp. 21 x 29,7 cm

ISBN: 38765987928376375

Legal Dep.: 236235768336

All right reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or any means without prior written permission from the Publisher.

**EDITOR**

Universidad de Sevilla

**COMPILERS**

Antonio Tejedor Cabrera

Marta Molina Huelva

**DESIGN AND LAYOUT BY**

Pablo Blázquez Jesús

María Carrascal Pérez

Daniel Longa García

Marina López Sánchez

Francisco Javier Navarro de Pablos

Gabriel Velasco Blanco

**ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICES STAFF**

Adoración Gavira Iglesias

Seville, november 2017

© 2017. IDA: ADVANCED DOCTORAL RESEARCH IN ARCHITECTURE

SEVILLA

IDE

ORGANIZED BY

**iuacc**  
INSTITUTO UNIVERSITARIO  
ARQUITECTURA Y CIENCIAS DE LA CONSTRUCCION

UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA  
**u** **eidus**  
Escuela Internacional de Doctorado

**arquitectura**  
Escuela Técnica Superior  
Universidad de Sevilla

COLLABORATORS



Consejo Andaluz  
de Colegios Oficiales  
de Arquitectos



fundación **arquia**



## **FORMAT**

### **Thematic tables**

The thematic tables are places to present the methodologies and experiences of young doctors and doctoral students from different universities. They are managed by the doctorate students themselves, who generate conclusions to be debated and reworked in the final plenary session. The sessions are developed simultaneously with the presentation of the papers selected in the call, organized in four areas or thematic lines:

1. Architectural technologies
2. Housing, city and territory
3. Heritage and Rehabilitation
4. Analysis and advanced projects

### **Workshop**

The workshop of the Congress is oriented towards the analysis of the problems and management needs of the Doctorate Programs, with the objective of arriving at conclusions that may be useful to the Universities involved. The coordinators of the Doctorate in Architecture programs and the doctoral students' representatives will participate in the workshop. The following are topics for debate: lines of research, methodologies, organizational needs of the doctoral programs, the International Doctorate and the Industrial Doctorate, and the future of doctoral research.

### **Plenary Sessions**

The plenary sessions are held at the beginning and end of the Congress. In the first session of welcome and introduction to the Congress, researchers from the national and international scene and the coordinators of the doctorate programs are invited to participate. In the second plenary session an open debate is proposed for the going over of the proposals drawn from the workshop and the thematic tables. It also serves as a closing ceremony with the presentation of the final conclusions of the 2017 IDA\_Sevilla Congress.



## OBJECTIVES

1. Analyze the research lines of the various programs and build a map of doctoral research in Spain with the support of coordinators, tutors / thesis supervisors, doctoral students and young doctors in the disciplines related to Architecture and their related areas.
2. To know the status of doctoral theses in progress or defended in the last three years, selected by means of a call with blind peer evaluation of the doctoral programs participating in the congress.
3. Discuss the structure and university management of doctoral programs in relation to employment challenges, collaboration with the productive sector and national research programs.
4. Exchange experiences with other international doctoral research programs on international mobility management, theses with international mention, co-supervised theses, theses with industrial mentions, etc.
5. No less important, consolidate a national and international network of Doctoral Programs related to Architecture, Urban Planning, Heritage, Landscape, Technologies and related disciplines.



**LT 1**

ARCHITECTURE  
TECHNOLOGIES

**LT 2**

HOUSING, CITY  
AND TERRITORY

**LT 3**

HERITAGE AND  
REHABILITATION

**LT 4**

ANALYSIS AND  
ADVANCED PROJECTS

All manuscripts have been submitted to blind peer review, all content in this publication has been strictly selected, the international scientific committee that participates in the selection of the works is of international character and of recognized prestige, an scrupulous method of content filtering has been followed in terms of its veracity, scientific definition and plot quality.



## COMMITTEES

### CONFERENCE CHAIRPERSONS

**Antonio Tejedor Cabrera**, *Coordinator of the PhD Program in Architecture and Director of the University Institute of Architecture and Construction Sciences, Professor Department of Architectural Design, University of Seville*

**Marta Molina Huelva**, *Secretary of the University Institute of Architecture and Construction Sciences, Professor of the Department of Building Structures and Geotechnical Engineering, University of Seville*

### ORGANISING COMMITTEE

**María Carrascal Pérez**, *Department of History, Theory and Architectural Composition, University of Seville*

**Mercedes Linares Gómez del Pulgar**, *Department of Architectural Graphic Expression, University of Seville*

**Ángel Martínez García-Posada**, *Department of Architectural Design, University of Seville*

**Pilar Mercader Moyano**, *Department of Architectural Constructions I, University of Seville*

**Domingo Sánchez Fuentes**, *Department of Urban Planning and Spatial Planning, University of Seville*

**Manuel Vázquez Boza**, *Department of Building Structures and Land Engineering, University of Seville*

### CONFERENCE SECRETARY

**Pablo Blázquez Jesús**, *Ph.D. student, Department of Architectural Design, University of Seville*

**Marina López Sánchez**, *Ph.D. student, Department of Architectural Design, University of Seville*

## SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

**José Aguiar**-Universidade de Lisboa  
**Benno Albrecht**-Università IUAV di Venezia  
**Francisco Javier Alejandro Sánchez**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Darío Álvarez Álvarez**-Universidad de Valladolid  
**Antonio Ampliato Briones**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Joaquín Antuña**-Universidad Politécnica de Madrid  
**Ángela Barrios Padura**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**José María Cabeza Laínez**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Pilar Chías Navarro**-Universidad de Alcalá  
**Juan Calatrava Escobar**-Universidad de Granada  
**María Carrascal Pérez**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Helena Coch Roura**-Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya  
**Jorge Cruz Pinto**-Universidad de Lisboa  
**Carmen Díez Medina**-Universidad de Zaragoza  
**Fernando Espuelas Cid**-Universidad Europea  
**Alberto Ferlenga**-Università IUAV di Venezia  
**Luz Fernández-Valderrama**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Vicente Flores Alés**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**María del Carmen Galán Marín**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Jorge Filipe Ganhão da Cruz Pinto**-Universidade de Lisboa  
**Carlos García Vázquez**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Sara Girón Borrero**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Francisco Gómez Díaz**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Amparo Graciani**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Francisco Granero Martín**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Francisco Hernández Olivares**-Universidad P. de Madrid  
**Miguel Ángel de la Iglesia**-Universidad de Valladolid  
**Paulo J.S. Cruz**-Universidade do Minho  
**Francesc Sepulcre**-Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya  
**Ángel Luis León Rodríguez**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**Mercedes Linares Gómez del Pulgar**-Universidad de Sevilla  
**María del Mar Loren Méndez**-Universidad de Sevilla

## FOREWORD

The Instituto Universitario de Arquitectura y Ciencias de la Construcción (IUACC), in collaboration with the Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura (ETSAS) and the Escuela Internacional de Doctorado (EIDUS) of the University of Seville are pleased to welcome the heads of research from both Spanish and overseas universities, consolidated researchers and young doctoral researchers to the First International Congress of Doctorates in Architecture IDA Sevilla, from 27th to 28th November 2017.

The **IDA\_Sevilla 2017** Congress offers a general perspective of doctoral studies in the field of Architecture and its related disciplines: urban planning, heritage, landscape, construction technologies and sustainability. In the new context generated after the elimination of the doctoral programs prior to RD 99/2011, it is necessary to carry out an analysis of the complex panorama that the former programs and the new doctoral programs have drawn up, in order to know in detail both what has been achieved so far, as well as the challenges of the future of advanced doctoral research in Spain, in the European and international context.

The startling changes that are taking place in our society call for a vision of research that is not compartmentalised into traditional disciplines or areas of knowledge. Doctoral research in Architecture must adapt to changes in society and to the sustainable productive needs of territory.

The congress will take place at the Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Sevilla, organised in four simultaneous thematic tables, a workshop on the administration of doctoral programs and two plenary sessions.

The **thematic tables** are aimed at young doctors and doctoral students of the different participating universities who will present their experiences and methods of their research - in development or recently concluded. The participation in the thematic tables is carried out through the selection procedure with blind peer review established in the call for papers and through express invitations to the debate. The almost 70 communications have been structured in four thematic areas representative of the PhD programs in Architecture.

The **open workshop** will be held in two sessions with the participation of the coordinators of each of the collaborating programs of the Congress, and professors with extensive doctoral experience. Its objectives are multiple: to discuss the experiences undertaken in the different universities, exchange ideas about the approaches and models applied, address the challenges of internationalization and management, launch the new Industrial Doctorate with companies and public agencies, and so on.

There are two **plenary sessions**: one, a plenary session of introduction to the congress, with the participation of coordinators of national and foreign doctoral programs; and a closing plenary session, with an open debate for the going-over of the conclusions drawn from the thematic tables and the workshop, and the presentation of final conclusions.

We thank the Escuela Internacional de Doctorado of the University of Seville, and the Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Sevilla for the support they have provided for the holding of this meeting, which contributes so much to the clarification of the future of doctoral studies in Spanish universities in the face of the great challenge of internationalization and the continuous improvement of the quality of research in Architecture. We also thank those responsible for the participating Doctoral Programs, the Architecture library of the US and all the participants and attendees.

Antonio Tejedor Cabrera  
Marta Molina Huelva

## PRÓLOGO

El Instituto Universitario de Arquitectura y Ciencias de la Construcción (IUACC), con la colaboración de la Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura (ETSAS) y la Escuela Internacional de Doctorado (EIDUS) de la Universidad de Sevilla, se complacen en recibir a los responsables de investigación de universidades españolas y extranjeras, a los investigadores consolidados y a los jóvenes investigadores de doctorado en el I CONGRESO INTERNACIONAL DE DOCTORADOS EN ARQUITECTURA IDA\_Sevilla, del 27 al 28 de noviembre de 2017.

El congreso **IDA\_Sevilla 2017** ofrece una perspectiva general de los estudios de doctorado en el campo de la Arquitectura y sus disciplinas afines: urbanística, patrimonio, paisaje, tecnologías de la construcción y sostenibilidad. En el nuevo contexto generado tras la extinción de los programas doctorales anteriores al RD 99/2011 es necesario realizar un análisis del complejo panorama que han construido los programas extintos y los nuevos programas de doctorado, con el objeto de conocer con detalle tanto lo conseguido hasta ahora como los retos que depara el futuro de la investigación doctoral avanzada en España, en el contexto europeo e internacional.

Los vertiginosos cambios que se están produciendo en nuestra sociedad reclaman una visión de la investigación no compartimentada en disciplinas o áreas de conocimiento tradicionales. La investigación doctoral en Arquitectura debe adaptarse a los cambios de la sociedad y a las necesidades productivas sostenibles en el territorio.

El congreso se celebra en la Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Sevilla organizado en cuatro mesas temáticas simultáneas, un taller sobre la gestión de los programas de doctorado y dos sesiones plenarias.



Las **mesas temáticas** están dirigidas a los jóvenes doctores y a estudiantes de doctorado de las diferentes universidades participantes que exponen sus experiencias y métodos sobre las investigaciones en desarrollo o recientemente concluidas. La participación en las mesas temáticas se realiza por el procedimiento de selección con revisión por pares ciegos establecido en la *call for papers* y por medio de invitaciones expresas al debate. Las casi 70 comunicaciones se han estructurado en cuatro áreas temáticas representativas de los programas de doctorado en Arquitectura.

El **taller** de puesta en común se realiza en dos sesiones con la participación de los coordinadores de cada uno de los programas colaboradores del Congreso y de profesores con amplia experiencia doctoral. Sus objetivos son múltiples: debatir sobre las experiencias desarrolladas en las distintas universidades, intercambiar ideas sobre los enfoques y los modelos aplicados, abordar los retos de internacionalización y de gestión, poner en marcha el nuevo Doctorado Industrial con empresas y agencias públicas, etc.

Las **sesiones plenarias** son dos: una sesión plenaria de introducción al congreso, con la intervención de coordinadores de programas de doctorado nacionales y extranjeros; y una sesión plenaria de clausura, con un debate abierto para la reelaboración de las conclusiones extraídas de las mesas temáticas y del workshop y la presentación de las conclusiones finales.

Agradecemos a la Escuela Internacional de Doctorado de la Universidad de Sevilla y a la Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Sevilla el apoyo que han proporcionado para la realización de este encuentro que tanto contribuye a clarificar el futuro de los estudios doctorales en las universidades españolas ante el gran reto de la internacionalización y la continua mejora de la calidad de la investigación en Arquitectura. Damos las gracias también a los responsables de los Programas de Doctorado participantes, a la Biblioteca de Arquitectura de la US y a todos los participantes y asistentes.

Antonio Tejedor Cabrera  
Marta Molina Huelva

## OBJETIVOS

1. Analizar las líneas de investigación de los diversos programas y construir el mapa de la investigación doctoral en España con el apoyo de los coordinadores, los tutores/directores de tesis, los doctorandos y los jóvenes doctores en las disciplinas relacionadas con la Arquitectura y sus áreas afines.
2. Conocer el estado de las tesis doctorales en marcha o defendidas en los últimos tres años, seleccionadas por medio de una *call* con evaluadores por pares ciegos de los programas de doctorado participantes en el congreso.
3. Debatir sobre la estructura y la gestión universitaria de los programas de doctorado en relación con los retos de empleo, colaboración con el sector productivo y los programas nacionales de investigación.
4. Intercambiar experiencias con otros programas de investigación doctoral a escala internacional sobre gestión de la movilidad internacional, tesis con mención internacional, tesis en cotutela, tesis con mención industrial, etc.
5. No menos importante, consolidar una red nacional e internacional de Programas de Doctorado relacionados con la Arquitectura, la Urbanística, el Patrimonio, el Paisaje, las Tecnologías y sus disciplinas afines.



### 3. Results, Tools for Local Development

The tools for local development discussed in this paper serve as the basis for understanding the local processes (bottom-up), that are not being considered by general planning (top-down) and that are linked to collective actions resulting from processes generated by the population with backgrounds of forced displacement by the armed conflict and that can be identified as "models of territorial organization." These instruments are used spontaneously as a result of a process of community consolidation as a result of their natural needs.

As a result of the field work, indicators associated with land ownership, productivity and infrastructure were identified, thus allowing the deduction and codification of the community actions that helped form the settlements, which can be considered tools due to their effectiveness and merit. This identification was carried out based on the following premises:

1. Organized community actions of migrant groups aimed at intervening and improving the physical and spatial conditions of their local environment.
2. Everything used by the communities victims of violence to achieve the local development of their territory as a current and future place of residence.
3. Community organization mechanisms or "tools" of a collective nature that are used to produce specific actions on the physical space that reflect general interests.
4. Partial actions that result in collective actions and partial actions that, as a whole, make up general actions.

When they are understood as community actions, the tools involve a process in their development that begins with agreements and the assignment of responsibilities within a community (participation), within an organized structure in which actors are assigned, resources are generated and guarantees are established for the realization of projects (management), which come together in the realization of an action that is expressed in a specific event associated with the formation of territory (local structuring).

To this effect, the recognition of the tools as a result of this research has ranked them among those that make up the actions linked to the processes of land ownership and subsequent informal possession, the processes of creation of the physical conditions and basic infrastructure and the processes associated with the generation of resources and means of economic subsistence. The progressive and linear correlation of these actions results in a process of local territorial structuring.

Based on the result, the comparison of the sectors analyzed converges in the identification of several common tools of greater relevance as the fundamental determinants in the process of forming outlying and border settlements. These tools, first and foremost, give an account of the factors associated with community organizations that have common origins, shared interests and backgrounds related to processes of expulsion and violence, without which it is impossible to understand the logic of the actions themselves. In particular, populations such as those of "Vallecito" and their history of returning, or of the outlying sectors of Barrancabermeja with their historical background of encroaching and migrant peasants.

That being said, the determining instruments can be summarized as follows:

- Collective peasant or trade organization. Many of the initial community organizations have been determined by previous peasant or trade organizations that were generated in their place of origin and have specific shared interests and projects. This experience provides them with a higher level of trust and consolidation as a community, as well as the recognition of leaders. For the sectors of Barrancabermeja, these organizations were generated in their rural places of origin. As for Vallecito, the peasant organization arose there spontaneously and has become stronger during the process of expulsion and particularly in the return process.
- The maintenance and observance of customs, peasant practices, knowledge and trades. Along with prior experience as a peasant community, for the purposes of improving its economic conditions, the experience of its work associated with farming, fishing and the preparation of food products allows the generation of small-scale vegetable gardens, family crops and the preparation of products that can later be sold. The inheritance of coca processing and mining trades is particular to Vallecito.
- Primary community organization. Prior to the community occupation process comes an initial community formation, either based on common place of origin or family proximity or friendships. It should not be considered an organized group in the sense of being constituted as such. It is more of a process of spontaneous collective clustering (according to immediate needs) that develops toward common interests, which are realized with the physical occupation of a place.
- Establishment of Leadership. The beginning of the process of occupying land is accompanied by a series of collective prior decisions led by one or more members. In general, one person assumes the coordination of the occupation process. Processes are agreed between several members that know each other from their common place of origin, which could be a neighborhood or a rural area. Under these coordinated leaderships, the projects for invasion, construction and installation of public

utilities are planned, along with the allocation of lots to new residents and the determination of occupation agreements, etc.

- The identification of basic consumption needs within the community. In the rural context of Vallecito, needs are linked to the improvement and appropriation of the housing project.. Likewise, the territorial dimension and not only the local dimension is based on the capacity of the communities to organize themselves through the establishment of programs of communal productive development that strengthen the roots towards a productive rural area.

- Within the urban neighborhood context and after a primary level of consolidation, the population identifies the consumption demands that can be offered as services within the neighborhoods. To this effect, the first businesses appear, such as hair salons, pharmacies, bakeries or grocery stores as particular actions with a collective impact. Associated with the appearance of the first businesses of a neighborhood nature based on the identification of basic needs, there are also spontaneous community initiatives related to the location of businesses or shops in areas, on streets and in strategic spaces with high pedestrian frequency, which are consolidated over time as core sectors of commercial offer.

- The generation of micro-communities. In light of an advanced process of consolidation and after having overcome basic needs thanks to a high level of community integration, divisions take place and differences arise based on particular interests demanded from small groups or micro-communities. These new frameworks of collectivity, in certain circumstances, allow the channeling of the generation of specific projects through more efficient and particular management processes.

- The formation of public space based on social appropriation. In these settlements, the community first takes over free spaces through activities of leisure, meetings for the community, etc. and over time, the space is physically configured (lighting, furniture, etc.), contrary to what occurs in traditional land-use planning where the space is first designed and physically completed and later appropriated by individuals.



Fig.4 (Building of public space. Author: David Burbano G.)

- Land reserve agreed by the community for social infrastructure. At the same time that lots are distributed, land is determined exclusively for public use, either for facilities or as free spaces. Many times, they are strategies based on professional advice to meet the minimum conditions for the future legalization of the neighborhood.

- Intermediation of armed groups. Throughout recent history, armed groups have had a great impact on the lives of residents. Decisions in many of the actions associated with planning are conditioned under the control and supervision of these groups. Both in Vallecito and Barrancabermeja, the tools associated with economic productivity are controlled and managed by them.

## **FORMATO**

### **Mesas temáticas**

Las mesas temáticas son lugares de presentación de las metodologías y las experiencias de jóvenes doctores y de estudiantes de doctorado procedentes de las diferentes universidades. Son gestionadas por los propios estudiantes de doctorado que generan unas conclusiones para ser debatidas y reelaboradas en la sesión plenaria final. Las sesiones se desarrollan de manera simultánea con la presentación de los *papers* seleccionados en la *call*, organizados en cuatro áreas o líneas temáticas:

1. Tecnologías de la Arquitectura
2. Vivienda, Ciudad y Territorio
3. Patrimonio y Rehabilitación
4. Análisis y Proyectos Avanzados

### **Taller**

El workshop del Congreso se orienta hacia el análisis de los problemas y las necesidades de gestión de los Programas de Doctorado con el fin de extraer conclusiones que pueden ser útiles a las Universidades implicadas. En el workshop participan los coordinadores de los programas de Doctorado en Arquitectura y los representantes de los doctorandos. Son temas de debate: las líneas de investigación, las metodologías, las necesidades organizativas de los programas de doctorado, el Doctorado Internacional y el Doctorado Industrial, y el futuro de la investigación doctoral.

### **Sesiones Plenarias**

Las sesiones plenarias se realizan al inicio y al final del Congreso. En la primera sesión de bienvenida e introducción al Congreso se invita a participar a expertos investigadores del panorama nacional e internacional y a los coordinadores de los programas de doctorado. En la segunda sesión plenaria se propone un debate abierto para la reelaboración de las propuestas extraídas del taller y de las mesas temáticas. Sirve también de clausura con la presentación de las conclusiones finales del Congreso IDA\_Sevilla 2017.

**ICF**

SEVILLA

# LT 2

VIVIENDA, CIUDAD  
Y TERRITORIO

## HOUSING, CITY AND TERRITORY / VIVIENDA, CIUDAD Y TERRITORIO

p. 257-266: **DOCUMENTARY ANALYSIS. TO LIVE WITH A RIVER IN THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT IN THE LAST 180 YEARS. OF CONVIENIENCE TO COEXISTENCE THE CASE OF THE RIVER ESGUEVA AND THE PEOPLES OF ITS VALLEY** / p. 267-276: **ANÁLISIS DOCUMENTAL. HABITAR JUNTO A UN RÍO EN EL MEDIO RURAL EN LOS ÚLTIMOS 180 AÑOS. DE LA CONVENIENCIA A LA CONVIVENCIA EL CASO DEL RÍO ESGUEVA Y LOS PUEBLOS DE SU VALLE**

*Espinosa Galindo, Arancha; del Caz Enjuto, Rosario*

p. 277-285: **MAN-MADE LANDSCAPES: FROM PICTURES TO THE AMERICAN TERRITORY** / p. 286-294: **PAISAJES CONSTRUIDOS: DE LA IMAGEN AL TERRITORIO AMERICANO**

*Santamarina-Macho, Carlos*

p. 295-303: **LOCAL ORDER, CITY AND POST-CONFLICT TERRITORIES IN COLOMBIA** / p. 304-314: **ORDENAMIENTO LOCAL, CIUDAD Y TERRITORIOS DE POSCONFLICTO EN COLOMBIA**

*Burbano González, David*

p. 315-324: **REOPEN THE URBAN QUESTION. THE RIGHT TO THE CITY AS AN INSTITUENT PRACTICE** / p. 325-335: **REABRIR LA CUESTIÓN URBANA. EL DERECHO A LA CIUDAD COMO PRÁCTICA INSTITUYENTE**

*España Naveira, Enrique*

p. 337-346: **URBAN ECONOMY AND SPACE CONFIGURATION AS A CONSTRUCTION OF CONTEMPORARY CITY DYNAMICS** / p. 347-356: **ECONOMÍA URBANA Y CONFIGURACIÓN ESPACIAL COMO CONSTRUCCIÓN DE LA DINÁMICA DE CIUDAD CONTEMPORÁNEA**

*Sánchez García, Juan Andrés*

p. 357-366: **NATURE CONSERVATION AND HUMAN WELFARE: THE ROLE OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE SOCIO-ECOLOGICAL TRANSITION OF THE URBAN AGLOMERATION OF SEVILLE** / p. 367-377: **CONSERVACIÓN DE LA NATURALEZA Y BIENESTAR HUMANO: EL PAPEL DE LA PARTICIPACIÓN CIUDADANA EN LA TRANSICIÓN SOCIO-ECOLÓGICA DE LA AGLOMERACIÓN URBANA DE SEVILLA**

*Donadei, Marta*

p. 379-393: **THE LOCAL UNIT NUMBER ONE IN PINO MONTANO. AN URBAN PROJECT NOT BUILT OF LUÍS RECASÉNS** / p. 394-408: **LA UNIDAD VECINAL NÚMERO UNO PARA PINO MONTANO. UN PROYECTO URBANO NO REALIZADO DE LUIS RECASÉNS**

*Redondo Redondo, Miguel*

p. 409-420: **THE INCARNATED LANDSCAPE. MERLEAU-PONTY AND THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF WILDNESS, MEMORY AND SELFHOOD IN NATURE THROUGH THE WORK OF JUSTINE KURLAND, ORI GERSHT AND LUISA LAMBRI** / p. 421-432: **EL PAISAJE ENCARNADO. MERLEAU-PONTY Y LA FENOMENOLOGÍA DE LO SALVAJE, LA MEMORIA Y EL ENSIMISMAMIENTO EN LA OBRA DE JUSTINE KURLAND, ORI GERSHT Y LUISA LAMBRI**

*Montero Sanchez de Corral, Paula*

p. 433-441: **ARCHITECTURE AGAINST CITY. ENCOUNTERS BETWEEN COLLECTIVE HOUSING AND PUBLIC SPACE** / p. 442-451: **ARQUITECTURA CONTRA CIUDAD. ENCUENTROS ENTRE LA VIVIENDA COLECTIVA Y EL ESPACIO PÚBLICO**

*Álvarez Arce, Raquel*

p. 453-464: **VISIONS AND PROPOSALS TOWARDS AN EMERGING URBAN PLANNING. A JOURNEY THROUGH "THE LIVING CITY", 2006-2016** / p. 465-476: **VISIONES Y PROPUESTAS HACIA UN URBANISMO EMERGENTE. UN VIAJE POR "LA CIUDAD VIVA" 2006-2016**

*Gallegos Rodríguez, Reyes*

p. 477-487: **METHODOLOGICAL PROPOSAL FOR THE ANALYSIS OF URBAN OBSOLESCENCE PROCESSES: THE CASE OF SPANISH HOUSING ESTATES** / p. 488-498: **PROPUESTA METODOLÓGICA PARA EL ANÁLISIS DE PROCESOS DE OBSOLESCENCIA URBANA: EL CASO DE LOS POLÍGONOS ESPAÑOLES**

*García-Pérez, Sergio*

p. 499-510: **URBANIZING NATURE: VEGETATION AND GARDEN SPACES IN THE THINKING BEHIND THE DEVELOPMENT AGENTS OF THE CITY OF MACEIÓ (1816-1930)** / p. 511-522: **URBANIZAR LA NATURALEZA: LA VEGETACIÓN Y LOS ESPACIOS AJARDINADOS EN EL IDEARIO DE LOS AGENTES CONSTRUCTORES DE LA CIUDAD DE MACEIÓ (1816-1930)**

*Leão, Tharcila M. S.; Ferrare, Josemary O. P.; Cavalcanti, Veronica R.*

p. 523-532: **PROJECT MANAGEMENT OF INTEGRATED REGENERATION OF DEPRIVED NEIGHBOURHOODS THROUGH THE PMBOK METHODOLOGY. LIFE CYCLE, PROJECT CHARTER AND IDENTIFY STAKEHOLDERS IN PROJECTS** / p. 533-543: **GESTIÓN DE PROYECTOS DE REGENERACIÓN INTEGRADA DE BARRIADAS A TRAVÉS DE LA METODOLOGÍA PMBOK. CICLO DE VIDA, ACTA DE CONSTITUCIÓN E IDENTIFICACIÓN DE LAS PARTES INVOLUCRADAS EN EL PROYECTO**

*Ledesma de la Rosa, Carolina; Galán Marín, Carmen; García Vázquez, Carlos; Morón Serna, Elena*

p. 545-553: **VERTICAL ARCHITECTURE. COMPLEXITY AND SCALE IN CONTEMPORARY CITY** / p. 554-562: **ARQUITECTURA VERTICAL. COMPLEJIDAD Y ESCALA EN LA CIUDAD CONTEMPORÁNEA**

*Gor Gómez, Agustín*



# REOPEN THE URBAN QUESTION. THE RIGHT TO THE CITY AS AN INSTITUENT PRACTICE

España Naveira, Enrique <sup>(1)</sup>

(1) Universidad de Sevilla, kikespana@gmail.com

## Abstract

The current narratives to understand the urban are in question and arises the need to explore new critical maps to read socio-spatial transformations within the geographies of capitalism. It seems that there are enough arguments in favor of a radical questioning of the existing epistemological approaches to the urban. This research aims to reopen the urban question through a discussion of the right to the city, based on the work of Henri Lefebvre and its developments in other thinkers and the contemporary urban social movements, understanding that is still new and confusing.

How do we articulate the right to the city in the current context? In this first approach we are going to see a general understanding in which the right to the city is framed to study then, at a later stage of the doctoral research, its materialization in a series of concretizations of this notion within the movements.

**Keywords:** Right to the city, Urban social movements, Critical urban theory, Lefebvre, Social space.

## 1. Introduction

What is the city? Who really thinks the city? And, more importantly, *what is it impossible to think* about the city, *and what kind of impossibility are we faced with here?* These questions lead the second paragraph of the preface to Michel Foucault's well-known book *The order of things* (1966: 1) with which he begins a process of questioning the human sciences throughout history, stating that every epoch of history (*episteme*) has underlying conditions of truth. What Foucault does is to take us to the limit of what we know, invites us to think about the impossibility of thinking, which can be useful to clarify what prevents us from thinking the urban ("the city") from an emancipatory perspective.

When we think in the city many ideas came to mind, however, it is not usual to get out of an instrumental approach, which understand the city as the support that guarantees the management of the "basic" needs of its inhabitants. We are used to see numerous studies, reports and forums dedicated to an understanding that puts the functionality at the center: a more efficient mobility through new technologies, a "greener" environment, cleaner streets using new garbage collection systems, safer public spaces thanks to new geolocated systems of surveillance, "smart" and "sustainable" buildings that increase the comfort of our day-to-day, ultimately, a mathematical city, an equation at the service of the myth of prosperity. One more instrument, fundamental, within the neoliberal logic. But, what hide this logic that puts the functionality at the center? and, what make us impossible to think this form of understanding the city?

Obviously, it is not a coincidence, it is the ideological consequence of one way of understanding the world, of certain power relations. Many critical authors, from different disciplines, have developed this question, emphasizing the important role that the city plays under capitalism: being an engine for capital accumulation. As authors like Lefebvre (1974) or Harvey (2007) explain, the real estate industry ceases to have a secondary character (instrumental) and becomes one of the main engines of the world economy dynamization. Due to the importance of the city and the space itself within the circulation of capital so that capitalism does not collapse, the construction of the city is reduced to a board of speculative game in which space is no more than a simple portion of soil that is only important as exchange value, that is, as merchandise.

The space of our time is based on this perverse logic that prevent us from seeing - and thinking - the obvious, that the city is a social production (Lefebvre, 1974), the scene of our lives, the ambient in which our dreams are produced and reproduced and the possibility to transform society. It is support, but also field of action. This apparent evidence is camouflaged from its own conception (design), the

insatiable will of control by architects, city planners and designers fits very well with the expansive and colonizing claim of the circulation of capital through the real estate industry and the building sector. Which allows from this coincidence of interests to reduce the city (and thinking the city) to a classifiable conceptual territory on the basis of "rigid and diaphanous at the same time" categories (Delgado, 2004: 8) where the urban is not thought from the conflict of the social, nor from the power that relations between individuals can unfold through their initiatives and spontaneous forms of living, but from "the impossible utopia of the appeasement of multidimensionality and instability of the social urban" (Delgado, 2004: 8). Hence the important difference announced by Lefebvre (1972: 70-71) between the city (static) and the urban (in progress, in movement).

## 1. The urban and the possible

For decades we know, at least intuitively, that the city disappeared, dissolved in the urban and by the urban, evidenced by Henri Lefebvre with his celebrated space-time axis 0-100, on the complete urbanization of society as hypotheses (Lefebvre, 1970b). The general framework used to establish a typology of the cities was broken while the accesses of a quantitative order, already limited in terms of the conceptualization of the "city", experienced the same fate. Then came the extreme confusion, relatively protected by the concept of global city (Sassen, 1991) and the spread of words, not concepts, which tried and try to designate with little fortune what was happening on the plane of the real. Language is imposed on words and these have been subjected to procedures and processes of emptying until they become useless and lack any capacity to induce and form concepts. It is therefore necessary to point out some questions that are relevant in this respect: that the use of the word "city" is performed here in terms of pure metaphor or inherited residue, and that this metaphorical use does not seek to escape nor hide the multiple and very different "cities" (Rubio & España, 2016: 2). As Lefebvre would say, although the "city" is displaced in theory by the urban, this does not suppose the disappearance of it from the lefebvrian language (as it reflects the own title of "the right to the city") (Martínez-Lorea, 2013: 14-15).

The result of the confusion is that there seems to be a strong contrast between the complexity of our "cities" and the simplifications imposed both in the theoretical and the political arena in their treatment. As has been pointed out in other fields, the analysis of cities (or the urban expanded in the territory) requires a greater and better study of the complexity of the urban. However, we could start from a previous agreement: characterize the "city" in any of its historical stages as a social reality that creates social space (Rubio & España, 2016: 2).

Talking about space in a context of capitalist spatial planning is, as we said before, a euphemism, in reality talking about soil, about space as merchandise. Even so, is contradictory because although the city's soil is fundamental for capital circulation (and, therefore, it supposes a space of deactivation of citizen initiatives) at the same time it is support (condenses and arouses) the struggles and demands of global mobilization that take *shape* (Butler, 2011: 1) in the city. As Manuel Delgado explains, urban space is ideological, political; is the support in which concepts such as "democracy, citizenship, coexistence, civism, consensus and other central political values" (Delgado, 2011: 10) are materialized, but not only that, it is where our bodies stand and the space in-between which constitutes us as a collectivity.

How we take back (materially) the city and the space? How do we think from a perspective that overflows the limits imposed? To try to address these issues, we will turn to the classical period (Greece and Rome) to explore what some authors have reflected on the relationship between the origin of the city and politics. Trying to flee from a simple approach that establishes a direct relationship, for example, between the Greek term *polis* (city) and *politikós* (politics), Massimo Cacciari (2009) makes the following clarification regarding this; there is a radical difference between the Greek *polis* and the Latin *civitas* which has to do with its genealogical and ontological roots, while the term *civitas* derives from *civis*, which means that it is the product of citizens "in their concurrence together in the same place and in the submission to the same laws" (Cacciari, 2009: 10). In the Greek term the relation is inverse because the fundamental term is *polis* and its derivative *polites*, which means that the concept of city is previous to the one of citizen. What does this mean? That in Greek civilization the idea of a city as a unit of people alludes to *ethos*, it is the seat of every custom and tradition, it is the place that serves as the seat of people who shares a series of issues and is prior to the idea of citizen. However, in Rome, the city is "the joint concurrence, the confluence of very different people" (Cacciari, 2009: 9-11) that the only thing they share is to be under the same laws, the idea of citizen, in this case, precedes the city and has a somewhat more open condition. However, this analysis does not deepens into what would be a contemporary understanding operative for the present context, or if it does, it occurs in a non-emancipatory sense. It should be remembered that in both Greece and Rome the condition of citizenship was not universal, it was restricted to those who had a series of conditions, including not being a slave. Today, still quite similar, the status of citizenship is really

problematic because it constructs an inside and an outside, we see it with absolute clarity in cases like the Detention Centers for Foreigners (*CIE*) or the migratory policies of the European Union.

Hannah Arendt, goes much deeper into the previous question, reaching a series of preliminary conclusions on the relationship between *polis* and political action. Arendt develops that political action arises precisely from being together, from "sharing words and acts", and not only this, but the action of being together is the only one that constitutes the public space, the polis. Hannah Arendt develops in her book *The Human Condition* (2009) an extensive analysis on the *polis* conducted throughout the whole book, although in more detail between pages 218 and 222, that we are not going to analyze in detail. One of the most interesting questions is that the German author establishes an understanding of the Greek polis from a contemporary conception of the political in the space. It goes on to state that *every political action requires a space of appearance* (Arendt, 2009). This interpretation of Arendt can be very useful to better understand the political dimension of urban space and, therefore, to unravel some of the limits that prevent us from thinking about the city. Arendt tells us:

The *polis*, properly speaking, is not the city-state in its physical location; it is the organization of the people as it arises out of acting and speaking together, and its true space lies between people living together for this purpose, no matter where they happen to be. "Wherever you go, you will be a *polis*": these famous words became not merely the watchword of Greek colonization, they expressed the conviction that action and speech create a space between the participants which can find its proper location almost any time and anywhere. (Arendt, 2009: 221)

That is, the political dimension of the space (of the city) is situated in the center of the discussion, not only on the enhancement of citizen participation in common affairs and in public space but also on the claim that political action is what constitutes the space (and the *polis*). As we said before, the different struggles and demands (political action) take shape in the city, but not only that, the political space of appearance is not an empty space, is an active support, "construct actions as well as allows to be constructed by them" (Sevilla, 2015: 93). The body here takes on an important dimension, as Butler points out "for the political to take place, the body must appear" (Butler, 2011: 3) and this implies that the space between us allows us to appear. Action emerges from "between" bodies and becomes meaningful when action is collective, the space of appearance can not be separated from the plural action that makes it reality, which constitutes it. She also warned that this plurality of action was cut off in the classical *polis*, since "the slave, the foreigner and the barbarian" (Butler, 2011: 3) were excluded from such space and separated from the possibility of being part of the plurality that shaped space. The question of exclusion is of great importance in the conception of space and political action, with many implications on relations and forms of power, which highlights the need to overflow the classical conception of *polis*.

What is this all about? Does this approach open up any possibility of thinking the city beyond the present impossibilities? Definitely. It serves us to think, in spite of fatigue and hopelessness, in the utopian question, in the revolutionary question, or in Lefebvre's words, in the question of the possible. Utopia is a delicate subject, precisely because in certain historical moments has been full of naivety or an idealism that was not intended to materialize in the real, but remain in the terrain of the abstract. We will not dig into this multiple question of utopia, but whether it is necessary to clarify one use of the utopian label; since the late 1940s, the modern "utopian" architecture, led by Le Corbusier and the CIAM, became an official trend in most cities. It should not be forgotten that this "utopia" is very far from what we are trying to address in this text. It could be generalized very superficially that this utopian conception does not question the way in which society is organized, but is more focused on an update, a modernization, within the same state of things. For a closer look at this idea see Coleman (2015). This circumstance makes it not a threat to the forces that contain a certain framework of the possible, more innocuous intellectual exercise than possibility of openness of thought and action. Lefebvre will assure that "without utopia, without exploration of the possible, there is no thought".

Today it seems that the social order (economic relations and desires, mainly; but also spatial organization) can no longer be modified and what remains for us is to adapt as best we can. Once the system of counterweights formed by the two blocs of the Cold War disappears, the balance tilts to one side and proclaims "the end of history" (Fukuyama, 1992), exposes the idea that the war of ideologies ended up by demolishing the wall of Berlin, definitively triumphing liberalism as an ideology and capitalism as an economic system. There would be no room left for formulating the great questions that had pushed history up to that point, but that the battle of ideologies was to be replaced "by economic calculation, the endless resolution of technical problems, concern for the environment and the satisfaction of the sophisticated demands of the consumers" (Fukuyama, 1992). The space of conflict is then confined to these "technical" spaces, that is, a border is built to make it immune to questions that challenge its existence. This prevents us from seeing that the root of problems is their own impossibility to think about them, not to assume the conflict that can generate the very expression of democracy, that space shared that appears between our bodies in alliance and referred to by Arendt (2009) and Butler (2011). The challenge is to rethink the problem of radical transformation

(from the root) of the existing, to explore another horizon of the possible (the urban) breaking with the corsets of capitalism as the only way.

To this, the *concrete utopia* is what Lefebvre suggests to us, meaning, a utopia that materializes in the real and that connects with the practices that unfold in the urban space by people that inhabit it. The possible, then according to Lefebvre, is in the urban. The urban is the possible, precisely because it constitutes an unfinished place, a reality that is constantly making "a space of conflicts, confrontations, space of the unpredictable, of imbalances, where normalities are disarranged and rearm in every moment" (Martínez-Lorea, 2013: 27), but also space for encounter, enjoyment and creative power. To reopen the question of *the possible* is to reopen the urban question.

In this challenge the figure of Lefebvre is fundamental to think the possible. Reopening the urban question is to re-read Lefebvre, from a "serene look" on the margins of the convulsive context in which his thinking was originated and once the storm generated by political struggles and controversies that occurred mainly within the French Communist Party, but generally within contemporary French thought, dies. The importance of Lefebvre as a source of inspiration and debate in contemporary urban reflection is undeniable; its lucidity to understand *the urban* as an expansive and global phenomenon, as well as the enunciation of *the right to the city* as a new problem from which to think of space as a social (and political) product, entail enormous potential for urban social movements and the different struggles and claims that have an emancipatory character. Since the 1980s, their proposals were decontextualized or vulgarized, when not directly ignored. In the 1990s different social movements (mainly in Latin America) flag the "right to the city" as a generic claim that in a way collects all other rights (water, housing, land, etc.), however, loses its specific right-of-way condition, which dissolves its potential for radical transformation. Perhaps the most interesting thing is not to clearly establish a concretion of *the right to the city* but to explore its original conception and rethink it at the present time framed within the resistances, flees and urban struggles that today question the state of things and intend to become instituent practices (Raunig, 2006, 2007), that is, in processes not only of deterritorialization but also of reterritorialization.

### 3. Reopen the urban

#### 3.1. Brief state of the art

Since Lefebvre's death 25 years have passed, far from the Parisian context and the convulsive historical moment that gave rise to his thought, we can feel now that his presence is becoming vibrant both in the academic world and in urban social movements. From the economic analysis from a radical geographic perspective of David Harvey (1973, 1985, 2007, 2013) to the postmodern geographies of Edward Soja (1989, 1996, 2000, 2010) there has been a continuity of Lefebvre's work, but is surely from a more recent re-reading of his work by a new generation of researchers which explains the growing importance that the French thinker is having in contemporary reflection. Among them are Lukasz Stanek (2011) and Christian Schmid (2005), who placed Lefebvre at the center of their academic discussions, generating two important congresses organized jointly between the Architecture Schools of TU Delft and ETH Zurich (2008, 2009), the first one in Delft under the title *Rethinking Theory, Space and Production: Henri Lefebvre Today* (Delft, 11-13 November 2008); the second in Zurich with the title: *Urban Research and Architecture: Beyond Henri Lefebvre* (Zurich, 24-26 November 2009). Also in recent years Neil Brenner, from the Urban Theory Lab (Harvard GSD), has made important contributions, among them the study on the Lefebvrian concept of *planetary urbanization*, recently published a book with an important collection of contributions titled *Implosion / explosion. Towards a study of planetary urbanization* (Brenner, 2014). Stuart Elden (2004) is another author who should not be forgotten to understand this return, together with Neil Brenner publishes a selection of Lefebvre essays entitled *State, space, world* (Brenner and Elden, 2009).

In France, Remi Hess (1988) emphasizes the work of reprinting the most important texts of the author with Anthropos editorial, an effort that is accompanied by other French authors who go in a similar direction as Grégory Busquets or Jean-Pierre Garnier (Busquets & Garnier, 2011). In Spain, the spread of his work came thanks to his friend and collaborator Mario Gaviria, being the main impeller of the Spanish editions of his work. Currently, the work of Álvaro Sevilla (2011) and the Department of Urban Planning of the School of Architecture of Madrid (UPM) should be highlighted with the publication of a monographic issue dedicated to his work. In the same vein, the second issue of the journal *Hábitat y Sociedad: nueva cultura del territorio* edited by the University of Seville dedicated to the right to the city, in which some articles stand out, among others: *First elements for a genealogy of the right to the city: H. Lefebvre* (Rubio, 2011).

It is also important to highlight the recent commitment of the publisher *Captain Swing* translating and editing *The production of space* (Lefebvre, 2013) with a magnificent prologue by Ion Martínez Lorea and a great introduction and translation by Emilio Martínez Gutiérrez that update and contextualize the work in a brilliant and rigorous way. In the Latin American context, his ideas have spread widely, a proof of which was the forum *Henri Lefebvre e o retorno à dialéctica* (Hucitec, Sao Paulo, 1996), or the enormous influence of the notion of the right to the city in movements of the continent (Sugranyes, 2010); to such an extent that it became concrete in the *World Charter for the Right to the City* (UN, 2004). Finally, Andy Merrifield (2006, 2011, 2013, 2014) and Nathaniel Coleman (2015) complete this heterogeneous second wave of academic production that puts Henri Lefebvre as the key author to address any reflection on the contemporary city from a critical perspective.

In this text we will briefly review some of these authors who, in one way or another, are drawing new paths to understand and reopen the urban. Whether from a deeper understanding of the contradictions of capitalism (and its spatial translation) of what implies the conceptualization of planetary urbanization and the epistemological challenge it poses for an urban theory without an outside or from new lines of flight that open the field of *the possible* in the terrain of the urban.

### **3.2. The city in crisis**

The city is in crisis. The impressive speed and savage scale of the urbanization processes of the last hundred years has changed the world and changed ourselves, but the important question would be: has this contributed to diminishing the inequalities of the world? Since the 19<sup>th</sup> century these questions have been preoccupying thinkers such as Friedrich Engels (2009) who studied the consequences of the rapid urbanization process of an increasingly industrialized society, as well as its effects on workers' housing (Engels, 1935). Today these problems have a global dimension and their consequences are devastating, the big cities have become concentrations of wealth and privileges, and at the same time, generating exclusion, degradation, poverty and decisive impacts on ecosystems. Throughout history the birth of cities has been closely related to the concentration of surplus production and its control is usually reduced to a few. In general terms, this dynamic does not change in capitalism, but it plays a much more important role. Capitalism is based on the unlimited pursuit of profit, which requires producing a surplus. As David Harvey (2010) has shown, urbanization plays a fundamental role in the "absorption of the surplus product that capitalists continually produce in the pursuit of surplus value" (Harvey, 2013: 23). That is, capitalism produces surplus required by urbanization, but at the same time, it needs urbanization to absorb the overproduct it generates continuously.

This is a key to understand why capital accumulation has always been a deeply urban issue, with all the repercussions it has on our form of living. However, it is necessary to clarify that for Harvey the central question was whether "we should consider urbanism as a structure that can come from the economic base of society (or superstructural elements) through a transformation or should we consider urbanism as a different structure in interaction with other structures" (Harvey, 1973: 308). For Harvey, as for Castells (1974), Lefebvre was in the separatist position (falling into spatial fetishism) with what he was surpassing limits that spatial analysis should not surpass in its rigorous Marxist application (Elden, 2004: 142). It is not a minor problem, since within the rigidity of this structuralist logic did not fit the socio-spatial dialectic proposed by Lefebvre. What Lefebvre proposed, rather, was "a dialectically defined component of the relations of production, relations that are simultaneously social and spatial" (Benach and Albet, 2010: 84). Neither is it a coincidence that Lefebvre was expelled from the PCF and the influence of his ideas on the urban mitigated, which conditioned the following decades of Marxist space thinking, orphaned of imagination and openness. An opening that we really can see outside the field of urban studies of geographical studies in authors like Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt, that focusing on the production tell us that "the metropolis is for the multitude what the factory was for the industrial working class" (Negri & Hardt, 2011: 256). The metropolis in Negri and Hardt is "the urban environment that sustains its activity [that of the multitude] and the social environment that constitutes a deposit and a repertoire of skills in the field of affections, social relations, customs, desires, knowledge and cultural circuits" (Negri & Hardt, 2011: 255). With this, the authors show that the contemporary productive activities of the multitude (Negri and Hardt, 2005) overflow the walls of the factory and extend through the urban reality (metropolis), transforming them in a substantial way: life itself becomes part of the production. This overlaps the contradictions that the production of capital determines, now in the urban, with the multiplicity of cracks, openings and resistances proper to the complexity of *everyday life*. It is interesting because in a way it is what Lefebvre called urban society (Lefebvre, 1970b), in addition to opening to more complex interpretations of the subjects of emancipation or the question of time (of the times).

Returning to socio-spatial dialectics years later, the contributions of Edward Soja (1989, 1996, 2000) recover an interpretation of Lefebvre's work on the urban from a critical spatial perspective, his proposal for a postmodern geography (Soja, 1989) would be a way of "correcting the imbalance which

for more than a century had privileged time and history over space and geography" (Benach & Albet, 2010: 262). In *Thirdspace* (Soja, 1996) the author re-elaborates Lefebvre's space triad (Lefebvre, 1974) (perceived space, conceived space and lived space) as First Space, Second Space and Third Space. This last space, which gives name to the book, is the one that would include the other two and that would serve to lead to something "new". Soja, on the other hand, is harshly criticized by authors like Andy Merrifield, perhaps for taking somewhat rigid attitudes about the preeminence of space above all things, that is to say, what was known as "spatial turn". This makes it clear in *Taking the space personally*:

I put space first, before seeing things historically or socially, or as essentially political or economic or cultural, or modeled by class, race, gender, sexual preference; or views through discourse, linguistics, psychoanalysis, Marxism, feminism or any other specialized perspective. I try to see the world through all those fine lenses, but the primordial focus is insistently spatial; conditioned, motivated and inspired by a critical space perspective. (Soja, 2008).

In any case Soja brings new energies to urban studies that is still inspiring and source of interesting reflections. In his latest book "Seeking spatial justice" (Soja, 2010) he develops the idea of "spatial justice" that we will not analyze here, but if it is necessary to clarify that in its direct relation with the right to the city of Lefebvre (1968a) is shown with a limiting character, since it does not understand the right to the city as a specific field, with all that implies, but rather, as a collection of other rights to claim and that would have in the space its representation, Soja would say that there are "many forces that shape these unjust geographies, such as racism, religious fundamentalism and gender discrimination (...) systems of collective transportation, location of schools and hospitals" (Soja, 2010: 16).

For Lefebvre, the right to the city implies knowledge of social needs. However, there is no "perfect" list. Needs have a dual nature (both opposed and complementary). There are even needs that are not solved in the equipment (Lefebvre, 1968a: 123), nor in a clear way through the mechanisms that we know but must be invented.

It is not a rule but, in spite of everything, Lefebvre will not conceive the right to the city like that which understands the formulation of a constellation of positive contents relative to the satisfaction of certain demands. It refers to the creative activity as a right, accompanied by the rights to information, symbolism, play activities and appropriation of time. These rights are specified in the demand for qualified places, those that allow the simultaneity and the encounter. Probably counter-spaces with respect to the impure places described by Augé, that is, places of overcoming anonymity, inscribed in the contractual of non-places (Augé, 1993), which allow the emergence of social bond and creativity. In short, what it proposes and demands is not to improve what exists but its radical transformation (Rubio & España, 2016).

Throughout Lefebvre's work there is a kind of contagious, joyous, revolutionary energy, which floats through a rigorous and deeply learned writing. A learning of enormous value about everyday life is also distilled: despite the different forms of oppression and domination, the conflicting and contradictory character (complex) that characterizes the multiplicity of the urban is a potential for multiple and constant intervention of citizens. An intervention by re-appropriation of times and collective intervention of space, which mobilizes differences and puts the imagination at the center, as Lefebvre would say, "thanks to the potential energies of a variety of groups that use homogeneous space according to its purposes, space is theatricalized and dramatized. It is eroticized, surrendered to ambiguity, to the birth of needs and games" (Lefebvre, 1974: 450).

#### **4. The right to the city as an instituent practice**

How do we articulate the right to the city in the current context? This would be the question that we think is more interesting. Authors like Merrifield think that it is a concept that must be abandoned because it has already been captured by the logic of power, and using Lefebvre postulates: "If a concept does not fit, if it somehow does not work, Lefebvre insists on that in that case the concept should be abandoned, give it to the enemy. Perhaps this is what we must do with the right to the city" (Merrifield, 2011: 101). Merrifield understands that the challenge would be to look for other concepts such as the proposal of *politics of the encounter* (Merrifield, 2013) that comes from the theoretical corpus of Lefebvre.

However, we believe that the notion of *the right to the city* is still to be exploited, that is to say, the potential that resides in Lefebvrian thought and, in a way, condenses in *the right to the city*, it is worth giving it meaning and not abandoning it. The main challenge is to recover its original radicality and its power of openness, for once this unfolding, which is not easy due to the density of Lefebvrian thought, to connect it, through re-appropriation and updating, with the current forms of resistance and invention. This work is a medium-term task that unravels the intentions of this research, in which it is wanted, rather, to lay the foundations for subsequent concretions.

Lefebvre, in his commitment to think spatiality, in a disciplinary and ideological context where the instrumental was insufficient to understand the result of the dissolution of the city, led to the development of a theoretical perspective where space was the core, associating multiple properties: host of activities and interactions of social development, means of production and component of productive forces; object of consumption, political instrument and component of the class struggle. A long work, an "extraordinary journey" as it is called Soja, which will end with the return to everyday life through the thought of temporality (Lefebvre and Regulier, 1985, 1986).

It is considered precursor or antecedent of the organizations and movements that claim today this collective right (Sugranyes, 2010: 72). Such demands have been specified in positive content, whose main expression is the World Charter for the Right to the City (UN, 2004), a document with universalist aspirations. In addition, it is reflected in certain UNESCO proposals, in certain legal frameworks of diverse scope (constitutions, city statutes, charters of rights to the city, etc.) and undoubtedly floats in the atmosphere of the most recent social movements.

However, as we have explained before, Lefebvre went far beyond what many authors and social movements have interpreted, Lefebvre proposed a radicalization of democracy (an extended democracy) a critique of the practices of social participation and even of the idea of social participation itself, which implied both space and its control (a re-appropriation of both space and time) and the right to modify what exists, including collective creation. Therefore, what he proposed was not exactly any participation but intervention, which is not directly related to the formal democracy we know. Lefebvre did not explain its contents with sufficient amplitude, but its horizon is solved "on another scale, under other conditions, in another society" (Lefebvre, 1968a: 125).

The idea of citizen intervention implies a radical change in the logic, forms and usual programs of citizen participation. There are two ways to overcome its statement and avoid its concretion as a new catalog of rights. One is the identification of "what people do", that is, their practices and another, which can be described as a new institutionality, tending to the construction of alternatives. Normalized participation, involving a plurality of political representatives, citizens, trade unions, technical institutions, technical advisors, tries to be the base to reach agreements and consensus on projects already configured. It is hoped that, with certain modifications, such projects will eventually be accepted and endorsed. The capacity of this model to generate "imaginaries" has been so great that it is very difficult to criticize and overcome. (Rubio & España, 2016).

Citizens are generally left out of the big issues, and neither can they bring in or open up other areas for discussion and debate. This type of normalization of participation always places the representatives of citizens before a dissymmetric correlation of forces. The condition of fiction of the consensus that "surpasses" the particularities of the different interests present and their conflict is accentuated. Specifically, as has been said, "the intelligence of a system is not measured in the capacity to form a consensus but in the capacity to provoke the processing of differences through consensus fictions" (Innerness and Innerness, 1999: 236). Regulated participation frameworks (citizen participation regulations, public information periods, etc.), have the formal nature they have, and their theoretical support, have been characterized for decades to present these paths as almost transcendental forms for the intervention of citizens in territorial and urban affairs. Sometimes with rigorous and very complex approaches it is confirmed as the only possibility for the government-management and, on the contrary, do not assume the possibility of a democratic deepening. In a way, it seems that citizenship (society) is a "strange uncomfortable" qualified negatively (lazy, obtrusive, prone to self-organizing, confused) and understood as poorly qualified to give an opinion on big issues out of sheer technical disability.

Any concretion of the right to the city implies knowledge of social needs and, inevitably, the implementation of adequate research programs (co-research) that would not always coincide with the current ones, let alone those derived from the proliferation of observatories, indicators and reports of 'experts', which abound in useful but very limited tasks. The need to explore new experiences of co-research arises to understand, from autonomy, the multiple processes that occur in the field of urban social. What is imposed on us is a new task: to erect a world from/within the existing one. Of all this, for the urban, it follows an unwritten program and oppositions that we can speak concretely but that are not a program of slogans as a constellation of what must be done.

Resistance do not really appear and emancipatory struggles have so far failed to reverse the serious attacks on social rights and labor. Precarization advances, as an instrument of government and domination; but, at the same time, as an expression of the precarious condition, that is, as an agglutinator of new expressions of political subjectivation that can advance in an update/reinvention of the class struggle. Now, how do we construct mechanisms, strategies, processes that help increase the powers of the conflict against the logic of the neoliberal regime? Given this situation, Negri suggests institutional creation (*instituent power*) as a way, through the "great tactic":

The great tactic then means to submit the slogans of the class struggle to the revolutionary critique of mediation, of political generalization. We need to express, in tactic articulations, the first workers' and proletarian institutions of communist liberation. (Negri, 1980: 31)

As Sánchez Cedillo (2008: 228) explains, this happens in response to the entrenchment produced by the difficulty of imagining a "transition" outside the classical schemes. Faced with this problem, what transition do we imagine? What forms of institutionality can be operative? For Negri, it goes through new *institutional dimensions*, that is, new forms of deployment of invention and cooperative power. Instituent creation, as a tactic, opens the field of possibility to new ways of understanding contemporary antisystemic movements (Sánchez, 2008: 229). This idea connects with the trajectory of a series of re-appropriation practices that understand everyday life in a radically political, relational and creative way. Institutional practices such as squatted social centers, copyleft licenses, hacking cooperatives, militant research groups. How does this new tactic connect with the urban? The ability to express real counterpowers goes through the multiplication of coordinated disobediences, antagonistic simulacra and communicative guerrillas inserted in a chaotic but functional way in an instituent swarm: the *urban strike*. If Negri advanced that "the metropolis is for the multitude what the factory was for the industrial working class" (2011: 256), the urban strike goes through the total mobilization of the multiple production that unfolds in the urban, through a constellation of instituent practices. This collective enunciator, generator of new forms of doing (a new collective intelligence), capable of promoting new forms of subjectivation (deprecarización) and new rights.

The *right to the city* as an instituent practice would be one of these new forms of doing, a new constituent right. It would be inserted within this polyphonic tactic that tries to re-appropriate of a revolutionary attitude in a time in which the subversion does not seem possible. The elaboration of this hypothesis is in the process of being built, this has been the first step.

## 5. Conclusions

The main contribution of this research work is the revision of the concept of *right to the city*, recovering its original radicality within Lefebvrian thought, that of being a specific right and not a summation of other rights. At the same time explore ways of updating this right, within the contemporary urban social movements, with an instituent vocation.

## 6. References

- Arendt H (2009) La condición humana. Paidós, Barcelona
- Augé M (1993) Los "no lugares". Espacios del anonimato. Gedisa, Barcelona
- Benach N, Albet A (2010) Edward W. Soja. La perspectiva radical de un geógrafo radical. Icaria, Barcelona
- Busquet G, Garnier J (2011) Un pensamiento urbano todavía contemporáneo. Las vicisitudes de la herencia lefebvriana. Urban 2: 41-57
- Butler J (2011) Bodies in alliance and the politics of the street. Transversal 10/11. Available in: <http://transversal.at/transversal/1011/butler/en>. Accessed 20 noviembre 2016
- Brenner N (ed) (2014) Implosions/explosions. Towards a study of planetary urbanization. Jovis, Berlín
- Brenner N, Elden S (eds) (2009) State, space, world. Selected essays. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Cacciari M (2009) La ciudad. Gustavo Gili, Barcelona
- Castells M (1974). La cuestión urbana. Siglo XXI, México
- Coleman N (2015) Lefebvre for architects. Routledge, Nueva York
- Delgado M (2004) De la ciudad concebida a la ciudad practicada. Archipiélago 62: 7-11
- Delgado M (2011) El espacio público como ideología. Catarata, Madrid
- Elden S (2004) Understanding Henri Lefebvre. Theory and the possible. Continuum, Londres
- Engels F (1935) The housing question. International Publishers, Nueva York
- Engels F (2009) The condition of the working-class in England in 1844. Penguin Classics, Londres



- Foucault M (1966) *Les mots et les choses, une archéologie des sciences humaines*. Éditions Gallimard, Paris. Spanish edition: Foucault M (2006) *Las palabras y las cosas, una arqueología de las ciencias humanas*. Siglo XXI, Madrid
- Fukuyama F (1992) *El fin de la historia y el último hombre*. Planeta, Barcelona
- Harvey, D. (1973). *Social justice and the city*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press
- Harvey D (1985) *The urbanization of capital. Studies in the history and theory of capitalist urbanization*. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore
- Harvey, D (2001) *Spaces of capital. Towards a critical geography*. Routledge, Nueva York
- Harvey D (2007) *Espacios del capital. Hacia una geografía crítica*. Akal, Madrid
- Harvey D (2013) *Ciudades rebeldes. Del derecho a la ciudad a la revolución urbana*. Akal, Madrid
- Hess R (1988) *Henri Lefebvre et l'aventure du siècle*. Métailie, París
- Innenarity C, Innenarity D (1999) *La transformación de la política para gobernar una sociedad compleja*. *Revista de Estudios Políticos* 106: 231-255
- Lefebvre H (1968a) *Le droit á la ville*. Anthropos, París. Spanish edition: Lefebvre H (1969) *El derecho a la ciudad*. Ediciones Península, Barcelona
- Lefebvre H (1970a) *Du rural á l'urbaine*. Anthropos, Paris. Spanish edition: Lefebvre H (1975) *De lo rural a lo urbano* Ediciones Península, Barcelona
- Lefebvre H (1970b) *La révolution urbaine*. Gallimard, Paris. Spanish edition: Lefebvre H (1972) *La revolución urbana*. Alianza Editorial, Madrid
- Lefebvre H (1972) *Espacio y política*. Península, Barcelona
- Lefebvre H (1974) *La production de l'espace*. Anthropos, Paris. Spanish edition: Lefebvre H (2013) *La producción del espacio*. Capitán Swing, Madrid
- Lefebvre H, Regulier C (1985) *Elements de rythmanalyse*. *Communications* 41: 191-199.
- Lefebvre H, Regulier C (1986) *Essai de rythmanalyse des villes méditerranéennes*. *Peuples Méditerranéens* 37
- Martínez-Lorea I (2013) *Introducción*. In: Lefebvre H (2013) *La producción del espacio*. Capitan Swing, Madrid
- Merrifield A (2006) *Henri Lefebvre. A critical introduction*. Routledge, Londres
- Merrifield A (2011) *El derecho a la ciudad y más allá: notas sobre una reconceptualización lefebvriana*. *Urban* 2: 101-109
- Merrifield A (2013) *The politics of the encounter: urban theory and protest under planetary urbanization*. University of Georgia Press, Athens
- Merrifield A (2014) *The new urban question*. Pluto Press, Londres
- Negri A, Hardt M (2005) *Multitud*. Debolsillo, Madrid
- Negri A, Hardt M (2011) *Commonwealth. El proyecto de una revolución del común*. Akal, Madrid
- ONU (2004) *Carta Mundial por el Derecho a la Ciudad*.
- Raunig G (2006) *Prácticas instituyentes*. *Fugarse, instituir, transformar*. *Transversal* 01/06. Available in: <http://transversal.at/transversal/0106/raunig/es>. Accessed 5 noviembre 2016
- Raunig G (2007) *Prácticas instituyentes, nº2. La crítica institucional, el poder constituyente y el largo aliento del proceso instituyente*. *Transversal* 05/07. Disponible en: <http://transversal.at/transversal/0507/raunig/es>. Accessed 5 noviembre 2016
- Rubio A (2011) *Primeros elementos para una genealogía del derecho a la ciudad: H. Lefebvre*. *Hábitat y Sociedad* 2: 89-107.
- Rubio A, España E (2016) *Reabrir la cuestión urbana. El derecho a la ciudad como emergencia*. In *Working Paper Series CONTESTED\_CITIES*, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Sánchez Cedillo R (2008) *Hacia nuevas creaciones políticas. Movimiento, instituciones, nueva militancia*. In *Transform* (eds) *Producción cultural y prácticas instituyentes* (pp. 217-241). *Traficantes de sueños*, Madrid
- Sassen S (1991) *The global city*. Princenton University, New York

Schmid C (2005) Stadt, raum and gesellschaft. Henri Lefebvre und die theorie der produktion des reumes. Steiner, Stuttgart

Sevilla Buitrago A (2015) Espacialidades indignadas: la producción del espacio público en la #spanishrevolution. ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies 14(1): 90-103

Soya E (1989) Postmodern geographies. The reassertation os space in critical social theory. Verso, Londres

Soya E (1996) Thirdspace. Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagened places. Blackwell, Oxford

Soya E (2000) Postmetropolis. Critical studies of cities and regions. Blackwell, Los Ángeles. Spanish edition: Soja E (2008) Postmetrópolis. Estudios críticos sobre las ciudades y las regiones. Traficantes de sueños, Madrid

Soja (2008) Taking space personally. En Warf B, Arias S (eds.) The spatial turn: interdisciplinary perpectives (pp. 11-35). Routledge, Nueva York

Soja (2010) Seeking spatial justice. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis. Edición castellana: Soja E (2014) In busca de la justicia espacial. Tirant Humanidades, Valencia

Stanek L (2011) Henri Lefebvre on space. Architecture, urban research and the production of theory. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis

Sugranyes A (2010) El derecho a la ciudad. Praxis de la utopia. Hábitat y Sociedad 1: 71-79