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Abstract
Economic recession, conditions of restricted spending and austerity politics have led architects to seek ways of expanding architecture and to a mainstreaming of ‘small’ architectures, small-scale designs and short-term interventions, many of which focus on contesting and remaking public space. Mass mobilizations of the past years, especially the protests of the so-called Arab spring, pose new opportunities for the field. This essay first frames the six case-based articles, included in this special issue, within the literature on the politics of public space and protest. It groups the case studies around two main categories of analysis: the transformative effect of mass protests on formal public spaces (walking) and the agency of protest occupations (camping). Second, the essay identifies a lack in literature of the role (or lack thereof) played by designers in contemporary mass mobilizations in the Islamic world. It further seeks to respond to that question by providing an overview of various approaches to social engagement in architectural research and practice, under the broad categories of ‘humanitarian design’ and ‘activism by design’ with an attention to the historical specificity of the Islamic world, the examples from which tend to be of the first, humanitarian, type.
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Economic recession has led to much questioning in architectural research and practice. Architects are seeking ways to theorize appropriate responses to conditions of restricted spending and austerity politics. The recession has been paralleled with a mainstreaming of alternative critical practices, many of which focus on contesting and remaking public space. An important implication for architecture is the blurring of the boundary between design activity and activism. From ‘guerrilla’ to ‘tactical’ to ‘do-it-yourself’
(DIY), alternative urbanisms currently celebrate the agency of the individual or small groups to make modest changes to public space without the need for extensive investments or new infrastructure. Such calls to claim public space in small ways conveniently align with the contemporary emphasis on the neo-liberal subject’s individual agency and capability – as governments willingly ‘outsource’ their responsibilities onto uncompensated citizens. But what happens when ordinary people demand not just modest but copious and radical changes?

**Face and Space**

Throughout 2011, the ‘Arab spring’, Indignati and the Occupy movements have provided inspiring images of revolutionaries voluntarily coming together to demand changes from their governments – leading *Time* magazine to declare ‘The Protestor’ (an unidentified figure appropriate for a leaderless movement) to be the 2011 ‘Person of the Year’. In 2012, anti-austerity protests swept through Europe. Dismayed by top-down governance structures, auto-censorship of the mass media, social and economic injustice intensified by neo-liberal policies and, at times, the inefficiency of representational politics, ordinary people have claimed their rights as citizens. In the process, they have activated streets and squares, turning them into political ‘space[s] of appearance’, ‘where [the individual] appears to others as others appear to [her]’. This has, in turn, led to increased interest in the use and potential of public space in both architectural research and practice.
Figure 2: Puerto del Sol in Madrid.

Figure 3: Zuccotti Park in New York.
Public space has always been central to architectural concerns, but mobilizations in 2011 suspended laments over its demise. Remarkable instead was the rise to prominence of particular public spaces – Tahrir (Liberation) Square in Cairo, Puerto del Sol in Madrid and Zuccotti Park in New York becoming household names — leading media theorist W. J. T. Mitchell to suggest, ‘The iconic moments, the images that promise to become monuments, of the global revolution of 2011 are not those of face but of space […]’. Protest appropriates public space temporally and transforms its image, and use, permanently. What kind of role is there in this process, if any, for design professionals? Should they create spaces and structures that can facilitate public protests? Should they devise methods of making public space less exclusive? Or should they tackle the broader problematic of spatial injustice? These are questions hovering over us following the intense speculation the mobilizations of 2011 have garnered in the field of architecture. How do, and can, architects ‘occupy’?

Social Media and Physical Space

Since the ‘Arab spring’, commentaries and research on protest movements from outside the architectural field have initially emphasized the use of social media. The ‘spring’ seemed to spring from nowhere. In the case of Egypt, before the ‘revolution’, international and local news media supportive of President Hosni Mubarak (r. 1981–2011) celebrated the country’s economic growth. Yet protests by poor people for basic resources such as water, or against government-led mass evictions, were not unknown. Therefore, when the revolution ‘erupted’, as it were, it was convenient to tie it to social media – an association that simultaneously celebrated western prowess in creating technologies supposedly relevant to democracy. However, detailed analysis of reports perpetuating such views, and the different paths the ‘Arab spring’ has taken (e.g. bloody street fights in Tunis, Egypt and Yemen; civil wars in Libya and Syria) complicate the narrative of a social-media revolution, and emphasize instead the importance of face-to-face contact enabled by mass demonstrations and especially by encampments. They have also highlighted actually existing ‘differentiated citizenships’ based on class, ethnicity, religion and gender. For example, while participating in protests for democratic change, women were subjected to various forms of sexual harassment and violence by both civilians and police or military forces.

The powers of social media were tested early in 2011 in Syria when activists called for a ‘Day of Rage’ but the call failed to attract protestors in numbers comparable to other Arab countries. In fact, the Syrian government used social media to crack down on protestors and to stifle protest. Archaeological and architectural sites of great historic and cultural value have become causalities in the war that has since erupted. Social media has once again been enlisted – e.g. a Facebook group, ‘Le patrimoine archéologique syrien en danger’ (LPASED) – to raise awareness but with limited impact thus far. The mobilizations of the past year have shown that the use of public spaces goes hand in hand with varied uses of media. Thus, technology acts not only as ‘extensions of man’ but also of public space. Furthermore, technology may generate new forms of repression that reshape the use of public space. The uneven geopolitics of privilege inevitably also shape perceptions.
and portrayals of protest events in different regional, religious and cultural contexts. For instance, alluding to hygiene and safety, police and municipal authorities evicted the movement known as #Occupy Wall Street (OWS) from the public spaces of various US cities. In contrast, political protests in non-western countries were portrayed as synonymous with the emergence of more democratic societies. And, in celebrating western media and technology, most western leaders and analysts treated the movements and protests in the Middle East as a novelty, playing down earlier histories of popular protest.

Mimicry

A third aspect of recent mass protests has been, as several scholars have pointed out, the ‘infectious mimicry’ or the ‘contagion’ between the ‘Arab spring’ and the OWS. Protests for the right to housing in Israel, perhaps the most unexpected of all places since the country is run by a seemingly successful neo-liberal regime, that erupted on July 14, 2011 were also mimicking the ‘Arab spring’: Yael Allweil explains, ‘Israeli protesters representing a broad social spectrum poured into the streets, declaring “Egypt is here”’. Foreshadowed by Iran’s Green Movement of 2009, and preceded by protests in Tunisia, Egypt’s protests captured the international imagination in a special way, arguably because of their symbolic centring on the occupation of Tahrir Square (beginning on January 25), and later became an inspiration for OWS in New York’s Zuccotti Park (beginning on September 17). Central to this ‘contagion’ was the tactic of occupation, and the utilization of tents in central public spaces. It was as if the encampment in Cairo’s Tahrir Square toppled President Mubarak.

Le patrimoine archéologique syrien en danger (LPASED).

Figure 4: Website of a Facebook group to raise awareness of the destruction of archaeological heritage in Syria during its internal war.
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There were, of course, some fundamental differences between Tahrir Square and Zuccotti Park. To mention but a few: while the occupation of Tahrir Square was unified by a single demand, the resignation of the Egyptian President, what seemed to unify OWS occupiers was a critique of corporations rather than government; OWS chose to present a multiplicity of demands rather than a single one; while Tahrir Square was just one part of the violent struggle going on in other parts of the city, including the Square’s edges, OWS was a peaceful demonstration. Nevertheless, the dialogue across recent social movements invites reflections about why, when and how activists turn to protest and occupation, and how ordinary citizens turn into activists; and, in particular, why encampment evokes compassion and empathy across borders.

**Politics of Public Space and Manifest Protest**

When people amass on the street, one implication seems clear: They are still here and still there; they persist; they assemble, and so manifest the understanding that their situation is shared, and even when they are not speaking or do not present a set of negotiable demands, the call for justice is being enacted. The bodies assembled say ‘we are not disposable’, whether or not they are using words at the moment. What they say, as it were, is that ‘we are still here, persisting, demanding greater justice, a release from precarity, a possibility of a livable life’.  

Public space is commonly seen within architecture and urban studies literature as the basis of political representation and democratization. One strand of this theme is to associate public space with publicity: for example, by occupying physical public space the homeless can create a space for representation in which to make political claims. Another view, however, argues that public and private spaces do not exist as such – privacy and publicity are power relationships that exist as part of all spaces. Representation in public space thus does not necessarily equate to empowerment: e.g. the homeless may be further marginalized due to struggles over public space. Access to power on one’s own terms requires both the power of exclusion (privacy) and the power of access (publicity). Accordingly, with the catchy slogan ‘We are the 99%’, OWS participants highlighted that their protest was not about marginality but, on the contrary, concerned the centrality of structural economic inequality that unites the well-to-do college student with the actually homeless. By turning a public space into a set of private spaces, and devising the now famous technique of the ‘human mike’ (because they were prohibited from using amplifiers and microphones), they asserted their power to exclude as well as to access, transforming hegemonic discourse on poverty irrevocably.

The ideal of the Greek agora as a physical space where strangers can meet and interact in the city centre underlies various contemporary theorizations of public space, despite recognition of its historical limitations (i.e. the exclusion of women, slaves and other marginalized groups). This somewhat Eurocentric model does not apply too neatly to the Islamic world, where the political function of the agora was arguably substituted by that of the mosque, that is, until the beginning of the colonial era when colonizing Europeans, as well as Ottomans competing with them for legitimacy, implemented numerous urban modernization projects, inserting new modern settlements, wide avenues and squares with statues. In an age of secularization, public squares
became important arenas for staging independence movements and later for commemorating them. As architectural historian Nasser Rabbat points out, the ‘Arab spring’ was unique in the sense that both the pre-modern public space of the mosque, and the modern one of the square, worked together. Instead of city squares, there were mosques that enabled strangers to meet and to spill out to the streets and other formal public spaces. He explains, ‘[The mosque and public square] functioned in tandem despite the decades of mistrust between the religious movements, which saw the mosque as their sanctuary, and the populist, generally Left-leaning political movements, which recalled the days when the public squares were their favorite arena.’

While drawing from theories on the politics of public space developed from case studies in western cities, it is important to bear in mind the cultural and historical specificity of Islamic contexts.

Anthropologist Setha Low reminds us that public protest takes on many forms and it is not limited to mass demonstrations or occupations: ‘Public space is often about public protest but the form of that protest is not always the same.’ She identifies three kinds of protest: manifest, latent and ritual. Manifest protest takes the form of demonstrations and gatherings to express discontent and opposition. It also includes ongoing forms of spatial appropriation, such as by the homeless. The articles in this issue deal mainly with manifest protest as defined by Low. However, other categories of protest are also useful to study public space (e.g., Chandra discusses insubordination), and may be further explored in subsequent issues. Latent protest involves the ongoing debate on the use of public space. And ritual protest involves the occasional occupation of public space by a ‘popular fiesta or [carnivalesque] parade’, with no change to it in its aftermath.

Mass Demonstration

Through use, a conventionally designed public space, such as a public park, pedestrian shopping district or a monumental plaza may become, in Henri Lefebvre’s terminology, socially produced space; that is, it may become a representational (lived) space. For Lefevbre, space was not a passive container but a social product. In his search to formulate a critique of Enlightenment rationality and its dualism within geography, Lefebvre opposed ideal (abstract) space as conceived by planners and governments to material (indifferent) space as an inert, passive, measurable entity/container. As a way to resolve the conflict, he proposed ‘lived space’, the space of human experiences, sense-making, imagination and feeling, as a binding concept. Lefebvre’s conceptual triad of space is useful for thinking through the appropriation of formal public squares, implemented in many cases to project the power of regimes.

Mass demonstration can be in support of or against a regime or a dominant practice. Some of the most famous recent examples of manifest protest have taken place in Tiananmen Square in Beijing and Plaza de Mayo in Buenos Aires. The spatial forms of gathering impact upon the success of a demonstration. Numbers and location may not matter as much as visibility, and organizers tend to plan the use of space and type of performance for utmost visibility. While the Tiananmen Square protests of 1989 were mass demonstrations for democratic reforms, the protest of the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo involved a relatively smaller number of individuals, grieving mothers who initially met while looking for their missing children under the
Ipek Türeli

military regime and came together regularly every Thursday afternoon starting in 1977. Architect-geographer Tali Hatuka explains of the Mothers,

Despite the ban on protests by the dictatorship, they march in circles, two women at a time, revealing how an innovative act emerges out of both the space’s design (the paved circle around the central monument) and the legal limitations on protesting against the regime.30

The design of public space can be generative of the performative forms employed for protest.

Ahmed Z. Khan’s article in this issue discusses how conceived public spaces in Karachi, Lahore and Islamabad were transformed into representational spaces via mass demonstrations called the ‘long marches’. Once a formal public space is appropriated for manifest protest, it is typical of governments to redesign that space to prevent such events from happening again. Subdividing, fencing off and closing a public space indeterminately for infrastructural or beautification ‘projects’ emerge as some of the common spatial strategies. Certain cases, e.g. People’s Park in Berkeley, California, however, reverse this process, and the design – of an otherwise empty lot, appropriated by the homeless and activists as a ‘park’ for unstructured activity – seeks to transform ‘public space’ into an ‘outdoor space’ with structured activity – such as volleyball courts for university students with the expected impact of pushing out the homeless.31 Kishwar Habib and Bruno De Meulder’s discussion of the Bangladesh Central Language Martyrs’ Memorial monument shows such a process whereby formal design of the square and the monument located within it followed initial protests by university students who demanded the right to use their native language. The design was commissioned by the postcolonial provincial government and realized after the separation of East Pakistan (Bengal) from (West) Pakistan. In this case, since the original event was connected to nation-building, the design bolstered the plaza’s civic aspect, enabling mass demonstrations and protests in subsequent years.

Mass demonstrations are fundamentally different from acts of occupation in terms of their effect but the two forms are usually employed complementarily. The power of walking is demonstrated foremost by military marches and parades, in what Hatuka calls ‘acoustic power displays’, where the unison of steps signals discipline and support for central command.32 Participants in mass demonstrations also use walking to draw attention to grievances they are otherwise unable to correct, but rarely do their steps mimic that of the rigidity of a military march. What moves such crowds then? What keeps them walking? In the early days of the protest in Egypt (six days into it to be precise), Arabic literature scholar Elliot Colla pointed to a long history of revolts in Egypt, and argued for ‘poetry’ as a binding agent:

The slogans the protesters are chanting are couplets – and they are as loud as they are sharp. The diwan of this revolt began to be written as soon as Ben Ali fled Tunis, in pithy lines like ‘Yâ Mubârak! Yâ Mubârak! Is-Sa’ūdiyya fi-ntizârak!’ (‘Mubarak, O Mubarak, Saudi Arabia awaits!’). In the streets themselves, there are scores of other verses, ranging from the caustic ‘Shurtat Masr, yâ shurtat Masr, intû ba’aytû kilâb al-‘asr’ (‘Egypt’s Police, Egypt’s Police, You’ve become nothing but Palace dogs’), to the defiant ‘Idrab, idrab yâ Habîb, mahma tadrab mish hansîb!’ (Hit us, beat us, O Habib [al-Adly, now former Minister of the Interior],
hit all you want – we’re not going to leave!). This last couplet is particularly clever, since it plays on the old Egyptian colloquial saying, ‘Darb al-habib zayy akl al-zabib’ (‘The beloved’s fist is as sweet as raisins’). This poetry is not an ornament to the uprising – it is its soundtrack and also composes a significant part of the action itself.\textsuperscript{33}

In other contexts of demonstration, music and simple noise can be utilized to disrupt and challenge authority. Such links between acoustic territorialization and public protest have been drawn mainly by musicologists or historians.\textsuperscript{34} Soundscape, or ‘aural architecture’, is essential to the embodied experience of individuals acting as crowds in public spaces, and to the methods deployed to communicate their grievances. Understanding more fully the role of embodied experience in crowd formation will require analytical attention to both physical and phenomenological aspects. In Iran, Reza Masoudi Nejad explains, dissidents once banned from public spaces by heavy-handed government crackdowns following the massive post-election protests of 2009, took to rooftop chanting. Chants play a role in the continuity of the protest as they sustain it during actual manifestations yet also endure even when the protest itself has ended.\textsuperscript{35}

Protest Encampment

If the mass protest walk takes its power partially from movement, sound and, borrowing from Siegfried Kracauer, its ‘mass ornament’, the aesthetics of the protest encampment, with its insistence on remaining in place, and occasional performance of normative rituals of habitation, may seem to belong to a different orbit.\textsuperscript{36} Yet both express a desire for the individual participant to be part of a public culture without standing out and apart. Both have military associations, and both insinuate a sense of ‘militancy’ (avant-gardism) that the activist craves.

The word ‘camp’ derives from the sixteenth-century French champ (and even earlier usage appears in Italian as campo, and in Latin as campus), meaning a level ground suitable for athletic or military drills.\textsuperscript{37} Over time, camp came to refer to a state of containment and separation, a stark contrast to the cosmopolitan ideal of the city. Yet, along with the gated enclave and squatter settlement, it was also typical of the fragmentation of the contemporary urban condition.\textsuperscript{38} The recent decade has witnessed a proliferation of ‘camp literature’ in architecture, ranging from studies of municipal auto camps to summer camps, to internment and refugee camps, and ultimately to protest camps.\textsuperscript{39} Especially pertinent for this analytic approach has been Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben’s theorization of the camp as the biopolitical paradigm of the times,\textsuperscript{40} and Michael Foucault’s ‘heterotopias’: ‘[spaces] reserved for individuals who are, in relation to society and to the human environment in which they live, in a state of crisis’.\textsuperscript{41} In its variants, from post-disaster, internment to refugee camp, the camp is a space where a state of emergency – hence, of exception and suspended law – is the rule.

Efforts to re-design camps to empower residents have become a popular concern within humanitarian architectural design – as exemplified by the popularity of Shigeru Ban’s paper-tube shelters for post-disaster camps [Figure 5] – now finding a place in architectural education, particularly in studio work.\textsuperscript{42} The irony, of course, is that while designing for camps is seen as an exercise in temporary architecture, in many instances camps actually
turn into protracted multigenerational camps and as such become permanent, urbanized settlements. Policy-makers or designers in search of better temporary-shelter solutions may assume the camp is an efficient way to distribute aid to refugees, but in practice and in the long term it is primarily a means for a host city or state to contain and control refugees. In turn, refugees may refuse to cooperatively abandon the camp under the terms of the host society. In her discussion of the sixteenth-century Purana Qila (Old Fort) – an archaeological site that was used first as a campsite for Muslim refugees during the partition of India in 1947, and then by Hindu and Sikh refugees in the aftermath of the partition and even extending through to 1963 – Aditi Chandra argues that, in their insistence to remain, the refugees defied local authorities and, more broadly, the policies of the host state. This essay, like other recent architectural research devoted to the refugee camp, challenges Agamben’s description of the body of the refugee as reduced to ‘bare life’ and seeks instead to show how refugees have agency and can exert this in the shaping of built environments.43

Shigeru Ban Architects.

Figure 5: Shigeru Ban’s paper-tube shelters for earthquake victims, Turkey.

Protest (or peace) camps are a special breed of camps that, in addition to being an important form of peaceful political action, particularly suit the rising international networks of resistance by providing spaces of accommodation. Bülent Batuman (who provides a brief history of protest camps) points out that just as camps provide accommodation, they point to a condition of ‘homelessness’ or not being at home. The global media attention to the encampment of Tahrir Square has to be understood in the context of this legacy. Quickly dubbed a ‘tent city’, the encampment provided the occupiers with a temporary library, stages for artists and musicians to entertain the protestors, a kindergarten, restrooms, clinics and other facilities to aid the daily workings of their temporal community.44 At times, such camps may be intent on expressing opposition; at others, they may be focused on resisting eviction. Perhaps more important than their appeal, however,
is the transformative effect of the camps on their very own occupiers. By performing as a mini-city, participants can create opportunities to talk amongst themselves, to get to know each other and formulate positions that they can then circulate as interpretations oppositional to mainstream public opinion. While mass demonstrations alter the memory of the urban spaces in which they take place, protest tent encampments create temporary built environments that present a peaceful, perhaps utopian, form of collective political action.

Figure 6: At the Tenth Venice Biennale (2006), the French Pavilion responded to the biennale theme of Meta-city by creating ‘Métavilla’ which was designed for occupation by visitors and architects.

How Do, and Can, Architects ‘Occupy’?

Social movements and participatory artistic practices are increasingly sharing aesthetic techniques (of street protest as performance, of tents, of occupation, for instance) – blurring boundaries and supporting each other at certain times and diluting messages at others. The protests of 2011 have now bolstered a long-existing fascination in architecture with temporary and mobile structures. The occupations of public squares, such as Zuccotti Park in New York in 2011, prompted architects and new collaborative enterprises to devise architectural solutions for temporary use and to speculate on how they could contribute.

This corresponds with a resurgence of interest in DIY tactics as a form of designer activism in support of urban protest. At the same time, it is becoming increasingly clear that designer activism is fuelled by larger economic and institutional transformations that are also changing the field of architecture, its research and practice, in significant ways. Two main strands of practice can be identified with their own historical legacies: first, humanitarian design that seeks to advance the living conditions of the less-well-to-do; second, explorations into expanding the architects’ societal
123 Occupy, members including Greta Hansen, Kyung-Jae Kim, Andy Rauchut and Adam Koogler.

Figure 7: 123 Occupy was formed in response to OWS. One of the group’s outputs is a ‘DIY Manual for Occupiers’.

relevance that have led to the utilization of architecture as a form of cultural critique and political practice.

Visual manifestos for ‘small’ architectures, small-scale designs and short-term interventions have proliferated in recent years [Figure 8]. The exhibitions

Figure 8: The issue ‘Building for Social Change’ is an example of the ‘mainstreaming’ of social engagement.
‘Actions: What You Can Do With the City’ (Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA), 2009), ‘Small Scale, Big Change: New Architectures of Social Engagement’ (Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), 2010) [Figure 9], and ‘Design with the Other 90% Cities’ (Cooper Hewitt, National Design Museum, 2011), among others, have advocated small-scale design interventions that could dramatically transform the lives of disadvantaged people, whether in the global north or south. What these exhibitions share is recognition of a major shift in architectural culture in the past decade, paralleling the drift of the global economy. From thinking ‘big’ during the mid-1990s economic boom, we have arrived at designing ‘small’ during a time of recession. Paradigmatically, the New York Times architecture critic Nicolai Ouroussoff claimed in his article of October 14, 2010 introducing the MoMA exhibition, ‘Architecture is rediscovering its social conscience.’ What is the ‘social’ in socially engaged architecture? Largely, it is construed as addressing the needs of the poor and the disadvantaged.

The institutionalization and convergence of humanitarian and activist agendas within architecture is perhaps best illustrated by the 2012 Venice Architecture Biennial, tellingly titled ‘Common Ground’. At the event, the US pavilion garnered a special mention. It was based on the theme ‘Spontaneous Interventions: Design Actions for the Common Good’, and collected projects, received after an open call, such as ‘community farms, guerrilla bike lanes to urban repair squads, outdoor living rooms to pop-up markets, sharing networks, and temporary architecture’. Also at the Biennial, the Golden Lion for Best National Participation was awarded to the Japanese pavilion, an effort led by Toyo Ito, based on research and design for a small community centre.
in an earthquake-struck area.\textsuperscript{52} And the Golden Lion for Best Project of the International Exhibition went to Torre David/Gran Horizonte by Urban-Think Tank. The common ground between these humanitarian and activist projects is a genuine professional search for social relevance.

Torre David documented how a half-finished bank tower in Caracas, Venezuela, was taken over by squatters in the aftermath of the collapse of the national economy and the building’s prolonged vacancy [Figure 10].\textsuperscript{53} The project exhibition took place in Venice’s Arsenale, in a space themed as a typical Venezuelan slum where visitors were invited to ‘participate’ by consuming items from the local cuisine [Figure 11].\textsuperscript{54} The architects declared that their goal was to appeal to fellow architects, ‘... to see in the informal settlements of the world a potential for innovation and experimentation’,\textsuperscript{55} echoing other contemporary and past projects such as Bernard Rudofsky’s 1964 landmark MoMA exhibition on vernacular architecture from around the world, titled ‘Architecture without Architects’.\textsuperscript{56}

The resurgence of humanitarian and activist agendas has corresponded with the rise of a range of academic, philanthropic and non-governmental organizations concerned with the built environment.\textsuperscript{57} Many of these new institutional frameworks are connected to the rise of neo-liberalism, the withdrawal of government support for social services and the rise of non-governmental organizations legitimized by corporate donors and governments. In the case of the OWS and how it has recently transformed the agenda of New York’s cultural institutions, such as the Storefront for Art and Architecture, with its exhibition ‘Strategies for Occupation’, architectural critic Mimi Zeiger points out that these institutions are ‘sponsoring discourse around the defining topic of the day’ with the undesirable potential of the ‘strategic co-option of tactical practice’.\textsuperscript{58} The nature of the institutional mechanisms supporting humanitarian and activist agendas in architecture deserves further inquiry, especially in the context of the Islamic world.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{family_home.jpg}
\caption{A family home from Torre David.}
\end{figure}
Humanitarian Design

Much of humanitarian design today deals with what can be considered ‘exceptions’, such displacements following environmental (hurricanes, earthquakes) and societal (wars, genocide) disasters or as a result of economic inequality (slums, foreclosures). The recent rebranding of social engagement as ‘humanitarian’ design emerges partially from the actions of Architecture for Humanity, established in 1999 as a collaboration between Cameron Sinclair and Kate Stohr, although we should not omit the importance of the earlier Habitat for Humanity (1976), a Christian non-profit that builds affordable housing with volunteer labour.

Humanitarian activity intended to provide architectural solutions to (mostly housing) crises has a long history. Such efforts were once under-categorized as the rubric of ‘charity’, and left to the concerns of religious organizations and reformers. Then the category of the ‘social’ entered the purview of architects when governments decided to step into the field of (social, public, council) housing at an unprecedented scale as a component of the nation-building process. In many Muslim-majority countries, whose boundaries were drawn up through international agreements, e.g. following the fall of the Ottoman Empire, or the independence of the Indian subcontinent from the British Empire, this also entailed resettlement and refugee housing. Later, as these countries started implementing programmes of economic modernization, problems of rural-to-urban migration and squatter settlements also emerged as pressing architectural and urbanistic problems. With economic globalization and neo-liberal restructuring, governments gradually withdrew from the provision of direct supply in the field of low-income housing.

Starting in the early 1970s, when it was understood that the direct supply of conventional housing would prove insufficient to meet the needs of rapidly urbanizing cities, governments in much of the ‘developing’ (including the Islamic) world collaborated with international agencies such as the World
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Bank to hire professionals to institute ‘self-help’ projects, first through ‘sites-and-services’ schemes and later through slum upgrading.61

Since the 1990s, however, as neo-liberal monetary policies have become firmly established, international agencies and governments have focused more on increasing the entire housing supply rather than targeting their efforts at improving the housing conditions of lower-income groups. Just as in other social-service realms, therefore, non-governmental organizations have stepped into the field of housing production for low-income groups, working with a new generation of architects. For example, Hashim Sarkis’s acclaimed project, Housing for the Fisherman of Tyre, an 84-unit complex which has been featured in many publications, including the above-mentioned MoMA exhibition and catalogue, was based on collaboration between a local organization, Al Baqaa Housing Cooperative, formed by the fishermen, and the Association for Development of Rural Areas in South Lebanon [Figure 12].

In the Islamic world, the Aga Khan Development Network, with its Award for Architecture (AKAA, established in 1977), has been tremendously influential in promoting humanitarian interventions to the built environment.62 The programme recognizes social responsibility as one of the criteria for nomination. Since the first cycle, which included an award to the (UNDP/World Bank-funded) Kampung Improvement Programme for Jakarta [Figure 13], the programme has recognized not only architects and buildings but also stakeholders. And it has had an immense impact internationally by publicizing innovative projects,63 even if it has at times created consternation and debate among local architects.64 Before AKAA arrived on the stage, it was Egyptian architect Hassan Fathy whose name and neo-traditional practice was associated with ‘architecture for the poor’ (the title of his renowned 1973 book) [Figure 14]. Although Fathy was later criticized for the negative reaction of poor communities to the projects he designed for

Figure 12: Hashim Sarkis’s acclaimed project, ‘Housing for the Fisherman of Tyre’.

Hashim Sarkis Studios.
Aga Khan Award for Architecture, Christopher Little.

*Figure 13: Kampung Improvement Programme for Jakarta.*


*Figure 14: Cover of Fathy's book.*
them, his legacy endured, at least in terms of architectural vocabulary, and some of his followers, such as Abdel Wahed El-Wakil, received the Award in subsequent years.65

Complementing government agencies and charitable non-governmental organizations’ efforts, universities have also contributed by encouraging their architecture students and faculty to engage with social issues. One strand has been the rise of community-based studios and the ‘advocacy planning approach’, which involves professionals who align themselves with poor communities in order to help them resist destructive top-down development.66 Comparable in Turkey was the involvement of design professionals in a limited number of ‘people’s committees’ that guided development in squatter settlements in the 1970s.67 Another example is the now well-established tradition of design-build studios, the most famous of which is the Rural Studio in Alabama.68 A relevant example from Turkey is the ‘Summer Practice’ programme of the Middle East Technical University’s Department of Architecture, which was launched in 1958 and lasted for a dozen years. The programme involved sending second-year architecture students to rural communities to construct small school buildings under the supervision of their teachers [Figure 15].69

Activism by Design

Much quoted in recent urban studies literature is that the world’s population is growing at an unprecedented rate, and becoming increasingly urbanized. There is rising awareness among architects and their educators that the figure of the architect – that is, the dominant model of the heroic architect, who designs new buildings, taught in architecture schools – is playing a limited role in this process. Responding to a perceived trivialization of architects vis-à-vis the production of the built environment, architects have tried to expand their areas of expertise and find new relevant and meaningful roles for themselves. One recent idea advanced by architect-educator Thomas Fisher is ‘public-interest architecture’, i.e. that architects may start
attending not only to wealthy, paying customers but also to the needs of the general public as do public health professionals. It seeks to establish new design-related opportunities for architects. Another older, more established avenue is to utilize architecture as a form of cultural critique and political practice, and in doing so to centre the architect as creative genius. The most famous examples of this search appeared in the 1960s, from radical utopian architectural groups such as Archigram (1961) in the United Kingdom, Archizoom (1966) and Superstudio (1966) in Italy; and the most enduring influence of all was that of the avant-garde group the Situationists (1952).

The Situationists were a group of European artists, under the leadership of Guy Debord, who met mainly in Paris, roughly from 1952 to 1972. Especially in the 1960s, they associated with Henri Lefebvre, who expanded Marx's theory of economic exploitation and alienation (of the worker from the products of his labour) to that of ‘everyday life’. Debord argued not only that people had become alienated from the goods they produced and consumed, but that they had also become alienated from their emotions and desires: ‘separation perfected’. People were thus passive spectators of their own lives, compartmentalized in front of a TV in their cubicle-like apartments – a ubiquitous feature of urban planning in post-war France. The Situationists sought to devise a set of revolutionary strategies – détournement, dérive, psychogeography, constructed situations and unitary urbanism – to reclaim and transform the physical environment as a basis for total revolution.

The DIY politics that emerged in the late 1980s and led to ‘guerilla actions’ bear a clearly Situationist legacy. A well-known example is Reclaiming the Streets (RTS), a one-day event in which a large crowd may take over a highway or an urban space typically under assault by cars or development proposals. They then plant trees, pour sand, etc. and make the ‘public space’ or ‘public’ infrastructure their own according to ideas of the carnivalesque and with an attitude of play. The effort can be conceived as an anti-artwork that challenges the status quo. It is anti-art in the sense that there is no identifiable author, nor is there a saleable artwork as an end-product.

Designer activists today build on citizen initiatives for insurgent public space and contribute projects of ‘guerilla urbanism’. ‘Park(ing) Day’ is the appropriation by one architectural group, REBAR, of this idea, involving the temporary takeover of a piece of public infrastructure, the parking space. However, as Peter Bishop and Lesley Williams have suggested, it is city authorities in Europe and North America, charged with the task of revitalization without necessary resources, who are ‘[experimenting] with looser planning visions and design frameworks, linked to phased packages of smaller, often temporary initiatives, designed to unlock the potential of sites now, rather than in 10 year’s time’. Paris-Plages or the pedestrianization of New York’s Times Square are contemporary examples of public–private partnerships that enable temporal events, but which are devoid of transformative potential, and are used merely to encourage tourists to spend more time and money, increase sales and market the city.

The Situationist programme of appropriation and disruption, like that of most avant-garde groups, has been assimilated into various modes of artistic production, and even turned into place marketing and branding strategies in
Rebar Group.

*Figure 16: Rebar’s Park(ing) Day.*

Choblet & Associates.

*Figure 17: Paris-Plages.*
the consumer city. Thus, it may seem as if we have come full circle: instead of designer activism challenging the status quo, the free or near-free labour of the architect-artist is used to generate capital. Yet, each case is unique to itself. The détournement of publicly owned space – the car park or any other piece of public infrastructure – does not in itself carry political meaning. What matters is not the act, but who performs it, in whose name, and what impact and implication it has.

Ultimately, commodification in examples like Paris-Plages or the pedestrian-mallization of Times Square, do not necessarily negate the value of Park(ing) Day as a citizen-designer initiative that can remain outside economic transactions.

What is charted here is a long history of efforts to ‘expand’ architecture, to make it societally relevant rather than an elite profession marginalized by the realities and pressures of a behemoth real-estate and construction industry. Out of the two strands discussed, examples from the Islamic world belong mostly to that of humanitarian design. Though there is certainly no lack of politicization among architects of the Islamic world – we can point to architects in Turkey aligned with labour unions in mass demonstrations in the 1970s [Figure 19] – it is difficult to provide examples that use architecture as a form of cultural critique in the manner of avant-garde groups in Europe except within the domain of international art events [Figures 20 and 21]. A democratic realm is the necessary precondition of cultural critique, and the engagement of architecture as an intellectual pursuit, rather than merely a technical profession of problem solving. While it is difficult to predict the outcomes of the social movements of the past few years in the Islamic world, the way they have activated public spaces and the public sphere present a potential world of new opportunities for architects.

Figure 20: The installation consists of a basic apartment installed at the intersection of İstiklal and Yeniçaşı Avenues, with rooms separated from each other, parts of which could be entered and used by visitors during exhibition hours.
‘Small’ Architectures


Figure 21: The installation turns a public square into a soccer field by painting lines on the ground and placing two goals, while keeping pre-existing features.

‘Spatial Justice’

Much of activist practice is intellectually grounded in the theoretical revival of ideas concerning space and ‘the right to the city’ articulated by Lefebvre who predicted an ‘urban revolution’ – also the title of one of his seminal books. Following Lefebvre, neo-Marxist urban geographers have since argued for the ‘urban’ as the locus of political mobilization. In the 2000s, the idea of the ‘right to the city’ underwent a popular revival, due to urban social movements and struggles over shaping features of daily life – cited among important new formations in the United States is the National Right to the City Alliance. Both David Harvey and Edward Soja dream of different oppositional movements coming together, in Harvey’s words, ‘coalescing around the slogan of the right to the city’ to demand ‘greater democratic control over the production and use of the surplus’ and ‘democratic control over the deployment of the surpluses through urbanization’. According to Harvey, ‘[t]o claim the right to the city […] is to claim some kind of shaping power over the process of urbanization […]’. Harvey explains in great detail how capital urbanizes, and suggests understanding the urbanization of capital as the first step for any meaningful action for social change: ‘To understand how we can share that shaping power, we need to understand how cities are made and remade.’ There are two recurrent themes in his writing: capitalism produces surplus products that urbanization requires; and, capitalism needs urbanization to absorb the surplus products it perpetually produces. Thus, he regards the built environment as the key to the workings of capital in his discussion of the political process and citizenship rights.

Edward Soja and other urban geographers are putting forth a challenge for architects to do more than produce ‘small’ architectures, to instead contribute to ‘spatial justice’, at the very basic level, by simply making the larger public aware of it. Spatial justice links social justice to space. In the past decade or so, pioneering works by Henri Lefebvre (1968) and David Harvey (Social Justice and the City (1973) have been revived by a new generation of theoretical explorations in political science, geography and planning. These have led, for
instance, to recognition that space is not simply a container for politics, and to a reconceptualization of citizenship in relation not to the nation but to the city, with an emphasis on its spatial dimension. Both justice and injustice can be spatially produced, or may become visible in space. Injustice, however, is usually invisible. It is here, by making the invisibles of injustice visible, that architects and designers can most effectively connect to larger movements for social change. They can potentially ‘amplify’ for visibility those missing aspects, in a capital-focused account, about how the built environment’s organization and design perpetuates social injustice; in other words, they can re-centre public debate on the agency of the built environment in social justice.

**Conclusion**

The two avenues that architects have adopted in order to expand their field, or what I have referred to as ‘Humanitarian Design’ and ‘Activism by Design’ focus respectively on (the right to) housing and (the right to) public space. But in recent years, a certain convergence between these two categories can also be observed in relationship to the rise of new institutional frameworks (e.g. NGOs, cultural institutions with a new-found commitment to ‘public-interest’ design), economic policies (austerity) and the political ideologies (neo-liberalism) that support them. The examples from the Islamic world tend to be of the humanitarian type. This may be due partly to the lack of a historically specific cultural disengagement with formally designed public spaces, and partly to the lack of political and social frameworks that valorize critical utopian visions. Mass mobilizations of the past years, especially the protests of the ‘Arab spring’, pose new opportunities for the field in the unique way they have activated public spaces.

Theoretically uniting calls for the right to housing and the right to public space is the ‘right to the city’ and the perspective of ‘spatial justice’. Designer activism in its current variations is simply too atomized, too detached from larger movements for social justice. Only if architects can find ways of utilizing their professional expertise to mediate citizen and community initiatives with organizations and institutions of organizational capacity can they enable enduring change. Humanitarian design, on the other hand, seems to evade the problems of spatial (in)justice in the way the built environment is organized, by focusing on ‘the other half’. Perhaps the most sustained criticism of the general organization of the built environment came from the feminist movement in architecture of the 1970s and early 1980s. Specifically directed towards suburbia, and the suburban home, this critique argues that it was no longer a viable model for working women. The criticism of suburbia has been furthered by the sustainability discourse (based on a critique of energy consumption) but the aspect of social justice in regards to the built environment is one that remains to be further scrutinized, especially as spaces of exception – the camp, the squatter settlement and the gated community – emerge as the defining characteristics of a global ‘splintered urbanism’, including in the Islamic world. Following along this line of inquiry, the collective citizens’ calls for social justice acted out in physical spaces merit architectural analysis to shape modes of future practice and the future shape of our cities.

The articles in this issue, propelled forward by the events of 2011, do not chronicle the quintessential ‘Arab spring’ sites in the Middle East and North Africa directly – impartial analysis of these sites will require further time and critical distance, since new events are unfolding by the day. These articles are,
however, very much informed by the new frame of reference offered by the ‘spring’ in the way they address spatiality, mediation and calls for justice. Half of them deal with the spatiality of mass demonstrations: how demonstrations work at the topographic urban level (Masoudi); how public spaces designed for nation-building are co-opted for dissent (Khan); and how demonstrations themselves can lead to the design of new public spaces (Habib and De Meulder). The other half deals with the agency of encampments, for housing (Allweil), labour (Batuman) and refugees (Chandra). Based on case studies from Bangladesh, India, Iran, Israel, Pakistan and Turkey, they also discuss how technologies – photography, cinema and the Internet – mediate social relations. Overall, the articles presented here provide a wide-ranging perspective on the history and uses of public space for dissent. The issue thus seeks, through a widening of historical and geographical horizons, to contribute to a host of new publications that have appeared, or are undoubtedly about to appear, on demonstrations and occupations.85
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Endnotes


2. As an example of ‘mainstreaming’, see Architectural Record’s ‘Building for Social Change’ issue (March 2012).

3. The most clear policy articulation of this approach, ‘Big Society’, was developed in the United Kingdom under the Conservative Party following the 2010 general elections. In Prime Minister David Cameron’s words, Big Society sought to transfer power, ‘from the élites in Whitehall to the man and woman on the street’, supposedly to empower local people and communities; but it was heavily criticized across the political spectrum, and regarded mainly as a justification mechanism for budget cuts. Quoted in Lauren Collins, ‘All Together Now!’, The New Yorker (October 25, 2010).


5. For example, in December 2011 the online journal Places launched an open call for ‘articles that explore the complex dynamic of public and private in contemporary politics and culture’ and has recently been publishing very important and influential papers (Emphasis in original). MIT’s student journal Thresholds launched a special issue (forthcoming) titled ‘Revolution!’

6. Ted Kilian identifies two strands within the literature on the demise of public spaces. One of the strands (e.g. J. Jacobs, R. Sennett) responds to urban renewal and the erasure of inner-city neighbourhoods; the other (e.g. M. Sorkin) responds to the commercialization of public space as a result of public–private partnerships. Both are based on what is happening in New York, or broadly in the western city. See Ted Kilian, ‘Public and Private, Power and Space’, in Andrew Light and Jonathan M. Smith,


9. The Middle Eastern Studies Association’s annual conference in the fall of 2011 featured many papers on new communication technologies and the recent social movements in the Middle East. Searching for ‘Facebook’ among the paper abstracts from 2011 brought up 22 papers; only three came up in a similar search for 2012. The online programme for the 2012 conference, to take place in November, after this article is written, shows fewer discussions of new media. See https://mymesa.arizona.edu/meeting_program.php?program_bookyr=2011.


20. This emphasis on space and place is in stark contrast, for instance, to Jürgen Habermas’s classic theorization of the ‘public sphere’, which consisted originally of bourgeois, propertied men who were private individuals with no relationship to the state and who came together in salons and coffee houses originally to discuss works of literature and art but over time broadened their debates to economic and political disputes, leading to rational decisions that could exert an influence on the state as ‘public opinion’. According to Habermas, the rise of the press was instrumental in the rise of the public sphere in the early modern era. Its transformation into the media led to a perceived enlargement of the public sphere, but only by diminishing its power to monitor the state, leading Habermas to lament the ‘collapse’ of the bourgeois public sphere in the twentieth century. Jürgen Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry Into a Category of Bourgeois Society, trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1991[1961]).


22. Ibid.


30. Ibid.

31. Mitchell, ‘The End of Public Space?’.


35. This was the case during the eviction of OWS campsites in the United States as well.

36. Kracauer’s essay ‘The Mass Ornament’ (1927) presents the appearance of masses as an ornamental phenomenon. The essay opens with a discussion of Tiller Girls, a dance company that became known for its line of female dancers who performed uniform, disciplined routines. In Kracauer’s interpretation, the girls were no longer individual dancers but existed only as part of the mass. This was emblematic of modern society. While his criticism was for the use of the mass ornament for repressive means (fascism), Kracauer also suggested enjoying the mass ornament was not inherently bad, and in fact it was a valid reaction that brought aesthetics into close contact with individuals, and as such could be seen as a step towards social change. Siegfried Kracauer, ‘The Mass Ornament’, in *The Mass Ornament: Weimer Essays*, trans. Thomas T. Levin (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 75–88.


42. See, for example, ETH’s Studio Basel: http://www.studio-basel.com/assets/files/files/040_RefugeeCamps_Program_E.pdf.


45. Fraser’s much cited critique of Habermas is relevant to think through occupation as a protest form. The core of her argument is that individuals do not form their identities in the private sphere, and arrive in public with well-formed, fixed identities; second, the idea of a public sphere is limited in the sense that it does not include counter-publics and their (perhaps not so ‘rational’) forms of expressing opinion; and third, that differences must be brought to the centre of the discussion. Nancy Fraser, ‘Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy’, in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. Craig Calhoun (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1992), 109–42; also *Social Text* 25.26 (1990): 56–80.


50. Rem Koolhaas introduced the idea of ‘big’ in architecture in the 1990s in S, M, L, XL (New York: Monacelli, 1995). As he wrote: ‘Bigness no longer needs the city; it competes with the city; it represents the city; it preempts the city; or better still, it is the city’, 515.


56. As such, the Torre David project echoed additional research projects and proposals having to do with vertical slums, such as Rufina Wu and Stefan Canham’s ‘Portraits from Above: Hong Kong’s Informal Rooftop Communities’ and MVRDV’s ‘The Vertical Village: Individual, Informal, Intense’. It also recycled, with some amnesia, ideas first developed in projects such as ‘How the Other Half Builds’, by Vikram Bhatt and Witold Rybczynski. See Bernard Rudofsky, Architecture without Architects: A Short Introduction to Non-Pedigreed Architecture (New York: MoMA, 1964); Rufina Wu, Stefan Canham and Ernest Chui, Portraits from Above: Hong Kong’s Informal Rooftop Communities (Berlin: Peperoni Books, 2008); MVRDV, ‘Why Factory, and Museum of Tomorrow’, The Vertical Village: Individual, Informal, Intense (Rotterdam: NAi Publishers, 2012); Witold Rybczynski, Vikram Bhatt, Mohammad Alghamdi, Ali Bahammam, Marcia Niskier, Bhushan Pathare, Amirali Pirani, Rajinder Puri, Nitin Raje, and Patrick Reid, How the Other Half Builds (Montreal: Centre for Minimum Cost Housing, 1984).
For example, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation-funded Slum Communities Achieving Livable Environments with Urban Partners (SCALE-UP) Programme (1994) coordinates the implementation of slum improvement programmes in India and Ghana. In other cases, existing institutions have geared their focus towards public issues. In Architecture for Humanity’s case, it was the Van Alen Institute that served as host for its first international activity: an open call for, and ensuing exhibition of, proposals for transitional housing for returning refugees to Kosovo. The Institute was originally established as the Society of Beaux-Arts Architects in 1894, but it was renamed and reoriented in 1996 to focus on ‘the design of the public realm’.

Zeiger differentiates between strategy and tactic, based on Michel de Certeau’s distinction, and takes issue with the naming of the Storefront exhibition. Zeiger, ‘The Interventionist’s Toolkit: Project, Map, Occupy’.


In a way, the meteoric rise of Architecture for Humanity, with its best-seller(s) Design Like You Give a Damn: Architectural Responses to Humanitarian Crises (I and II) and publications such as Expanding Architecture: Design as Activism (New York: Metropolis Books, 2008) foreshadowed the current appeal of social engagement.


In addition to the award, the projects, publications, and symposia organized by the agencies and affiliates of the Aga Khan Development Network have contributed in significant ways to architectural discourse in the Islamic world since the 1980s.

As curator Lepik himself points out, two of the projects in MoMA’s exhibit – Diebedo Francis Kere’s school in Burkina Faso and Anna Heringer’s school in Bangladesh – had already been recognized with Aga Khan awards in 2004 and 2007 respectively.

For a summary of the heated debate among Turkish architects following the award to poet Nail Çakırhan in 1983 for his vernacular house in a village
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