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Abstract

Multiculturalism, as a set of ideas and policies, is one of the normative approaches to the current situation of cultural diversity in multicultural cities. But how can the ideas of multiculturalism be translated into the reality of urban form? The overall aim of this dissertation is to provide a theoretical and conceptual frame of reference for distilling and identifying the ideas of multiculturalism which can be translated into spatial form, and in this way, to highlight the role urban form may play in addressing the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’. In this study, the relation between the materiality of urban form and the political framework of multiculturalism is at the core of the discussion.

In its exploration into multiculturalism, the thesis identifies theoretical lacunae in explaining the spatial dimensions of multiculturalism. To be able to discuss multiculturalism in urban form terms, the dissertation chooses the position of a ‘civility of indifference’, developed by Amin (2012), as one of many possible stances within this discourse as an operative conception for such an exercise. Adopting the logical argumentation as the research strategy, the thesis delves deep into the conceptual domain mapped by space syntax theory as a primary system in this endeavour, and accordingly, describes how the spatial form of the city, by way of human movement, has the potential to create a variety of social groupings. Thereupon the thesis develops a secondary conceptual system with explanatory applicability to the relation between multiculturalism and spatial form. Supported by these systems of argumentation, the study describes how the spatial morphology of the city may have influence on the situation of living together. It is suggested that overlapping spaces represent the spaces where urban structure potentially can provide the spatial viability for the emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’ and its two organizing principles of co-presence and multiplicity.

Hence, the dissertation intends to contribute to theoretical efforts into the experience of living ‘together-in-difference’ from architectural and urban design perspectives, and argues that multiculturalism distinctly possesses spatial dimensions, which should be conceptualized and addressed through the theoretical lens of spatial form. Hence, the thesis defends that notwithstanding being a complex of social processes, the spatial dimensions of multiculturalism should not be belittled in efforts to address the situation of living together in the multicultural cities of the West.

Keywords: spatial form, multiculturalism, ‘civility of indifference’, co-presence, multiplicity, overlapping spaces, ‘together-in-difference’.
Sammanfattning

Multikulturalism i form av en uppsättning idéer och politiska riktlinjer är en av de normativa strategierna för att beskriva den nuvarande situationen med kulturell mångfald i mångkulturella städer. Men hur kan idéer om multikulturalism överföras till verklighetens stadsplanering? Avhandlingens övergripande syfte är att ge en teoretisk och begreppsmässig referensram som kan användas för att destillera fram och identifiera de idéer inom multikulturalism som kan överföras till rumslig form och att därigenom belysa den betydelse den urbana formen kan ha för möjligheterna att leva "together-in-difference". Det centrala för denna studie är förhållandet mellan den konkreta urbana formen och multikulturalismens politiska ramverk.


Avhandlingen är tänkt att bidra till den teoretiska kunskapen om erfarenheten av att leva "together-in-difference" ur arkitekturens och stadsplaneringens perspektiv. Tesen är att multikulturalism har rumsliga dimensioner som bör konceptualiseras och hanteras med hjälp av rumslig teori. Avhandlingen för fram tesen att multikulturalism visserligen utgörs av ett komplex av sociala processer men att dess rumsliga dimensioner inte bör föringas när det gäller att hantera människors sätt att leva tillsammans i västvärldens mångkulturella städer.

Nyckelord: rumslig form, multikulturalism, "civility of indifference", co-presence, multiplicity, overlapping spaces, 'together-in-difference'.
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1 - Translation of Abstract from English by Semantix.se
Contents

Acknowledgment ........................................................................................................... 9

Chapter One: Introduction .......................................................................................... 11
City: a state of cultural diversity .............................................................................. 11
Research aim and questions ..................................................................................... 18
Research approach ................................................................................................... 19
Outline of the thesis .................................................................................................. 29
About the licentiate thesis ......................................................................................... 31

Chapter Two: Multiculturalism ............................................................................... 33
Introduction .............................................................................................................. 33
Multiculturalism: a set of ideas and politics ........................................................... 34
‘Together-in-difference’: discussing space in political theory .................................. 39
‘Interculturalism’: an urban planning approach to multiculturalism ....................... 42
‘Civility of Indifference’: Amin’s alternative politics of living together ....................... 58
‘Co-presence’ and ‘Multiplicity’: two organizing principles .................................... 61
Closing Words ............................................................................................................. 64

Chapter Three: Urban Form and Living ‘Together-in-Difference’ ....................... 67
Introduction .............................................................................................................. 67
City and culture ........................................................................................................ 69
Spatial frame of reference ......................................................................................... 73
Space-society relation ............................................................................................... 76
Space as social behaviour ......................................................................................... 80
Non-correspondence space-society ......................................................................... 83
Linking multiculturalism to urban form ............................................................... 88
Closing words ............................................................................................................ 99

Acknowledgment

Chapter One: Introduction
City: a state of cultural diversity
Research aim and questions
Research approach
Outline of the thesis
About the licentiate thesis

Chapter Two: Multiculturalism
Introduction
Multiculturalism: a set of ideas and politics
‘Together-in-difference’: discussing space in political theory
‘Interculturalism’: an urban planning approach to multiculturalism
‘Civility of Indifference’: Amin’s alternative politics of living together
‘Co-presence’ and ‘Multiplicity’: two organizing principles
Closing Words

Chapter Three: Urban Form and Living ‘Together-in-Difference’
Introduction
City and culture
Spatial frame of reference
Space-society relation
Space as social behaviour
Non-correspondence space-society
Linking multiculturalism to urban form
Closing words
Chapter Four: Overlapping Spaces ............................................................... 101
  Introduction..................................................................................................... 101
  Social grouping – spatial demarcation ...................................................... 105
  Overlapping in spatial structure .............................................................. 111
  Spatial pervasiveness ................................................................................. 117
  Related theories and concepts ................................................................... 122
  Closing words ............................................................................................. 128

Chapter Five: Spatial Multiculturalism .......................................................... 133
  Spatial structure of community fluidity .................................................... 135
  Visible spaces of marginality .................................................................... 148
  Adaptable spaces of otherness ................................................................. 169

Chapter Six: Conclusions ............................................................................... 187
  Introduction..................................................................................................... 187
  Uncovering a theoretical lacuna................................................................. 188
  Framing a conceptual system .................................................................... 190
  Spatial perspective on living together in multicultural cities ................. 191
  Closing words ............................................................................................. 195

References ......................................................................................................... 197

Websites ............................................................................................................ 211
Acknowledgment

The story of my research endeavours is nothing but a hope; a hope for the future of our multicultural cities; a hope for a day when living in diversity and difference will not be regarded as a challenge in the eyes of our cities; a hope for a day when difference will be acknowledged as the essence of our urban life; a hope for a day when the life of our great cities will be inextricably intertwined into a civility towards otherness. Despite its ups and downs, this hope filled my PhD journey with inspiration and determination, and hence, I would like to have the chance herein to thank everyone who accompanied me along the way.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Lars Marcus. I will always appreciate the intellectual support, comments and advice he has given me. Above all, I am extremely grateful for the encouragement and motivation I gained from him throughout my PhD years; I cannot thank him enough for all that. I would also like to thank Tigran Haas for his constant support during my years at KTH. Thanks to Nazem Tahvilzadeh for his helpful insight and suggestions.

My sincere gratitude goes to Ash Amin (University of Cambridge) whose precious advice in the early stages of my study left deep influences on the overall approach of the dissertation. I deeply appreciate the time he generously spent guiding me through my questions.

During my PhD, I had a unique opportunity to be a member of two research groups at KTH. My grateful thanks go to the members of the research group SAD-Spatial Analysis and Design at the School of Architecture: special thanks go to Ann Legeby for the most valuable and helpful discussions I had with her. Thanks to Daniel Koch for his constructive comments on the core chapter of my dissertation. Thanks to Eva Minoura, Sara Sardari Sayyar, Eunyoung Choi, Pablo Miranda Carranza, and Ehsan Abshirini for the fruitful discussions and meetings we have had during the past few years. My grateful thanks also go to all my colleagues at CAL-Civitas Athenaeum Laboratory at the Department of Urban Planning and Environment.

I would like to thank Claus Bech-Danielsen, Hedvig Vestergaard, Phillippa Suenson, and Knud Erik Hansen at SBi - the Danish Building Research Institute (Aalborg University) where I spent a visiting spell. I would also like to thank Nils Holtug for facilitating my short stay at CESEM: Centre for the Study of
Equality and Multiculturalism (University of Copenhagen), where I was given an ideal opportunity to gain a background knowledge of political multiculturalism.

Regarding the licentiate stage of my graduate studies, I owe a large debt of gratitude to Reza Kazemian and Sussan Babaie (The Courtauld Institute of Art) for their valuable support during my licentiate studies. I also would like to thank Ali Madanipour (Newcastle University), the examiner of my Licentiate thesis, for his constructive comments and advice on my dissertation.

Special thanks go to Kristina Grange and Göran Cars for all their help throughout my studies. I feel grateful to my colleagues, former and present PhD peers at our URS-Division with whom I have shared years of work; Luciane, Ying, Zeinab, Elahe, Feras, Lina, Saghi, Alazar, Malin, Sandra, Charlotta, Marcus, Bengt, Yuheng and all others; we had the most cheerful lunch-times at the Division.

I would like to express my appreciation to Halina Dunin-Woyseth (AHO- The Oslo School of Architecture and Design) for her detailed comments on my dissertation draft at the final seminar, and to Inga-Britt Werner for the final quality check of the dissertation.

I would never have managed to undertake this task without the financial support of the Lars Erik Lundberg foundation that stands as the main supporter of this research endeavour. I believe that the Lundberg doctoral scholarship has opened up opportunities for international students to pursue their post-graduate studies in Sweden. Also, thanks to the Axel och Margaret Ax:son Johnson foundation for their support at one stage of my PhD studies.

Above all, my heartfelt gratitude goes to my parents for being a precious source of kindness and support to my life.

Stockholm, May 2015

Mohammad Sarraf
Chapter One: Introduction

City: a state of cultural diversity

Since the summer 2001 when several cities across England experienced ethnic riots, many European cities have witnessed similar ethnic unrest. Notwithstanding a variety of social, economic, political and other reasons, one clear message that such unrest sends is that the situation of living together in multicultural cities needs careful attention. Hence, urban planning and design – as the fields concerned with the development of urban space – need to do their part in creating viable conditions for living together in the plural society of the 21st century. The issue raised in this dissertation is therefore the question of living together in multicultural cities from an urban planning and design perspective.

Not only is cultural diversity an undeniable character of every modern society, it is also the history of urbanism – in its general meaning – is intertwined with the history of cultural diversity and ethnic co-existence. Culture, defined as “the meaning or point of human activities, social relations and human life in general, and the significance or value to be attached to them” (Parekh, 2008, p. 80) is constantly manifested in the city through signs, symbols, and material objects, despite being inextricably interwoven with social, political, economic and other institutions.
The more recent history of urbanism in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries is entwined with globalization and immigration processes. Immigration has opened a new scene in the multicultural nature of today’s western societies, despite being merely one among many sources of cultural diversity in cities (Parekh, 2008, p. 81). Immigration is one of the influential aspects of what several urban scholars define as contemporary “cosmopolitan cities” (Sandercock, 2003; Vertovec & Cohen, 2002; Sennett, 2002).

People with different ethnic, social, national and religious backgrounds converge and share the built environment of the city. Notwithstanding all differences, they get together in the quest for a home in cities that increasingly become demographically more multicultural than before (Sandercock, 2009, p. 193). Many modern western societies have accommodated a notable percentage of their population from foreign-born people. Given the heterogeneous population and the cultural diversity of those societies, western cities have brought a new meaning to the multiplicity of cities and it is therefore not difficult to conclude that today’s modern western societies are hybrid in every sense (Amin, 2012, p. 1).

The coexistence of different cultures in the city is not a new phenomenon however, as the multiplicity of social and cultural landscapes living and sharing common spaces has been an invariable character of cities from ancient and medieval times (Qadeer, 2010, p. 11; Wood & Landry, 2008, p. 94). The concept of multicultural cities is also discussed in archaeology, for instance by Insoll (2007, pp. 11-13), in order to find any precedents to the multicultural phenomenon of today’s cities. However, due to paramount differences between the ancient situation of cultural diversity and modern multicultural cities (Edwards & Woolf, 2003), the multicultural feature of contemporary cities requires particular approaches.

The city can be perceived as a spatial phenomenon shaped for the accommodation of differences and complexity (Bridge & Watson, 2003, p. 255). Differences and the hybridity that arise from them in cities have been and will continue to be essential for the development of societies. However, in a culturally diverse society, in which culturally more or less distinct groups have different principles, values, norms and ways of life, conflicts are inevitable (Parekh, 2006, p. 149; Madanipour, 2007, p. 97). Cities, as spaces of encounter and creation, are also scenes of aggression, conflict, and paranoia which is also
something that needs to be accounted for in the urban experience (Donald, 1997, p. 180). Therefore, conflict of interests, as an integrated component of urban life, is evident within social encounters in public spaces of the city. The city is a place where different groups communicate and cooperate, or as Lewis Mumford (1937) already maintained, the city is “a special framework directed towards the creation of differentiated opportunities for a common life and a significant collective drama”; in (Miles, Hall, & Borden, 2004, p. 29). This collective drama can also be connected to pejorative phenomena such as racism, cultural and ethnic conflict and segregation.

Regardless of time and place, city planners and designers have been dealing with different approaches of how to manage cultural diversity in the processes of city making. Urbanism continuously needs to contemplate the challenges of multicultural cities anew, and find solutions and regulations for the situation of living together despite the challenges of today’s metropolitan areas. The core of such challenges is to address social inequalities and injustices that various minority groups may be faced with due to their cultural, social, and ethnic differences.

Most generally, one may say that this challenge has historically been dealt with by planning either for socio-spatial mix or division. The concept of urban division is far from new as cities throughout history more or less always have been divided into socio-spatial partitions (Marcuse, 2002, p. 15; Kostof, 1992, p. 121). Spatial clustering of groups in cities has its roots in many determinants (Rapoport, 1977, p. 249), such as differences in class, status, position in the hierarchy of power, culture, economic status, race, colour, ethnicity, language, and other individual or group norms and values. Considering generally two distinct types of physical determinants that could affect the socio-spatial arrangement of settlements, i.e. the natural and the man-made determinants (Morris, 1994, p. 10), patterns of group clusters and differentiation of people in cities could be either voluntary or involuntary. Either way, they come to spatialise one or several ranking systems and power distributions that reflect historically specific systems of dominance and power (Marcuse, 2005, p. 15).

The history of urbanism not only displays attempts to spatially divide and separate groups, there have also been numerous attempts to mix different social groups by pursuing physical and spatial transformations at different scales of urban planning programmes, from small scales of community-building in
neighbourhoods to the larger scales of planning new towns. For instance, Sarkissian (1976, pp. 231-4) describes how the social-mixing plans over the previous couple of centuries have followed a range of social, political and economic purposes. In brief, the history of urbanism reveals numerous attempts to group, divide or mix people through physical and spatial interventions along social, ethnic or cultural lines. That is, the concept of arranging social order through spatial interventions has been pursued within the history of city-building long before the rise of modern urban planning practice. By the same token, the processes of city planning have always been entangled with the social issues of diversity and differences within its physical and spatial considerations.

In the more recent history of urban planning, the ideas of mixed social communities and groups have been at the core of some urban planning theories, projects and movements. For instance, the Garden City movement of Ebenezer Howard (1850-1928) – which in the hands of Raymond Unwin (1863-1940) was joined with the aesthetic program of Camillo Sitte (1843-1903) into one of the major influences on modern city planning – had social issues and complexes at the core of its spatial planning process. The roots of the current concept of sustainable planning can also be traced back to Howard’s ideas, and later to Lewis Mumford’s (1895-1990) social approaches to community-building (Larice & Macdonald, 2007, pp. 43-7). Designed by Unwin and Parker, Letchworth, one of the first practical examples of a Garden City, which later on became a pattern for the New Town movement in Europe had community-building as the core concept in its design ideals. However, the social underpinnings of the Garden City movement were perhaps more notable in the early stages of its conceptual diagrams, than in its later physical implementation (Larice & Macdonald, 2007, p. 44).

As yet another example, one may refer to the concept of the neighbourhood unit in modern urban planning, which was introduced by Clarence Perry (187-1944) as an American version of the garden cities. The community-based social character of the neighbourhood was clearly evident in the articulation of the neighbourhood unit specifications (Watson D. P., 2003). Perry’s intention with introducing the concept of the neighbourhood unit was to aim for some of the social goals that were usually pursued at larger scales of urban planning projects – for example, in the concept of the Garden City – by dealing with the smaller scale of the neighbourhood units. His idea of a correspondence between social communities and spatial neighbourhoods remain highly influential even today.
For example, today’s Smart Growth and New Urbanism movements are inspired by the spatial neighbourhood units in Perry’s model (Larice & Macdonald, 2007, pp. 54-5).

Historical investigation of the capabilities of spatial interventions in order to correspond to social complexes is beyond the scope of this research. However, as a recent poignant example of social ordering by means of physical intervention, one may refer to the modern concept of zoning, by which cities are divided into different functional zones. Modern zoning, referred to as “the practice of boundary management” (Boyer, 1983, p. 164), has exerted a major influence on the social order of many cities around the world. For example, the CIAM congress and the publication of the Athens Charter by Le Corbusier (1887-1965) were notable efforts by the modernist movement to establish an urbanism for city development based on social objectives (Mumford E. P., 2009).

The influence of Jane Jacobs’ (1916-2006) ideas and general design principles, based on sensitive observation of the relationship between urban form and the social life of the city became a turning point in understanding the role of casual everyday social interactions on the streets and in the public spaces of cities. As a prominent voice against modernist planning, Jacobs (1961) articulated a number of physical and spatial conditions, such as small blocks, multifunctional neighbourhoods with mixed uses and aged buildings, as a way to affect the dynamics of city life. Her understanding of city streets, as important public spaces where the social life of cities occurs, has inspired generations of urban planners and designers. Considering social segregation and racial segregation to be the “most serious social problem” of the American cities, Jacobs (1961, p. 73) exquisitely described the potentiality of urban form as a means of bringing “togetherness”. Jacobs observed the effects of the public space on the holistic social life of the city, and cast light on the importance of “lowly, unpurposeful and random” sidewalk contacts in establishing social ties among individuals and groups. She implicitly declares that tolerance emanates from the intense city life due to the capability of cities to let strangers establish a spatial ‘togetherness’ in public space. In her opinion:

“the tolerance, the room for great differences among neighbors – differences that often go far deeper than differences in color – which are possible and normal in intensely urban life, but which are so foreign to suburbs and pseudosuburbs, are possible and normal only when streets of
great cities have built-in equipment allowing strangers to dwell in peace together on civilized but essentially dignified and reserved terms” (Jacobs J., 1961, p. 72).

Since the middle of the twentieth century, the search for a binding force in modern plural society has occupied an abundant body of urban planning and design research on the situation of living together. For instance, Kostof (1992, p. 121) argues that although urban division is a prerequisite for the situation of living together with differences, the lack of what used to bind the population of the city together in olden days is evident in the modern city.

Given that urban spaces are primary among the public realms where the situation of living together becomes a reality in people’s daily lives, the built-environment-related debates have to address cultural diversity. How can the practice of urban planning and design be used to realise the conditions for living together despite differences in multicultural cities?

Academic disciplines dealing with the built environment – such as architecture, urban planning and design – have been practical tools to partly implement policies of living together in practice and, so to speak, build ideal cities. For instance, writing about planning for an ideal city of the 21st century, Sandercock (2003, p. 208) writes: “I dream of a city […] where citizens wrest from space new possibilities, and immerse themselves in their cultures while respecting those of their neighbours, collectively forging new hybrid cultures and spaces”.

Empirical practices and theoretical efforts related to the built environment have tried to follow and accommodate the emergent discourse surrounding politics of living together. In other words, urban planning and design practices and theories have been tools in the hands of urban planners and architects to implement policies of living together in practice and in this way regulate the coexistence of diverse groups in the physical spaces of cities. Therefore, a range of approaches to address the sensitivity of the built environment to current cultural pluralism have been developed, often by reference to normative ideas around the politics of recognition. In this respect, multiculturalism, as a part of the politics of
recognition\textsuperscript{2}, has been a source of theoretical inspiration for a variety of emergent theories and tactics in urban planning and design research.

Multiculturalism is a set of normative ideas about the politics of recognition and respect (Taylor C., 1994, p. 68). According to Parekh (2006, p. 336), multiculturalism should be regarded as a “perspective on human life”, which is within the scope of individuals and groups’ culturally embedded differences, and in general terms is mainly about the relationships between different cultural groups (2006, p. 13). In his *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*, Parekh (2006, p. 2) argues that while formal acceptance of difference demands arrangements in political structures and legal systems of society, respect for difference calls for changes both in social attitudes and ways of thinking, and maintains that public affirmation of difference can be emphasized by a variety of means, for example symbols. But a question arises here of how urban planning and design can interpret multiculturalism.

This thesis takes its starting point in an exploration into how the politics of multiculturalism are interpreted in the academic disciplines that deal with the physicality of urban space. The research explores the current interpretation of multiculturalism in urban planning, and argues that there is a tendency in urban planning theory to neglect the complexity of living with difference by narrowing it down to regulations of public space as neutral meeting sites where people are purported to be able to achieve a deep understanding of their cultural differences and establish intercultural ties through spatial encounters. Hence, the research refers to an alternative politics of living together, which does not rely upon establishing intercultural ties, and by extension argues that such an approach shows potentials to be translated into urban form.

What distinguishes this research from earlier similar research is that it intends to approach the question of multiculturalism in urban planning and design discourse through the lens of physical space and spatial relations. In other words – following Hillier and Hanson’s (1984, p. 2) elaboration on spatial relations – in our approach to exploring multiculturalism, space and spatial relations are treated as “what we think with, rather than what we think of”. In other words, the

\textsuperscript{2} - Given that multiculturalism is about the differences derived from culture, Parekh (2006, p. 3) argues that notwithstanding being “part of the politics of recognition, multiculturalism is a distinct movement maintaining an ambivalent relationship to it”. 
intention is to explore a political set of ideas through spatial thinking. According to Massey (2005, p. 9), thinking spatially has the potential to “shake up the manner in which certain political questions are formulated, can contribute to political arguments already under way, and – most deeply – can be an essential element in the imaginative structure which enables in the first place an opening up to the very sphere of the political”. It goes without saying that there is no claim made that the situation of living together in multicultural cities can be, or should be, regulated merely through physical space and spatial relations. However, as a research project in urban planning and design, our particular intention with this study is to explain how the urban form and spatial structure of the city can create spatial conditions for an approach to the politics of living together.

As a theoretical contribution, this research has mainly targeted academic scholars in urban planning and design theory, with the primary intention of providing new insights into the understanding of cultural diversity and the situation of living together from an architectural and urban design perspective. However, it also intends to convey the message to scholars in political theory that despite being a political complex, multiculturalism has spatial and physical dimensions, which can be conceptualized and approached and perhaps enriched within the scope of architectural and urban design theory.

**Research aim and questions**

The overall aim of this PhD research is to provide a theoretical and conceptual frame of reference for distilling and identifying the ideas of multiculturalism so that it can be interpreted within an urban design discourse and more precisely be translated into spatial form. To achieve this aim, the research argues that the politics of multiculturalism possess spatial properties. Referring to space syntax theory, this research endeavour is furthermore built upon the idea that physical space should not be conceived merely as a “by-product” or representation of social relations, rather, it should be regarded as a form of social behaviour “in itself” (Hillier B., 1996, p. 300). Hence, the relation between the materiality of urban form and the political framework of multiculturalism is at the core of this interdisciplinary study.

Given its breadth, the aforementioned research aim is pursued within the frame of three complementary questions, which are addressed in sequence:
a) How can ideas and concepts of the kind represented by multiculturalism, that is, ideas and concepts in the field of political science, be formulated in a manner that opens up for interpretation by ideas and concepts in the field of urban planning and design?
b) How can such ideas and concepts furthermore be translated into a general conception of spatial form?
c) Can such translations in any way inform and even enrich ideas and concepts of multiculturalism?

**Research approach**

Given the overall aim of this research, it should come as no surprise that the scope of this PhD needs to transcend a monodisciplinary mode of research. However, as the first step in designing a proper research method, it is necessary to cast further light on the research mode and determine more precisely whether it is monodisciplinary, multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary. According to Dunin-Woyseth and Nilsson (2011, pp. 80-1), while monodisciplinary research remains loyal to one discipline and is approached and conducted within the framework of particular methods developed in one discipline, knowledge production within the two latter modes transcends the boundaries of sovereignty over disciplinary knowledge. In this regard, Dunin-Woyseth and Nilsson state:

“Interdisciplinarity concerns the transfer of methods from one discipline to another. Like multidisciplinarity, interdisciplinarity overrides the disciplines, but its goal still remains within the academic framework of disciplinary research, as is the case with multidisciplinarity” (Dunin-Woyseth & Nilsson, 2011, pp. 88-9).

According to Dunin-Woyseth and Nilsson (2011, p. 90), in accordance with the epistemological critique concerning the need to formulate a stronger intellectual identity, the discipline of architecture has after modernism to a large degree aimed for multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary modes of architectural research. It is in the same period that research in architecture and urban design try, first, to transcend the limitations of the pure *form-function* framework of modernism (Marcus, forthcoming:2015), and second, by borrowing theory and methodology from other fields, such as sociology, psychology and also incorporate philosophy
in the aim to form new epistemological frameworks. However, despite the emergence of advanced architectural research influenced by other disciplines (such as philosophy, sociology, geography, and cultural studies), have also been argued to largely remain unsuccessful in framing a disciplinary system of reference for architectural studies (Dunin-Woyseth & Nilsson, 2011, p. 90). Along the same line of argument, Zaera-Polo (2005, p. 4) states that such studies may have broadened the discipline of architectural studies, they have to the greater part been unsuccessful in framing an internal system of reference for architectural studies, so that “often this has resulted in some of the most advanced research in architecture looking like bad movies, bad sociology, or bad literature”. To conclude this paragraph, the early post-modernism critical studies attempted to address epistemological problems by employing theories and methods from other disciplines’, while they were unable to view and scrutinize the borrowed concepts through the prism of architecture and urban design as established monodisciplines (Dunin-Woyseth & Nilsson, 2011, p. 83).

This PhD research follows an interdisciplinary process, which Dunin-Woyseth and Nilsson (2011, p. 90) call “negotiations between disciplines”, more specifically this concerns in this case negotiations between urban design discourse and theory, urban planning theory, political theory, and social and cultural studies. The following may provide an explanation of the overall structure of the interdisciplinary negotiation process in the thesis. As the crux of the inquiry, this research investigates how the politics of multiculturalism are approached within contemporary debates in urban planning theory. For instance, assessing the reception of multiculturalist discourse in urban planning theory this research points out some theoretical lacunae when it comes to spatial form that could inform and support this reception. Hence, the thesis takes the shape of an initial aim to identify one interpretation of the notion of multiculturalism within political theory. Thereafter, based on this conceptualization, the thesis tries to re-capture this concept in terms of spatial morphology, and by way of such a spatial exploration contribute to the current interpretations in urban planning. Finally, emergent ideas within this framework of morphological discourse are related back to the cultural and social notions originally found in political theory and social theory. It is in this sense that the research is pursued within a process of constant ‘negotiations between disciplines’. The primary goal, however, is to conduct this research so that it specifically can inform and contribute to urban design theory.
Based in the discussion above, it can be argued that there are three notable aspects that characterize this research as an interdisciplinary research. First, the research can be sorted into a particular disciplinary framework of research – which is architecture and urban design. However, it discloses new insights by also involving theory from other disciplines, while being consistent in emphasising its urban design identity. For instance, the concepts related to multiculturalism are employed and portrayed in a manner that aim to establish a cogent connection to a sort of primary framework ideas and concepts from spatial morphology. Second, there is constant reflection on these latter concepts, but from the vantage points of different disciplines, which implies a constant negotiation and connection with a number of disciplines. Third, the research inquiry and problem, as will be discussed in the next chapter, arise from an epistemological stance that is typical of interdisciplinary research projects (Dunin-Woyseth & Nilsson, 2011, pp. 89-90).

Claiming that the mode of the research to be interdisciplinary, there may be the need to again emphasize that boundaries between monodisciplinarity, multidisciplinarity, and interdisciplinarity are overlapping and complementary. That is, due to the appropriateness of the occasion, the research does not limit itself to one rigid mode of knowledge production, but simultaneously benefits from theoretical and methodological frameworks of other modes as well.

The applied procedure for ‘negotiation between disciplines’ in this research implies negotiation mainly between architectural knowledge – which is the author’s background – and other knowledge landscapes, such as urban planning, political theory, and to some extent human geography. Here, the process of knowledge negotiation has been carried out employing some of the “integrative techniques” described by Klein (1990, p. 189), which she argues are important to provide a platform of understating within an interdisciplinary research:

- obtaining a primary knowledge of the ‘borrowed’ concepts and their related academic sources by spending brief spells as a visiting scholar, as well as taking courses in related topics;
- holding regular meetings with scholars of involved disciplines;
- participation and presentations at internal and external seminars on related themes;
- making occasional contacts with scholars in other fields and receiving comments on the text regarding the concepts borrowed from other fields; and,

- conducting an extensive literature review on the related concepts.
Earlier in this text, it was mentioned that the research ‘borrows’ from other knowledge disciplines. According to Klein (1990, p. 86), borrowing from other disciplines can be carried out in different ways and for a range of purposes. One of the purposes of borrowing, however, is to search for – and reach – a “new conceptual unity” (Klein, 1990, p. 86). Accordingly, this research has attempted to borrow some concepts from other disciplines – mainly from political theory – and to develop and interpret them within the scope of architectural and urban design. However, as Klein also stresses, there are some risks associated with the borrowing process. Among the most common problems which may arise through the process of borrowing, as Klein (1990, p. 88) maintains, are using concepts and theories out of their ‘original context’, as well as the problem of ‘illusions of certainty’, in which insufficient attention is paid to the fact that the borrowed concepts or theories are “treated with caution or skepticism in their original disciplines”. Being aware of such problems, an attempt has been made here to reduce the risk of such fallacies through ‘negotiation between disciplines’. Nevertheless, the interdisciplinary mode of research requires the acceptance of some theories and concepts from other fields in order to be able ‘to simplify’ the domain of the research inquiry (Klein, 1990, p. 85).

‘Logical argumentation’

Given its interdisciplinary enquiry into theories from different disciplines, the research has taken the form of “logical argumentation”\(^3\) as its main research strategy. Logical argumentation as a research strategy, seeks to establish a logical order in the form of a conceptual system out of factors that appear to be irrelevant and disconnected (Wang, 2002, pp. 301-340). According to Wang:

“The human mind often encounters a seemingly disparate group of factors or phenomena that it somehow senses can be interconnected into an explanatory system. Once this system is framed, it gives clarity to those disparate elements under a general heading […] The architectural literature and related literatures include works whose primary attribute is an ability to give logical order to a set of previously disparate factors. The works tend to be ends in themselves; their entire mission seems to be to frame logical conceptual systems that, once framed, interconnect

\(^3\) - Adopting a “logical argumentation” approach, the methodology of this research depends heavily on: Architectural Research Methods (2002), by Linda Groat and David Wang.
previously unknown or unappreciated factors in relevant ways. We consider these works examples of *logical argumentation*, and this in more than just the general sense that all theoretical works have logical coherence” (Wang, 2002, pp. 301-2).

Logical systems of argumentation, according to Wang (2002), are spread across a spectrum dealing, on the one end, with factors rooted in mathematical and formal rules, to the other end, dealing with factors rooted in cultural and discursive phenomena. In other words, the analytical tools and models of logical argumentation systems should be located somewhere across such a spectrum where they can on the one hand deal with mathematical and natural factors and on the other hand cover socio-cultural phenomena. While mathematical language deals with the formal systems, discursive language is appropriate for the other end of the spectrum where systems “have persuasive force because they capture a worldview and distill it into a logical argument with both theoretical clarity and rhetorical power. These systems use discursive language to anchor the validity of their claims to some larger transcendental venue […] by systematic analysis and explanation. […] That is, the ‘logic’ of the argument is usually derived from its connection to the larger theme” (Wang, 2002, p. 303; 307). The results of a logical argumentation system within architectural and urban design studies, according to Wang, can be either the establishment of a *normative ground* for design-related activities, or “a way of understanding some aspects of human interaction with the built environment”. The reason why logical systems may lead to such results, as he argues (Wang, p. 303), should be seen in the capacity of the logical system “to somehow capture a culture’s worldview in a discursive system that is perceived as a summary of its cultural ‘logic’ relative to design action or style”. Obviously, such systems need to benefit from both “*mathematical-formal*” and “*cultural-discursive*” approaches.

![Figure 1. Spectrum of logical argumentation by David Wang (2002, p. 303).](image)
According to Wang (2002), logical systems fall into two types: ‘primary logical systems’ and ‘secondary logical systems’. Primary logical systems, conceptualized at paradigmatic levels, possess a broad explanatory scope and define their own technical terms and analytical discourse. Put another way, the primary logical systems claim themselves to be “internally self-contained” conceptual systems of reference, with implicit or explicit claims to a sort of “universal explanatory power” (2002, p. 308). As an innovative discursive approach to portray the relation between the existing factors or phenomena, the primary systems tend to define their own discourse “at a paradigmatic level” (Wang, 2002, p. 309).

The ‘secondary logical systems’ are applicative studies made within the framework of a primary logical system, and based on the tools and discourse defined by the primary system. The crucial point about the secondary research endeavours in logical argumentation is that they often do not expand the primary system from the point of view of its analytical tools and techniques, “rather, they tend to go deeper into the domain mapped by the primary system” (Wang, 2002, p. 304). In some cases, however, the secondary application of the system possesses some primary characteristics and capabilities through which it offers new concepts for the logical argumentation system (Wang, 2002, p. 305).

Given the outlined characters of the primary and secondary logical systems, this research has designated space syntax theory, conceived by Bill Hillier and Julienne Hanson (1984), as the primary logical argumentation system. Given its aim to analyse, study and finally frame a logical conceptual system addressing the reciprocal relation between urban form and social phenomena, space syntax, as a primary logical system, defines a set of theories and methods, which are applicable to a variety of secondary logical argumentation systems. Based in this primary conceptual system, this thesis tries to frame a secondary logical argumentation system with the main focus on multiculturalism as an approach to the complexity of social and individual relations in multicultural cities.

Designating space syntax the primary logical argumentation system, this research inquiry can partly be described as an aim to develop a secondary system whereby one can analyse and study the relation between urban form and social grouping. In fact, if it is successful, a logical system of argumentation (mainly a

---

4 - Space syntax theory is elaborated within the ensuing parts of the dissertation.
primary or a secondary study with new concepts) provides an innovative approach for understanding and conceptualizing the existing facts or phenomena (Wang, 2002, p. 309). That is, more than anything else, the goal of a logical argumentation system is to provide new insights into the way that the relations between once unrelated phenomena can be captured, understood, and finally studied. According to Wang (2002, p. 334), the conceptual frameworks of the logical argumentation systems “shape how we understand the world we live in”. Accordingly, space syntax theory, as part of an epistemological criticism of territorial and semiotic approaches to architecture and urban from at the time, was developed to frame a logical relation between the materiality of urban space, and socio-cultural aspects of human behaviour, with a main focus on movement patterns. Proposing a “universal definition” of the city and its spatial structure (Hillier B., 2012, p. 130), the descriptive theory of space syntax is an outstanding example of a primary logical argumentation system from which many applicative studies can be spawned (Wang, 2002, p. 304).

Due to this innovative approach to offering new insights, (primary) logical argumentation systems need to define a terminology that covers a myriad of specific discourses. Wang (2002, p. 312) considers the breadth of the terminology of logical systems as one of their weaknesses and argues that the demand that a new logical system puts on the human mind is somehow equivalent to learning a new language. The logical systems should therefore pay attention to the number of new terms and the extent of their discourse in order to keep the system comprehensible. Accordingly, space syntax defines a collection of terms, which can be discussed under the rubric of configurational discourse. With the aim of framing a secondary logical argumentation system, while benefitting from existing discourse and the conceptions of the primary system, it in some cases need to develop these concepts further and also coin new terms in order to apply the explanatory powers of the primary system.

According to Wang (2002, p. 329), the authority of a logical system to a large extent pertains to its connection “to a large body of voices saying related things”. Therefore, along the lines of this research’s endeavour to frame a secondary conceptual system, the text occasionally refers to a variety of related conceptions, not only within the discourse of the primary system (which here is the space syntax theory), but also within the broader urban design discourse, as well as urban planning and human geography. On the one hand, this casts light on the academic framework of the research inquiry and on the other guarantees
the interdisciplinary mode of the research with its demands for constant negotiation and reflection between various disciplines.

According to Wang’s explanation of ‘logical argumentation’ strategy, in order to fulfil the expectations of logical cohesion, a systematic framework for a logical argumentation must possess “certain relational propositions” along the way of argumentation (Wang, 2002, p. 316). First, a logical argumentation needs to possess a necessity relationship between different components of the system in order to respond to certain expectations of “explanatory dependability” of the whole system. Elaborating on a necessity relationship for cultural/discursive systems, Wang (2002, p. 316) argues that since these systems base their arguments on broader frames of reference – culture for example – their necessity relationship is of the “nomic” type. That is, they tend to tie the logic of their argumentation to the one of the larger frame of reference: “because the larger domain is thus and so, therefore architectural action must be thus and so” (2002, p. 316). Second, logical argumentation systems are framed around a balance between deduction and induction (Wang, 2002, pp. 317-318). In other words, while deduced necessities are restatements of the “obvious”, induced promises give power to the system to explain the “contingent”. Third, cultural/discursive systems may benefit from syllogism frameworks embedded in their argumentation. However, owing to their heavy reliance on a range of contingent-induced projections, the syllogisms within cultural/discursive arguments cannot be interpreted as syllogism “in any formal sense of the word. But they are framed in such a way that two related premises are given, out of which a deductive operation drives the theorist’s point of view as an assumed necessary conclusion” (Wang, 2002, p. 318). In this dissertation, the argumentation system of the research inquiry employs different relational frameworks along the discussions. For instance, it is not uncommon to employ ‘nomic’ necessity to ground the logic behind the argument in the political framework of multiculturalism, or to employ a cultural/discursive kind of syllogism to reach necessary conclusions within the scope of urban form discussions.

One of the main challenges that a research project conducted with the strategy of logical argumentation may be confronted with is that “it may be hard to grasp why or how logical argumentation is a research strategy, since all frameworks need to have logical coherence” (Wang, 2002, p. 334). Regarding this weakness, Wang addresses two issues. First, the framed conceptual system needs to encompass a wide range of a particular reality that is entangled in a net of
complex layers. That indeed best certifies the suitability of a logical argumentation strategy for this interdisciplinary research. Second, which is of importance for the purpose of this dissertation, is that the conceptual frameworks “tend to culminate in the theoretical system itself as an outcome, rather than have the logical framework be a means to other outcomes” (Wang, 2002, p. 334). For instance, as one of the most important features of their urban model on integration-segregation dimension, Hillier and Vaughan (2007, p. 208) argue that these models, which are based on space syntax theory and methods, “seek to be explanatory in themselves of the phenomena they address”. This best shows the potentiality of space syntax theory to be employed as a logical argumentation system.

Finally, there is a need to take account of one of the fundamental logical argumentation weaknesses which, for heuristic convenience, we refer to under the rubric logical trap. According to Wang (2002, p. 335), the existence of an internal coherence within a logical argumentation system does not necessarily affirm that the system is capable of depicting and conceptualizing an existing complex reality. In other words, the logical trap portrays a situation in which “a system may not be an accurate representation of the reality it purports to explain and yet still be internally consistent from a logical point of view” (2002, p. 335).

To address the concern of logical trap, the dissertation tries to remain faithful to two constraints. First, it lays particular stress on its essence as a secondary logical argumentation system, notwithstanding its occasional tendency to develop new concepts. That is, terminologically derived from the primary discourse of space syntax, the research constantly ties its logical argumentations to the logic of the primary system. Second, a constant reciprocal negotiation between various disciplinary contributors – such as political theory and urban planning theory – not only implies the interdisciplinary mode of the research, but also guarantees the external logic of the system by constantly confronting the internal discussions with the related external ones.

Before closing the discussion on the employed strategy, it is necessary to mention the role of the literature review in the process of this research inquiry. As an important part of every research process and any implemented strategy, a literature review plays a key role not only at the beginning of a research process, but throughout the whole process (Wang, 2002, pp. 45-48). Literature that is related to a topic of inquiry leaves its strong influence in the outcome of the produced text. Ellin’s (1999, p. 282) notion of “intertextuality”, derived from
Julia Kristeva’s idea, that “every text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations, every text is absorption and transformation of another text”, best articulates that every descriptive research is highly under the influence of a literature review. The importance of literature review through the process of a research inquiry, according to Wang (2002, p. 49), can be realized due to its various applications. First, it is one of the ways to identify and connect the topic of research inquiry to (multi-) disciplinary sources of knowledge. In interdisciplinary research, a literature review helps the researcher become aware of different knowledge landscapes, which finally may lead to obtaining an emergent picture of the status of knowledge close to the topic of inquiry. For instance, in this research, the ideas of multiculturalism and their relation to the built environment are connected to political theory, human geography, and urban planning and design. Second, a literature review is necessary to ground the research in “the proper theoretical / philosophical / epistemological starting point” (Wang, 2002, p. 49). In this dissertation, the first two chapters benefit from an extensive literature review in order to ground the research project in a logical theoretical base. Additionally, it is with the help of the conducted literature review that the research mounts the identification of a lacuna when it comes to spatial morphology in the versions of multiculturalism discussed in the thesis, indicating that this may also be the case more generally. In fact, based in Wang’s (2002, p. 50) argumentation that “topics of inquiry can emerge from analyzing, critiquing, and suggesting improvements to an extant work”, the research attempts to authorize the necessity of its inquiry topic as a type of re-thinking of multiculturalism by way of urban design, while drawing from different bodies of literature. Hence, through a literature review, the author tries to identify a theoretical lacuna in addressing the concerns of living together in multicultural cities. This PhD research can be interpreted as a research attempt to fill in the spotted lacuna. Third, given that a “new explanatory system is almost always evaluated on the logic of how it relates to the body of literature it aims to contribute to” (Wang, 2002, p. 49), an extensive literature review has been pursued to authorize the logic of the framed secondary system.

As the final issue that the section on research approach may need to briefly address concerns the adequacy of the designated approach; the questions of why logical argumentation has been designated for this research, and why other potential research strategies have been brushed aside. First, the answer to these questions should be sought in the nature of this research inquiry, which is at the
level of theoretical debates. Second, the interdisciplinary research initiative is taken from academic disciplines – rather than the tangible empirical world – and adopts an epistemological stance. This will be explained in the next chapter where the thesis intends to address some theoretical lacunae in academic disciplines, rather than deal with empirical inquiries. These two points describe why logical argumentation may be best suited as the research strategy for such a research inquiry aiming to study one of the conceptual frameworks that “shape how we understand the world we live in” (Wang, 2002, p. 334).

For example, the case study strategy – which is, generally speaking, among the most applied methods in architectural and urban design PhD dissertations – could not fulfill the objectives of this research since this research inquiry has its roots in theoretical and conceptual levels. According to Yin (2003, p. 13), case study should be regarded as an “empirical inquiry” which deals with a “phenomenon within its real-life context”. Moreover, a case study inquiry, according to Yin (2003, p. 14), “benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions”, while this research inquiry seeks some theoretical lacuna, rather than structuring an empirical inquiry on some theoretical propositions. In the future, however, case study efforts may be conducted as “empirical means” to test the emergent logical system, adding that in such cases, the testability of a logical system is “not dependent upon ‘falsification’ of its claims; it is more indexed to the cultural underpinnings of its claims evolving to other principles” (Wang, 2002, pp. 310-311).

To sum up the section on the research approach, logical argumentation is the main strategy employed in this dissertation, which is supported by an extensive literature review throughout the process. Based in space syntax as the primary logical system, the research intends to develop a secondary conceptual system with explanatory applicability to the relation between normative ideas of multiculturalism and the materiality of urban space. The argumentation is supported by a number of diagrams as a “rhetorical tactic” for the adopted approach (Wang, 2002, p. 325).

**Outline of the thesis**

This research inquiry is an investigation into some ideas and concepts. This implies that it is not an empirical investigation into some experiments that possess the potential to yield some results out of an employed method. Rather,
the thesis is structured around discussions over conceptual concerns. The adopted ‘logical argumentation’ approach, however, helps the discussions to be structured based on an interdisciplinary mode of research. Furthermore, owing to adopting the logical argumentation strategy, it is of importance to gain a proper understanding of the primary system’s discourse prior to going through the secondary system. The outline of the thesis is therefore closely intertwined with the employed strategy of logical argumentation.

Chapter One: As is common practice for most doctoral dissertations, it commences with a preamble, describing the research background, the research problems, question(s) and aim, and the employed research strategy. This chapter commences with a brief discussion about de facto cultural diversity as an integrated part of urbanism and describes how research efforts on the built environment have been sensitive to the question of cultural plurality.

Chapter Two: This chapter explores how the politics of multiculturalism are addressed in urban planning theory. Discussing the theoretical grounds for the prevailing understanding of multiculturalism in urban planning debates, the chapter seeks an alternative approach to the politics of living together which helps provide insights into the role of spatial form in the situation of living together in multicultural cities. The underlying objective of this chapter is to spotlight a lacuna in the current theoretical approaches to the question of living together.

Chapter Three: This chapter seeks to depict a spatial frame of reference for addressing the ideas of multiculturalism in the spatial discourse. Using the logical argumentation strategy, the discussion devotes this chapter to introducing a primary logical system. However, as a background for the formation of the primary logical system, this chapter needs to elaborate on the concept of space, and its relation to society. As mentioned earlier, one of the weaknesses with using the strategy of logical argumentation is the large number of terms with which the conceptual frame of reference is described. Being aware of this weakness of the employed strategy, an attempt has been made here to limit the scope of the primary system to the minimum possible number of terms, however, without compromising the mission, which is to set the space syntax theory as a cohesive primary system of argumentation for the purpose of this research inquiry.
Chapter Four: This chapter delves deep into the conceptual framework established in the previous chapter, given space syntax as the primary logical argumentation system. In other words, it frames an applicative or secondary study on the relation between multiculturalism — in its general meaning articulated in this dissertation — and urban form based in space syntax descriptive theory. Here, the discussion tends to go deeper into the domain mapped by space syntax theory, and intends to reveal the role of movement patterns in shaping the patterns of ‘multiplicity’ and ‘co-presence’, the two organizing principles of a “civility of indifference” as Amin’s (2012) approach to the politics of living together. Despite being a secondary application, the portrayed logical system offers the concept of ‘overlapping space’ to provide a thorough grasp of the discussion’s intent. The previous chapters, in one way or another, provide a theoretical base for our discussions on ‘overlapping spaces’ in this chapter.

Chapter Five: Following our discussion on urban form for multicultural societies, this chapter will elaborate on ‘overlapping spaces’ through some common features representing basic demands on multicultural cities. Considering overlapping spaces to be the spaces where urban structure can provide the spatial viability for the emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’, the discussion here turns to a number of political concepts surrounding multiculturalism. In short, there will be an attempt in this chapter to narrow down our general discussion on co-presence and multiplicity to some common features of multicultural cities.

Chapter Six: This chapter discusses and summarizes the main conclusions regarding the role of spatial structure in shaping the urban habits of living together in multicultural cities.

About the licentiate thesis

The foundation of this dissertation is an idea that has been developed through my licentiate thesis⁵, Vestiges of Urban Spirit: Isfahan’s Urban Fabric through Socio-spatial Transformations. (Sarraf, 2010), can be retrieved and downloaded from the LIBRIS website, a national search service under the responsibility of the National Library of Sweden.
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⁵ - Based on the Swedish education system, Licentiate degree is an academic degree, which is a part of third-cycle (doctoral) studies, and is normally equivalent to two years of full-time study, and corresponds to 120 credits (KTH, 2014). My licentiate thesis, “Vestiges of Urban Spirit: Isfahan’s Urban Fabric through Socio-spatial Transformations”, (Sarraf, 2010), can be retrieved and downloaded from the LIBRIS website, a national search service under the responsibility of the National Library of Sweden.
Socio-spatial Transformations, (2010). The licentiate thesis’s main focus was centred around the relation between physical transformation and social interactions. However, it has been addressed through the case study approach as an empirical inquiry.

Investigating the city of Isfahan – one of the most historic cities of Iran with an urban form evolved over centuries – the discussions in the licentiate thesis try to provide new insights into the way physical transformations of the city have been processed over recent decades. In other words, the licentiate thesis can be regarded as a research endeavour to analyse how physical transformations in a city fabric may be related to social and cultural processes.

Notwithstanding differences in the topic, case of study and its context, and the employed method of approach, what links the PhD dissertation to the licentiate thesis is their common theme of studying the relation between materiality of urban form and non-materiality of social relations. In fact, the case study conducted in the licentiate thesis was the first step in my postgraduate research on how spatial and physical transformation on urban form may be a means of pursuing social and cultural aims in the hands of architects and urban planners.

In the licentiate thesis, the discussed theories on urban form and physical transformations led to an emergent interest to follow the same topic, but in the context of contemporary theoretical debates within architectural and urban design studies. In addition, revealing some theoretical lacunae, the results of the approach adopted in the licentiate thesis buttressed the underlying assumption that such a research inquiry needs to be addressed at a theoretical level too with a more architecturally-framed epistemological stance.

Therefore, after the licentiate thesis, the PhD path reached a turning point in its approach, and moved from an empirically based investigation on socio-spatial transformation, to theoretical debates on the relation between urban form and cultural diversity at epistemological levels. Nevertheless, the licentiate thesis played a crucial role in shaping the conceptual framework of this interdisciplinary PhD dissertation.

Link: http://libris.kb.se/bib/12053031
Chapter Two: Multiculturalism

Introduction

In this chapter, attention will be paid to two central questions to this dissertation. The first question relates to how urban planning theory – as the field concerned with the materiality of the built environment – approaches the politics of multiculturalism. The effort in this regard will be to unfold some of the ideas surrounding cosmopolitan urbanism as presented by some central scholars in urban planning theory. The main focus of the discussion in this part will be on Sandercock’s (2009) approach to ‘cosmopolitan urbanism’, and her efforts to “re-theorise” and “re-name” multiculturalism as “interculturalism” (2009, p. 219). This approach will be critically discussed and problematized in light of alternative theories of multicultural urbanism. However, the chapter will commence with a brief introduction to the theory of multiculturalism as discussed mainly by Kymlicka (2002), Parekh (2006), and further elaborated on the urban scale by Young (1999). The dissertation’s overall elaboration on the political theory of multiculturalism is framed according to Kymlicka’s discussions on multiculturalism as a normative theory for minority rights, which addresses the political ideologies of nations in general regarding ethnic differences. However, Parekh’s concept of “community of individuals and
“communities”, elaborated in *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain* (2000), with its close relation to policy and in extension urban planning and design, is a productive point of departure for this dissertation and its efforts to extend the ideas surrounding the political concept of multiculturalism into urban form theory. Similarly, Young’s (1999) ideal common polity of living together, what she calls “together-in-difference”, is an approach to the question of multiculturalism from the standpoint of political theory with emphasis on spatial dimensions, and hence is most relevant to this thesis’s efforts to interpret multiculturalism in terms of urban form.

The second question relates to how an alternative approach to multiculturalism can be envisioned which may help provide insights into the role of spatial form in the situation of living together in multicultural cities. The effort in this regard will be to seek an alternative approach to the politics of living together with broader applicability to urban form theory. The discussion here relies heavily on Amin’s (2012, p. 75) concept of a “civility of indifference” and its two organizing principles of “co-presence” and “multiplicity”. Although Amin’s approach to urban politics of living together is mainly developed based on his criticism of “strong expectations of mutual empathy” and towards expectations of establishing interpersonal and inter-cultural ties in public space (2012, p. 75), his concept of a “civility of indifference” has attracted the attention of this dissertation due to its applicability and relevance to urban form theory.

**Multiculturalism: a set of ideas and politics**

Although various interpretations can be connoted to the idea of multiculturalism, the common denominator is the politics of recognition. Fundamentally, multiculturalism is an idea of justice, which emphasizes the right of individuals and groups to be culturally different, and recognizes and embraces struggles against oppression imposed by dominant groups on minorities due to their cultural differences (Kymlicka, 1995; Parekh, 2006; Modood, 2013). The general idea of multiculturalism is a normative response to the prevailing cultural injustice and inequality in societies (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 327).

The political philosophy of multiculturalism is one of the normative approaches to the current situation of cultural diversity in western societies. The socio-political conduct of multiculturalism is framed and articulated, not in absolute terms but in a variety of forms depending on the complex determinants of the
spatiotemporal context. According to Modood (2013, pp. 40-43), the ‘multi’ in the term multiculturalism on the one hand emphasizes the plurality and multiplicity of the concept, and on the other hand, means that “specific policies, complexes of policies and multicultural institutional arrangements have to be customized to meet diverse (as well as common) vulnerabilities, needs and priorities” (2013, p. 42).

Contemporary multiculturalism is often said to have its roots in a speech by Canadian Prime Minister Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1905, where he said, “We do not anticipate, and we do not want, that any individuals should forget the land of their origin or their ancestors. Let them look to the past, but let them also look to the future; let them look to the land of their ancestors, but let them look also to the land of their children” (Roddick, 2010). In a sort of extension of this, Canada took the lead by adopting the Multiculturalism Policy in 1971 (Qadeer, 2005, p. 52), and in 1988 the Multiculturalism Act came into force, with the framework policy of civic participation, social justice and identity (Derouin, 2004). Recognizing and encouraging the practices and beliefs of individuals of different cultures, and opposing the concept of assimilation to the dominant or host culture, as is the case in most European countries, or the melting pot in the USA, the philosophy of multiculturalism has been developing ever since and is today embedded in both political and public discourse in Canada (Sandercock & Brock, 2009, p. 11).

Policies inspired by multicultural ideas more generally emerged in the 1960s as a response to a growing need for a definition of citizenship which does not surpass the historically inevitable differences of groups, “but to filter and frame them through the language of human rights, civil liberties and democratic accountability” (Kymlicka, 2010, p. 36). Multiculturalism as a normative theory for minority rights addresses the political ideologies of nations in general regarding citizenship and ethnic identities, but is also an ideology for the protection of three main groups of people in the western democracies (Kymlicka, 2010, pp. 36-7):

- Indigenous peoples, such as the Maori in New Zealand, the Aboriginals in Australia and Canada, the Sami in Scandinavia, etc.
- Sub-state national groups, such as the Quebecois in Canada, the Catalans in Spain, etc.
- Immigrant groups.
Given similar concerns and worries to those briefly outlined here, many attempts have been made to address the current situation of cultural diversity in the multicultural societies of the West. Societies with a degree of cultural diversity, including more than one cultural community, are categorized as multicultural societies. However, according to Parekh (2006, p. 6), a multicultural society could be perceived as a monoculturalist or a multiculturalist one, depending on its normative response to cultural diversity. In other words, different possible approaches towards a multicultural society fall into two primary categories of monoculturalist and multiculturalist (Parekh, 2006, p. 6). While the latter encourages and appreciates cultural diversity, the former turns its attention to the culture of the mainstream or dominant group in society. In the multiculturalist approach, the diversity of cultures is recognized and appreciated, and society respects the cultural demands of its diverse communities. In the monoculturalist approach, society tries to assimilate different communities to the majority or mainstream culture (Parekh, 2006, p. 6). A monoculturalist society runs the risk of privileging the lifestyle as well as the participation of the people of the main community in social practices (Allen & Cars, 2001, p. 2203). A multiculturalist society is associated with the “group-differentiated citizenship”, in which groups of people with socio-cultural differences demand a sort of citizenship that accommodates their differences (Kymlicka, 1995).

According to Parekh (2006), multiculturalism is about the relation and interaction between different cultures in an equal and just context, where one dominant culture has not imposed its values, norms and worldview on others. The multiculturalism perspective advocates the governance of multicultural community on the basis of recognition of the existing cultural and ethnic identities present in society, and stresses that a just governance of a multicultural society could only be derived from an equal interaction among diverse cultures (Parekh, 2006, p. 13). Despite what it may sound like, multicultural theorists maintain that it is not a utopian way of thinking, but a policy idea defining citizenship and a set of “actual policies in civil society” (Modood, 2007, pp. 15-16).

As a politics of recognition, the philosophical and political agenda of multiculturalism is about those facets of diversity and identity of individuals and groups which are embedded in, and derived from, culture (Parekh, 2006). That is, although multiculturalism is about diversity and difference of groups, it is more particularly about the differences that are related to cultures. It is about
groups of people who are categorized due to their culturally embedded differences, which might be in terms of beliefs or practices, individually or collectively, and the way they organize their lives (Parekh, 2006, pp. 2-3), and the way their personal and social identity is shaped (Parekh, 2008, pp. 8-20). Certainly, many differences in behaviour, however, cannot be associated to culture, and have roots in other logics than cultural ones (Madanipour, 2007, p. 142).

Based on the discourse surrounding multiculturalism, one of the factors that distinguishes this political approach from the liberal, conservative and other current orthodox philosophical and political traditions is the multiculturalism emphasis on social groups, cultural communities and the multi-faceted and fluid nature of communities. Given cultural affinities as one source of social groupings, it is of importance to conceptualize them not as coherent and absolute entities, but in a multiple and relational fashion to other identities and social categories (Young, 1990, p. 48).

In this respect, the report *The Future of Multi-ethnic Britain* (2000) – by Parekh as chair of the committee – is one of the first formal political endeavours to try to discuss the relationship between social cohesion and cultural diversity in the multi-ethnic society of Britain, and gives new insights into the way it should recognize social groups, communities and citizens.

Emphasizing the cultural aspects of ethnicities, the report avoids the racialized denotation of the term “ethnic minority” and argues that every individual in one way or another belongs to an ethnic group (Parekh, 2001). In fact, group differentiation – one aspect of which is ethnicity – is an inevitable aspect of modern complex social processes (Young, 1990, p. 47), through which each community or social group can express their similarities and differences in relation to other groups.

In the quest for a shared structure of authority or commonality as the source of social cohesion in a multi-ethnic society, the report casts light on the porous and fluid nature of communities. Parekh describes Britain as an example of a “community of individuals and communities”. On the one hand, every society is in essence perceived as a community of overlapping communities, i.e. each community, as a social group, has affinities to other communities, and is not internally homogeneous. On the other hand, all citizens are at the same time members of different political, civic, regional, cultural and other social groups.
and communities. Social processes, which constitute communities and define the individuals’ affinities, may however undergo changes over time. The report therefore maintains that communities are “fluid, overlapping, internally diverse, and subject to constant reconstitution” (Parekh, 2001, p. 696). In his later report *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: Reporting on A Report*, Parekh states:

“The report had said that, although communities were important to their members and deserved public recognition, they were inherently fluid, plural and overlapping and should not be allowed to oppress their members” (Parekh, 2001, p. 698).

Describing *community* as mixed and inherently fluid, Parekh (2000, p. 51; 2001, p. 696 & 698) emphasizes that membership of individuals and groups in communities is not restricted to specific rigid groups. Instead, every individual or group can be a member of a variety of communities simultaneously. Therefore, membership of different communities may overlap and bring about a situation in which an individual can be a member of two or more communities whose other members do not share the same cultural values, beliefs and practices. Given Parekh’s emphasis on the fluid overlapping character of community, and for ease of reference in this dissertation, the concept of “community of individuals and communities” is termed *community fluidity*.

In the next chapters, we will return to Parekh’s (2000) concept of “community of individuals and communities”, or *community fluidity*, which is of importance for our spatial discussions on multiculturalism. It should be emphasised here that although it may not be among the theoretically most developed ideas in multiculturalism discourse and is mainly a pragmatic approach to the politics of living together, the concept of “community of individuals and communities” is deemed to be of great relevance to the fields of urban planning and design, both in theory and in practice.

After elaborating on multiculturalism, the questions that may arise here are: How then have the philosophical and political discourses on multiculturalism been related to space? That is, how may a multicultural society be expressed and supported in space? And by extension, what spatial form may a multicultural city have?
‘Together-in-difference’: discussing space in political theory

The spatial dimensions of political multiculturalism have to some extent also attracted the attention of political theory, particularly when it elaborates on the spatial setting of the multicultural city. Millington (2011, p. 80) finds the roots of the contemporary multicultural city in the 1970s, the era he associates with the period of “repression, resistance, conflict and conquest” for the multicultural city.

For instance, as a part of the political conception of ‘differentiated citizenship’, and in a search for equality and justice in the multicultural democratic societies, Young (1999) argues that an ideal common polity of living together, what she calls “together-in-difference”\(^6\), enables people to live together while retaining their group affinities. Considering “segregation” as a social problem, Young (1999, p. 237) postulates that living ‘together-in-difference’ can be an ideal of desegregation, social equality and justice. In this way, she tries to extend the political ideas surrounding multiculturalism into spatial considerations, arguing that the spatial separation and neighbourhood clustering of groups per se is not wrong; rather, it is segregation that is problematic and wrong (1999, p. 239). Similarly, Vaughan and Penn (2006), coming from the opposite side, so to speak, of spatial morphology, maintain that spatial clustering can be a necessary and beneficial step in the complex process of socio-economic integration of immigrants. Young (1999, p. 240) describes three reasons why she considers residential segregation – rather than group clustering – problematic. According to her, segregation in residential areas: a) violates the equal opportunity for housing choice for diverse groups of people, b) reinforces social injustice by offering unequal access to benefits to some privileged groups while making it more difficult for some disadvantaged groups to have access to benefits, and c) makes it difficult to overcome the problems attributed to segregation by separating daily lives of people in a way that keeps the disadvantages groups out of sight in the city fabric.

Young (1999, p. 237) sums up the concept of “together-in-difference” as an ideal of desegregation, which assumes that “people dwell together in a common polity

\(^6\) - In the following chapters, this dissertation will use Young’s term “together-in-difference” in many occasions without referring to her again, rather it will suffice to use the term ‘together-in-difference’.
but are locally differentiated into group affinities. ‘Together-in-difference’ both affirms such group affinity and calls for equality of life chances across space’. In sum, the concept of living ‘together-in-difference’ is an attempt by political theory to set a spatial framework for multiculturalism.

Another aspect of the politics of multiculturalism that attracts the attention of political theory in framing a spatial setting for multiculturalism is the right to freedom of public expression for all minority groups in urban public space. As a criticism of the orthodox liberal-democratic states in the West, multiculturalists argue that although liberal-democratic states do not oppose the freedom of citizens to express and practice their cultural affinities in the private realm, they do not recognize any group-differentiate rights based on cultural or ethnic differences in the public realm (Kymlicka, 1995, pp. 3-4). According to Kymlicka (1995, pp. 3-4), similar to the adopted approach to govern the role of religion in modern society, the liberal-democratic states to some extent respond to cultural attachments with benign neglect, and try to exclude it from the state’s responsibilities.

There are, however, well-established arguments that no structured public space can be culturally neutral or free of cultural values and perspectives (Modood, 2013, p. 23 & 49), but rather are constituted (and biased) by a variety of cultural institutions. The aim to create a neutral ground for cultural expression in urban space may therefore be interpreted as naïve since public spaces are likely to be dominated by the cultural principles and interpretations of the dominant group and may not give minorities or marginalized groups an equal chance to attend public experiences and to express their differences. The cultural dominance of one group over others – or as Young (1990, p. 60) puts it, “cultural imperialism”, as a source of injustice – imposes a paradoxical oppression on the dominated groups. That is, on the one hand, both the dominated groups and their cultural values and norms are stereotyped by the culturally dominant groups. On the other hand, since the cultural practices and expression of the dominant group absorb all the dissemination, it may produce a sense of universality for its cultural values, and may convey an impression of inferiority over other perspectives. Consequently, it may hardly recognize any space for the manifestation of different worldviews, and in this way, may make others’ cultural expression invisible in society (Young, 1990, p. 59). Based on these discussions, it can be argued that the right to cultural expression in the public realm is an important aspect of the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’.
Hence, according to Modood (2013, p. 59 & 61), multicultural public spaces are neither about only the state’s neutrality and tolerance towards culturally different groups of people nor about mere respect for their difference, but about the support and “the remaking of the public sphere in order to fully include marginalized identities” as well as achieve public recognition of their beliefs, principles, and moral values. In this regard, most multiculturalism theorists call for a new politically constituted common culture through which different cultural communities are given an equal chance of representation and expression (Parekh, 2006, p. 223).

Despite considering other forms of equality such as socio-economic opportunities, the distinct feature of multicultural equality is “the inclusion into and the making of a shared public space in terms of equality of respect as well as equal dignity” (Modood, 2013, p. 57). Multicultural citizenship is based on a pluralized conception of equality through which “equality and ‘difference’ have to be expressed at different levels and woven together into a sense of commonality strong enough to encompass and counter-balance, without stigmatising, other identities” (Modood, 2012, p. 48).

Freedom of expression in public not only gives different groups an equal chance to practice and follow their cultural principles, but also provides them with new insights into others’ different worldviews, cultural values, and practices (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 82). In this regard, Hajer and Reijndorp (2001), researchers in political theory and public policy write about non-neutrality of public spaces, and argue that public proximity in urban spaces may offer the feasibility of a “shift of perspective”:

“The core of successful public space thus lies not so much in the shared use of space with others, let alone in the ‘meeting’, but rather in the opportunities that urban proximity offers for a ‘shift’ of perspective: through the experience of otherness one’s own casual view of reality gets some competition from other views and lifestyles” (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, p. 89).

However, the common polity of multiculturalism should guarantee that the engagement of culturally diverse groups in public space, as well as their expression, is not measured and assessed through the dominant group’s interpretation of conventional morality.
In a multicultural context, moreover, the public realm must accommodate the presence, participation, and expression of culturally different perspectives (Modood, 2012, p. 33), based on equal respect and dignity. It is of crucial importance to realize that giving different groups the legitimate right of cultural expression is not enough to encourage them to participate actively in the public realm. Notwithstanding holding the right and freedom of expression, if any group’s cultural expression is judged by others to be inferior, it runs the risk of self-marginalization, and creates the experience of “double consciousness” for the oppressed group; a situation in which, according to Young (1990, p. 60), one is constantly judging oneself through the criteria and values imposed by others.

To sum up this section, the spatial dimensions of multiculturalism have been – implicitly or explicitly – discussed within political theory. Different theorists of multiculturalism have stressed the necessity for a spatial setting for multicultural cities, and have tried to acknowledge the role of the urban fabric in the situation of living together with cultural diversity. However, the discussion on spatiality of multiculturalism in political theory remains mainly at conceptual levels and for natural reasons rarely encompasses a detailed framework of physical space and spatial relations in the urban fabric, since this must be beyond the reach of such theory. In other words, elaborations on multiculturalism in the physicality of urban space can hardly be expected to be fully developed within the scope of political theory.

Therefore, the framing of a coherent spatial setting for multiculturalism has rather been pursued by the disciplines dealing with the built environment or the materiality of urban space more generally, such as urban planning theory. The overall aim of those theoretical efforts has been to underline the role of the built environment in supporting living together in difference in contemporary multicultural societies. In this respect, the following section intends to illustrate one of the important approaches to multiculturalism developed from an urban planning perspective.

‘Interculturalism’: an urban planning approach to multiculturalism

The purpose of this section is to discuss how multiculturalism – as ideas proposing a distinct worldview and policy in the context of cultural diversity – has been interpreted, and subsequently addressed by theoretical urban planning discussions. The broader background is that since the early 1960s, there has been
a criticism of modern urban planning for its neglect of the diversity and multiplicity of urban life, rather explicitly supporting the idea of the norm. Since then, urban planning theory has increasingly been confronted with questions of cultural recognition (Fincher & Iveson, 2008, p. 119). Despite adopting different theoretical approaches, according to Qadeer (2010, p. 11), sensitivity to cultural diversity has been the “touchstone” of multicultural planning.

As one of the urban planning approaches to cultural diversity, Sandercock (2009) introduces her concept of “interculturalism” by referring to a set of policies and ideas surrounding multiculturalism. Sandercock’s concept of “interculturalism”, which is a theoretical effort to extend multiculturalism from a set of politics into urban planning theory, is of importance for our discussion here for the following reasons: 1) Sandercock is one of the pioneers in the field of urban planning who extended multiculturalism into planning theory by referring to the main political theories on multiculturalism, 2) Sandercock (2009, p. 219) intends to expand and re-name multiculturalism as “interculturalism”. That is, based on an urban planning approach to the question of living together in multicultural cities, and based on her criticism of multiculturalism, Sandercock (2009, p. 219) intends to expand “political possibilities” of multiculturalism. Therefore, her theoretical endeavour may be considered of significance not only for urban planning theory, but also for political theory. 3) Sandercock’s “interculturalism” has been a primary source of inspiration for a series of urban planning efforts which consider it core to their theoretical approach to cultural diversity; for instance: (Wood & Landry, 2008; Hou, 2013).

Sandercock (2009, p. 219) addresses the challenge of living together despite all cultural differences by re-theorizing multiculturalism mainly based upon the multicultural context of Canada. According to her, under the umbrella of the state policy of multiculturalism in Canada, the practice of urban planning seeks a ground for an inclusive approach to accommodate diverse needs of all groups of people within society (Sandercock & Brock, 2009). According to Sandercock and Brock (2009, p. 16), the idea of the ‘cosmopolitan urbanism’ emerges in a context in which multiculturalism policy is adopted by a nation state where the granted principles and ways of life, as well as notion of identity, are challenged by the age of global migration and the life norms of newcomers to the country.

Given the articulated definition of ‘cosmopolitan urbanism’ as the acknowledgment of the politics of difference, the idea of cosmopolitanism in
Sandercock’s interpretation can be considered an approach to multiculturalism. According to Sandercock (2006, pp. 47-49), the political and philosophical theory of “cosmopolitan urbanism”, what she also calls “an intercultural perspective” or “interculturalism”, is centred on five components. First, the establishment of “the dialectics of identity/difference” through which the term ‘mainstream’ in the political discourse is challenged (2006, p. 47). Second, the need for the existence of “an agonistic democratic politics” in a culturally diverse society in which there is always an amount of inevitable conflicts (2006, p. 47). This approach encourages the participation of individuals and communities in a constant process of redefining norms, values and principles, towards reaching a “common ground and shared destiny” (2006, p. 48), despite recognizing the right for individuals and groups to be (culturally) different, which is the third requirement. Fourth, “the right to the city” which is the equal right of all people to be present in the city, express themselves, dwell in the city, and use the public spaces for social activities (2006, p. 48). The fifth requirement for intercultural urbanism emphasizes that the sense of belonging to an intercultural society must be based, not on ethnicity, race, religion or any other factor that lays stress on the difference, but on “a shared commitment to political community” that has roots in agonistic democratic politics and empowered citizenry (2006, pp. 48-9).

In order to conceptualize ‘cosmopolitan urbanism’, Sandercock (2009, p. 219) emphasizes the necessity to expand “political possibilities and identities”. She further asserts that the expansion of political possibilities finds its substance in re-theorizing multiculturalism and introducing the “interculturalism” idea. Following her elaboration on ‘cosmopolitan urbanism’, Sandercock writes:

“This leads me to re-theorise multiculturalism, which I prefer to re-name as interculturalism, as a political and philosophical basis for thinking about how to deal with the challenge of difference in the mongrel cities of the 21st century” (Sandercock, 2009, p. 219).

Given the mentioned five components, one can argue that all of the requirements of Sandercock’s “interculturalism”, not only are not in contrast to the ideas of multiculturalism, but are rather, as for example Parekh (2006) argues in the case of “intercultural interaction”, “intercultural negotiation” and “intercultural
encounters”, inherent in multiculturalism perspective on human life and the relation between individuals and groups.

Therefore, given Sandercock’s (2003, p. 5) acknowledgment of some main theories of multiculturalism, this research argues that Sandercock’s “cosmopolitan urbanism” – and its theoretical-political base “interculturalism” – should be considered neither a criticism of multiculturalism nor a new theoretical framework; rather, it can be inferred that cosmopolitan urbanism is a theoretical endeavour within the scope of the urban planning knowledge landscape, and along the line of multiculturalism ideology and its related theoretical endeavours in political theory. It needs to be stressed here that the concept of “interculturalism” has been developed in political theory too, and a number of discussions are going on about the differences and similarities between multiculturalism and interculturalism; see for example (Meer & Modood, 2011; Taylor C., 2012; Barrett, 2013). However, such discussions are beyond the scope of this dissertation and we will limit ourselves for the purposes of our discussion to summarizing that Sandercock’s “interculturalism” is one of the main urban planning approaches to the question of multiculturalism with a focus on intercultural encounter in micropublics. By taking this standpoint, the following sections will focus on how this approach has been framed in urban planning theory.

Sandercock (2009, pp. 219-220) articulates a set of premises to portray her ‘interculturalism’ theory. The core of her argument is that ‘interculturalism’ is built on “a deep political and psychological understanding of difference” (2009, p. x), or a mutual ethno-cultural recognition (2009, p. 195 & 215). To achieve this, she says, there is a need to constantly negotiate difference in everyday practices “in all banal sites of intercultural interaction” (2009, p. 220). Sandercock (2009, p. 225) states that “in these ‘micro-public spaces’, these sites of everyday encounter and prosaic negotiation of difference, people from different cultural backgrounds come together, initially in quite practical ways, but in these moments of coming together there is always the possibility of dialogue, of initiating new attachments”.

7 - To elaborate on the everyday encounter and social contact in ‘micropublics’, Sandercock refers to Amin’s ‘Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity’ (2002). This dissertation too borrows Amin’s term ‘micropublic’ to refer to similar public spaces.
Accordingly, it can be concluded that Sandercock’s theory of ‘interculturalism’ is based on the achievement of recognition through spatial encounters in the micropublics. Sandercock (2009, p. 227) describes the neighbourhood of the Collingwood Neighbourhood House (CNH) in Vancouver, Canada, as “a marriage of the theory and practice of cosmopolitan urbanism” in which an empirical reality of the ‘interculturalism’ perspective is shaped. In their analysis of the CNH, Sandercock & Cavers (2009, p. 125) argue that people of diverse cultures, living next to each other in a neighbourhood, can benefit from neutral places as an opportunity to establish intercultural interactions and relations. A neutral place, in their opinion could be any public space where different people, regardless of ethnicity, age, gender, language, and other affinities can actively and equally participate in a shared interest that is the only topic that relates them to one another. As examples of those types of activities in CNH, they mention playing badminton or gardening that brings people with different backgrounds, even with different languages, together and relates them to one another by the common interest. In other words, the common interest becomes a base for more developed intercultural interactions (2009, pp. 125-6).

Under the guise of providing services to the local needs, the scheduled activities in the CNH neighbourhood pursue three goals towards an appropriate approach to cultural diversity (Sandercock & Cavers, 2009, p. 185). First, it tries to build community based, not on any service to a specific sub-cultural affiliation, but on the very idea of common residency. The purpose of building community based on the location of residency implies that community is conceptualized mainly based on the spatial location of its members – which is the neighbourhood area. In other words, there is an intention to seek a correspondence between the social grouping of neighbourhood-ship and the spatial zoning of the neighbourhood.

---

8 - Inspired by Sandercock’s ‘cosmopolitan urbanism’, Wood and Landry (2008, pp. 321-4) define five principles of their intercultural city as leadership, city-making, city management, citizenship and, finally, bridging and mixing. To them, the principle of bridging and mixing includes every individual’s small attempts to make a contribution to the intercultural city, such as “an open gesture and warm smile or sharing a common concern or celebration to beginning to see life through the eyes of another” (2008, pp. 321-4). They look at cities through an intercultural lens, and search for the “intercultural spaces” including “spaces of day-to-day exchange such as libraries, schools, colleges”, etc., in which people from different backgrounds can come together (2008, p. 260). The necessity for social encounter in micropublics therefore shapes the theoretical base for further development of the concept.
The second approach to the services provided at the CNH is that they are not meant merely to meet the local needs, but they are seen as “providing meeting places where people come together, and connect through engaging in activities together” (Sandercock & Cavers, 2009, p. 185). The purpose of providing meeting places for an intercultural approach highlights the importance of co-presence as a first, but not last, step in the establishment of recognition. However, as they also admit, this coming together of people in a meeting place cannot lead to recognition unless there is a meaningful activity behind it in which they can participate. Hence, there needs to be an initial motivation, as the very first step, to encourage people to be present in the meeting place, and accept some collective responsibility.

As the third approach, CNH gives the responsibility for investigating the community needs to its local members, and considers them to be “researchers”. According to Sandercock and Cavers, not only does it boost the establishment of more contacts and ties, but also empowers the local residents in the process of decision-making (2009, pp. 185-6).

In accordance with the discussed practical example of ‘cosmopolitan urbanism’, Sandercock (2009, p. 183) argues that despite the fact that the national and international immigration rules and policies are the primary reason behind the emergence of today’s multicultural societies, it is at the local level, such as streets, neighbourhoods, parks and schools that the significant consequences of those policies emerge and affect the social fabric of the city. Given that in her elaboration on such local public spaces, Sandercock refers to Amin’s (2002) concept of “micropublics of everyday interaction”, it may be reasonable to assume that the main concern of ‘interculturalism’ theory centres around social encounters at the local level of micropublics.9

9 - However, despite emphasizing the importance of the local level in establishing and supporting the intercultural cities, Sandercock highlights that the larger national scale also needs to fulfill some requirements. Given that the local level, such as neighbourhood, does not suffice to respond to all of the questions of immigrants and their needs in society, Sandercock (2009, pp. 188-191) underscores some requirements at larger scales, such as engagement of the political parties at the municipal level in integration plans, a supportive political system from the national to city and municipal level, some critical changes in the social and urban policies, emergence of new concepts of citizenship, and other similar requirements. In fact, urban planning for cultural diversity is rooted in different scales from national, regional, and provincial level to the neighbourhood and everyday-space level and therefore cannot be limited to one scale.
Spatial encounter in micropublics

To summarize Sandercock’s ‘interculturalism’, it mainly emphasizes the necessity for recognition and understanding of difference to overcome the difficulties of living ‘together-in-difference’. With the assumption that understanding of the difference is achievable through spatial encounters in public spaces, the main aim of this type of urban planning theories has been to reach a deep understanding of difference and establishing intercultural ties among culturally diverse groups of people through spatial encounters in micropublics. This aim has been followed mainly by attempts to provide the physical requirements of meeting places where there is the chance of spatial encounter in a neutral context. Therefore, the eventual target of this perspective is encounter at the local scale of micropublics.

While spatial encounters in micropublics may pave the way for deep understanding of differences between culturally more or less distinct groups, several arguments can be posed to this assumption. For example, what can serve as a common motive for different groups of people, with a variety of interests and values, to come together in urban micropublics and get along? Moreover, assume that through an intercultural approach and based on a common residency, people of a neighbourhood are encouraged to get together and establish a community. Then, what can ensure that the established spatial community – or spatial enclave – will not tend to develop a segregated area which not only spatially but also socially, is disconnected from the rest of the city? Also, some questions arise concerning the promises of recognition and that what would prevent the already privileged groups from taking over the decision-making process and disregarding equal opportunities for the disadvantaged groups to participate within the programming activities of the community (or the neighbourhood)?

A further critical question remains unanswered: to what extent is the underlying assumption about establishing recognition and gaining a deep understanding of difference through spatial encounter in micropublics defensible? This question can be approached at two levels. Can the achievement of understanding differences and establishing intercultural ties serve as a proper multicultural approach in hybrid and multiple societies of western metropolitan areas? Second, to what extent is this achievable through spatial encounter in micropublics? The purpose of this section is to explore the underlying assumption of achieving an
understanding of difference through spatial encounters in micropublics. Through a literature review on the concept of encounters within different fields, the ability of spatial encounters to establish interpersonal tie, and bridge cultural differences in a plural modern society is discussed.

One central argument is that social encounter among culturally diverse groups should not only be perceived as a source of conflict, but also a necessary step towards understanding difference. The argument is that there will be no chance to reach a just solution to avoid the conflicts of a culturally diverse society unless there is constant negotiation between different cultures to gain a better understanding of their differences (Parekh, 2006). For instance, Sandercock (2003, p. 87) argues that if there is no knowledge of negotiation, nor any interest in approaching others and learning from their differences, or if there is not any skill of intercultural dialogue and exchange between different cultures, then, each culture will try to impose its views on the rest and finally, different cultures will establish “a society of cultural enclaves and de facto separatism”. Therefore, diversity in a multicultural city should be accompanied by intercultural encounters and interactions between different groups, which, in turn, would allow different cultural communities to “mingle with one another”, and provide equal access to resources for every individual and community, regardless of their ties to a specific culture (Madanipour, 2007, pp. 143-4).

Due to the importance of the negotiation of difference in achieving recognition and consequently overcoming the conflicts of living ‘together-in-difference’, some groups of urban planning theories, such as Sandercock’s ‘interculturalism’ theory, aims at providing spatial sites at which this intercultural dialogues and negotiation of differences may occur through encounters. Here, the term spatial encounter is used to refer to the encounters that occur among individuals or groups in micropublics of cities. Addressing the question of living ‘together-in-difference’ through spatial encounters gives rise to three concerns:

---

10 - For instance, regarding such spatial sites at which “multiculturalism, [… as] a leap of the imagination” may take place, Sandercock and Brock (2009, p. 30) write that “The places you'll see this leap of faith are on the sidewalks of the city, on school playgrounds, on subways, at bus stops, in public parks, parking lots, sports clubs, queues in stores, at sports events, in high school gyms, child care centres”. These places can be interpreted as what Ash Amin (2002, p. 960) terms as “local micropublics of everyday interaction” and encounter.
The first issue in this theoretical frame of reference is whether dwelling ‘together-in-difference’ in an urban context necessarily demands a deep understanding and recognition of others’ cultural differences. In fact, this concern is rooted in the distinction between two different, yet akin, perspectives: 

\(a\) the recognition of the right to be different; and \(b\) the recognition of differences, \textit{per se}. This distinction becomes more visible when it seeks spatiality through urban planning theoretical debates and practices. Regarding the recognition of the right to be different, urban theory should, in utter accordance with the multiculturalism perspective, seek to provide public spaces for the public \textit{expression} of difference, and the espousal of equal rights for different groups of people to participate in public space and express their cultural differences. However, to achieve recognition of difference, as obtaining a deep understating of the difference between individuals and groups, it treats public space as the sites for the establishment of social ties through spatial encounters. These two different approaches to public space are visible within urban planning empirical endeavours that are aimed at addressing cultural diversity.

The second challenge to this approach is to determine the \textit{extent} to which spatial encounter in micropublics has the potential to establish recognition of difference, and to convey a deep understanding of difference among culturally diverse individuals or groups at all. In other words, the assumption that when people find themselves in a crowd or among many others, they necessarily build up social ties, is questioned through a number of research efforts; \textit{see for example} (Valentine, 2008). The question is therefore whether providing spatial proximity is necessarily \textit{sufficient} to achieve relational proximity.

The third concern is the potential scale of urban planning intervention in dealing with the culturally diverse city. That is, if the linkage between the politics of living together and urban planning theoretical debates is defined merely through ‘interculturalism’ – and its emphasis on spatial encounter in micropublics – as a result, the scope of an urban planning intervention would be limited to the micropublics as nodal isolated spaces, and hence, its relation to the spatial structure of the city as a whole may be overlooked\(^{11}\). Consequently, it may run the risk of what Amin (2002, p. 968) calls the reduction of public domain to

\(^{11}\) - There will be further discussions about the spatial structure of the city in the next chapters of the dissertation.
public space: “in the hands of urban planners and designers, the public domain is all too easily reduced to improvements to public spaces, with modest achievements in race and ethnic relations”. It would also be in contrast to the ‘interculturalism’ theoretical framework, within which it puts emphasis on a net of interconnected and interrelated scales in dealing with the question of cultural diversity.

Given the aforementioned concerns, there is a need to re-investigate the possibility of basing urban planning’s approach to the politics of living together on the idea of obtaining understanding of difference. Therefore, below we discuss the potentials of spatial encounters, their potential to establish social ties, and their relation to achieving recognition in public space. It is important to keep in mind that this dissertation has no intention to belittle or question the influence of understanding the difference and establishing intercultural ties on the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’. Rather, an attempt has been made to investigate if there may be other alternatives for urban planning and design to the question of multiculturalism that may provide insights into the particular role of spatial form in the situation of living together in multicultural cities.

Spatial encounter and ‘blasé attitude’

Since the late nineteenth century, the period in which modern society with its different characteristics and problems from traditional society emerged, the nature of spatial encounters between individuals in the public sphere of society has been occupying social, cultural, and political discussions. For instance Georg Simmel (1858-1918) writes on the possibility that culture is not necessarily dependent on the person and interaction – as George Herbert Mead (1863-1931) in his theory of self had argued that society exists as subjectivity, “sets of attitudes, symbols, and imaginations that people may or may not use and modify in an interaction” (Allan, 2011, p. 148). In his exceptionally influential The Metropolis and Mental Life, republished in the Classic Essays on the Culture of Cities by Sennett (1969), Simmel writes about the tension between objective culture and individuals’ subjective experiences and interactions. Writing on the problems of modern life in metropolitan cities, Simmel argues that human behaviour follows a “blasé attitude”, not only towards the city’s potential, but also to one another. To him, “the essence of the blasé attitude is an indifference toward the distinctions between things. Not in the sense that they are not perceived, as is the case of mental dullness, but rather that the meaning and the
value of the distinctions between things, and therewith of the things themselves, are experienced as meaningless” (Simmel, 1969, p. 14). He states that the psychological existence of human nature is dependent on differences, and the human mind is constantly “stimulated by the difference between present impressions and those which have preceded” (Simmel, 1969, p. 11). According to Simmel, since the human mind receives too many different modifications and contradictions in the modern metropolis, it creates a protective feature against these ongoing external disruptions. That is, there is an intensification of the consciousness and acknowledgment mental dominance over feelings and emotional responses. Therefore, “the reaction of the metropolitan person to those events is moved to a sphere of mental activity which is least sensitive and which is furthest removed from the depths of the personality” (Simmel, 1969, p. 12), which per se leads to a sort of ‘blasé attitude’ or rational indifferent attitude in social interactions towards the external world (Bridge, 2005, p. 11), either human or non-human.

According to Allan’s (2011, p. 162) interpretation, although the ‘blasé attitude’ may come with a sort of indifferent manner or lack of interest and concern, however, it may reduce the possibility of conflict among different groups since too many stimuli from diverse social groups make individuals emotionally withdraw from deep emotionally investment and care less about the principles and goals of groups. Moreover, being overwhelmed by a flux of knowledge and emotional differences and their constant changes, one must overstate its personal characteristics and differences in order to express and convey himself or herself, or “to remain audible even to himself”, as Simmel says, “the atrophy of individual culture through the hypertrophy of objective culture lies at the root of the bitter hatred which the preachers of the most extreme individualism, in the footsteps of Nietzsche, directed against the metropolis” (Simmel, 1969, p. 19).

Since Simmel’s elaboration on ‘blasé attitude’ in the late nineteenth century, there have been a variety of research efforts on the nature and intensity of encounter among individuals in modern life (Knox & Pinch, 2010, p. 160). In this respect, some contemporary theoretical debates argue that increasing the number of encounters (in micropublics between culturally different individuals and groups) may result in the appearance of a cultural ‘blasé attitude’ without necessarily building up cultural recognition among individuals or groups (Allan, 2011). In other words, interventions of creating micropublics might lead to a different purpose than encouraging more meaningful spatial encounters. By the
same token, the assumption that by encouraging more spatial encounters in micropublics individuals and groups have a greater possibility to achieve a deep understanding of the difference is questionable. More than the quantity of encounters in micropublics, what attracts the attention here is the quality and nature of encounters as well as their different capacities. In this regard, the following section will try to elaborate on different types of encounters in public space.

*Spatial encounter: ‘weak’ tie, ‘absent’ tie*

Mark Granovetter (1973) focuses on small-scale interactions between two individuals, as well as their potential relation and influence on the macro-level patterns. By defining the strength of an inter-individual tie, based on the combination of four elements, viz. 1) the amount of time, 2) emotional intensity; 3) intimacy, and 4) reciprocal services, he categorizes three types of tie: *strong*, *weak*, and *absent* (1973, p. 1361). The overlap of friendship circles (which includes both weak and strong ties) has a direct relation to the strength of the tie between two individuals. That is, the stronger the tie between two individuals, the more connections they share. Each social circle of strong ties could be bridged to another one by interpersonal *weak* ties between two members of each circle, and as a probable consequence, the available information and resources of each circle could diffuse across circles by that bridge. However, this is not to say that every weak tie is necessarily a bridge, yet “all bridges are weak ties” (Granovetter, 1973; 1983).

Information therefore diffuses across a larger number of people through *weak* ties than strong ones, and any removal of the weak ties would cause more damage to the transmission feasibility (Granovetter, 1973, p. 1366). It is indeed similar to what Jane Jacobs (1961, p. 134) terms “hop-and-skip relationships” through which people of a neighbourhood could extend their “local public life beyond the neighborhoods of streets and specific organizations or institutions and form relationships with people whose roots and backgrounds are in entirely different constituencies, so to speak”. Consequently, the chance of being isolated from the knowledge, ideas, and influence of the people beyond one’s circle of friendship is much higher in individuals who have a smaller number of weak ties, which could bridge them to other social circles. In addition, weak ties are a “connecting medium” for inter-cultural links between culturally different groups,
which may be internally cohesive, but suffer from an overall fragmentation (Granovetter, 1983, p. 215).

Based on his theory of the *strength of weak ties*, Granovetter (1973) draws two conclusions. The first conclusion is that small-scale inter-individual relations are interwoven into the social structure of the city in larger scales but in a way that is “beyond the purview or control of particular individuals” (1973, p. 1377), and according to Blau (1974, p. 623), can be extended to a degree that supports “macrosocial integration”. Second, in establishing inter-group linkages among different groups, weak ties are more influential than strong ties, whereas strong ties encourage intra-group cohesion (Granovetter, 1973, p. 1376).

Similarly, Allport (1954) argues that contact between majority and minority group members in a society helps to reduce the prejudicial attitudes of majority groups towards minorities. When those groups come into contact with each other, they may obtain more information about each other, e.g. their lifestyles, norms, and beliefs. Their racial and cultural stereotypes may therefore be challenged by understanding one another’s life perspectives. However, the capacity of contacts to establish recognition among different groups, as Allport (1954) also argues, to a large extent depends on the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of contacts, as well as the context in which those contacts occur.

Despite considering three types of strong, weak and absent ties, Granovetter’s focus is mainly on weak and strong ties. However, it is of importance to distinguish the potentiality of casual spatial encounters in establishing weak ties. There is a growing trend, especially in urban planning debates, to have expectations of a bridging character, not from weak ties, but from *casual spatial encounters*. The result of casual spatial encounters is mainly the establishment of the *absent* tie, which is either a lack of any relationship at all or a “negligible” interaction of no significance, similar to the “nodding relationship” among the people who live in the same area (Granovetter, 1973, p. 1361).

Therefore, following the argument proposed by Granovetter we cannot assume that emerging spatial encounters in micropublics have the potentiality to establish either strong or weak ties automatically. Instead, it may merely lead to
the emergence of more negligible interactions\textsuperscript{12} and absent ties in micropublics, without achieving any understanding or recognition of difference.

\textit{Spatial encounter: necessary, but not sufficient}

The criticism of ‘interculturalism’ proposed here is that it expects a deep recognition of difference, as well as (inter-)cultural bridging aspects, not from weak ties, but from spatial encounter and negligible ties in micropublic spaces of the city. However, as proposed by Amin (2012), the presence of individuals in micropublics and their physical proximity and spatial encounter in public space, should be regarded differently from “purposeful contact” in space, although their similarities categorize both of them as sites of “togetherness” in ethnographic studies of urban public spaces. Regarding the difference between co-presence and what Amin calls “purposeful contact” in public spaces, he writes:

“Not all forms of situated practice bring strangers into purposeful contact with each other, capable of affective transformation through engagement. The social dynamic of working, living, playing or studying together is quite different from that of strangers rubbing along (or not) in public space or sharing a cultural commons. Co-presence and collaboration are two very different things, and the meaning and affective result of situated practice in each of these sites of ‘togetherness’ is not the same. But this is not to say that the negotiations of co-occupancy are less significant in regulating proximities and distances between strangers, or between majorities and minorities, than those of collaboration. They are just as influential, only different […] by turning to the ethnography of urban public space” (Amin, 2012, p. 59).

\textsuperscript{12} - Similar to Granovetter’s understanding of the difference between weak ties and negligible interactions, in his \textit{Behavior in Public Places}, Goffman (1963, pp. 33-148) categorizes social interactions into two categories of “focused interaction” and “unfocused interaction”. Regarding the difference between these two categories, Legeby (2013, p. 43) states: “The unfocused interaction is described as a kind of communication that occurs when one gleans information about another person present by glancing at them, as they pass into and then out of one’s view. Hence, this is somewhat like ‘[…] sheer and mere copresence’ according to Goffman (1963, 24). Focused interaction, on the other hand, is the kind of interaction that occurs when people gather close together and openly cooperate to sustain a single focus of attention, for example by taking turns at talking”. What both Granovetter and Goffman share on their theorization of public behaviour is that the mere presence or gathering of individuals in a public site would not necessarily lead to achievement of recognition or a deep understanding of their differences.
According to Amin (2008, p. 7; 2012), despite a close connection between the characteristics of public space and public life, the sociology of public encounters and mingling, cannot be considered a politics of the public domain, since spatial encounters in the city and public space are under the influence of a range of public sentiments and cannot be simply reduced to the specific time and location of the particular encounter.

In other words, the core of similar approaches to the politics of living together, such as ‘interculturalism’, is the degree and the intensity of recognition among people who are co-present in the public space, not merely the physical co-presence of individuals *per se*. However, as we have tried to discuss here, it is questionable to assume that the logic of recognition would necessarily be achieved through spatial encounters when people find themselves co-present in a crowd amongst many strangers (Amin, 2012). Moreover, bonding the essence of a spatial encounter to a specific time and location ignores the complexity of its socio-spatial relations. That is, if social relations and spatial networks are embedded in each other’s entity, the nature of spatial encounters should also include them. While reducing spatial encounters to their physical and temporal contexts denies the complexity of space-society relations, it should be emphasized that there is no intention to deny the role of spatial encounters and co-presence in micropublics as potential incentives to establish further relations. However, this potentiality should not be conceived as a *sufficient condition* to establish intercultural ties and to achieve a deep recognition of difference. In other words, as Collins (2004, p. 142) maintains, “material conditions for interaction rituals are necessary but not sufficient”, and they should not be regarded as the “main ingredients” of interaction rituals; partly quoted in: (Legeby, 2013, p. 46).

To summarize the discussion thus far, the underlying idea of gaining a deep understanding of difference and establishing inter-cultural ties among diverse groups through encounters in micropublics has greatly influenced current trends in urban planning’s approach to the politics of living together. However, a number of questions may arise here: Is *gaining a deep understanding of difference and establishing inter-cultural ties among diverse groups through spatial encounters* the only possible approach of urban planning to the question of living ‘together-in-difference’ in multicultural cities? Can urban planning and design, as the fields concerned with the materiality of urban space, consider other approaches to this question which may help provide insights into the role
of space – as for instance the spatial role of micropublics – in the situation of living together in multicultural cities?

As discussed earlier in this section, urban life according to Amin (2012; 2008) can hardly be narrowed down to ‘purposeful contact’ in public space with the expectation that it will necessarily lead to establishing inter-cultural ties and gaining a deep understanding of difference; rather, there are a variety of encounters in urban space which may have influence on urban life without any demand to establish purposeful contact or achieve a deep understanding of difference. How should urban planning and design address the situation of living together in multicultural cities given that urban life cannot be narrowed down to purposeful inter-cultural encounters? Why should urban planning and design focus on establishing inter-personal ties and gaining a deep understanding of difference as their approach to living together, while according to Amin (2012, p. 59), discussions on the qualities of encounter in public space and their power to gain an understanding of cultural differences and to establish intercultural ties should be addressed within the scope of other fields such as ethnography?

Moreover, as discussed earlier, there are many other determinants that invade the moment of spatial encounter in public space that may be beyond micropublics’ spatio-temporal affiliation. In this regard, Amin states:

“[…] many other everyday influences shape habits of living with difference, and that being in the world involves a host of relational affinities that substitute or surround the direct encounter. Feelings formed in many other relational spaces invade the encounter, mediating the labour of inter-culture and recognition among proximate strangers, and the physical encounter is no longer the sole or privileged space of relational contact. The encounter is always mediated” (Amin, 2012, p. 81).

Yet another question that arises here is that of an approach to the question of multiculturalism, why urban planning and design should put their emphasis on some aspects of encounter that, according to Amin (2012, p. 81), are beyond spatio-temporal geography of encounter – given the complexity of spatial encounter and its dependency on a variety of determinants. To address a politics of living together in urban planning and design, why not rather adopt an alternative approach with greater potential to be discussed in physical and spatial terms?
The following section aims to develop a more nuanced approach to the politics of living together. It should once again be emphasized that there is no intention to belittle urban planning efforts to establish inter-cultural ties and to achieve understanding of difference, nor to deny the role that inter-cultural understanding can play in the overall situation of living ‘together-in-difference’ in multicultural cities. However, with the aim of bringing the conceptual ideas and politics of multiculturalism into the reality of urban space, the following section explores the possibility of an alternative approach to the politics of living together.

‘Civility of Indifference’: Amin’s alternative politics of living together

Writing about the social sphere of strangers in society, Ash Amin (2012) casts doubts on the current vision of a good society, in which all of the effort is put into establishing a common life by strengthening the social, communal and individual ties, and weakening the difference. Endorsing the endeavour of the late twentieth century ideologies and movements – such as feminism and post-colonialism – to establish social and political structures in which various groups can enjoy respect and equality despite their differences, Amin (2012, p. 3) considers such a return to a quest for a communal society based on interpersonal and intercultural ties “regressive and unrealistic: regressive for its veiled xenophobia and exclusionary nostalgia, and unrealistic for its denial of the plural constituency of modern being and belonging”.

Following Bruno Latour’s (2005) concept of social as comprising human and non-human elements, Amin (2012, p. 60) tries to shed light on the fact that the geography of the physical encounters is not limited to the “immediacies of place” and “the friction of bodies”, and argues that the phenomenology of spatial proximity of humans to their surroundings and other humans should consider a variety of other influencing elements than physical proximity, such as experiences, objects, technologies, ideas, media, political situation, individual biographies, etc. Accordingly, he states that the social relations of the stranger in public space should be investigated through the lens of an “urban unconscious” – which is “the assembly of technologies, built form, infrastructures, services, rules of order and symbolic landscapes that urban dwellers unthinkingly negotiate” – in lieu of spotlighting habits of inter-individual encounters in public spaces (Amin, 2012, p. 9).
As we discussed in the previous sections, Amin (2012, p. 64) poses the question of whether urban sociality could be narrowed to the question of interpersonal encounters, when local habits of encounters are linked to the living situation in the modern city of today and to the society of human and non-human associations in the mode of Latour (Latour, 2005). He questions if the urban sociality can be narrowed to the concerns over interpersonal encounters, where the territorial city has transformed into the topological city of connections and networks (Amin, 2012, p. 64). Similarly, he questions if urban sociality can be narrowed down only to the issues of spatial encounter in micropublics where the city should be understood in the context of a linked global network with different types of scalar interactions or within the city of telecommunication and ICT.

According to Amin (2008), parallel to the change in the city concept, the role of public spaces in today’s city as the only “spaces of civic inculcation” and political formation is challengeable, since civic practice is not reducible merely to urban, nor is sociality in public space “a sufficient condition for civic and political citizenship” through dealing with the precognitive nature of human responses in public space (Amin, 2008, pp. 5-11). That is, if mingling and co-presenting in public spaces of the city – as one of the sites of civic – have any effect on the formation of civic inculcation, it is through shaping the unconscious “habits of negotiating shared space” (Amin, 2012, pp. 70-71), rather than establishing intercultural bridges by interpersonal encounter in public spaces. Amin (2012) also emphasizes that it is not to undermine the anthropology of the casual everyday encounter in micropublics, but rather to emphasize the fact that spatial encounters are under the influence of many other relational affinities that cannot be limited to a given time and place. According to Amin (2012), feelings around physical encounters are not shaped only by the immediate contact experience, but they are modified by the accumulation of their social experiences, as well as physical characteristics of the non-human, or as Valentine (2008, p. 333) enunciates, “history, material conditions, and power” are the interwoven ingredients of everyday encounters.

However, Amin (2012, p. 65 & 67) also argues that notwithstanding the porosity character of the city, there are silent urban orders or regulatory machineries, which dictate the unwritten orders and principles of engagement within public spaces and regulate the quality of living ‘together-in-difference’; what Rapoport calls “sharing of unwritten rules, symbols and behavior” and considers a necessity to avoid conflicts (Rapoport, 1977, p. 248). This is where the urban
policies and strategies at the *local level* influence the position of different social groups within society and their access to different layers of the city of the plural form (Amin, 2012, p. 65).

Urban morphology, more specifically, is the study of urban form and the built landscape through the fundamental elements of time, form, and scale (Moudon, 1994). Social forces and their constant changes over time are embedded in the material space, and our understanding of the physical logic and organization of the city. However, there has been the question of how these elements could be studied independently, but without the denial of other influencing elements. Amin (2012, p. 66) argues that urban morphology addresses the collective feelings towards the city and its people, including the geography of encounters and co-presence, through an *urban unconscious* entanglement of humans with the non-human, symbols, technologies, and nature. Akin to Rapoport’s (1977, pp. 345-9) arguments on the social, cultural, perceptual and cognitive influences of design and planning, Amin (2012, p. 68) articulates that urban form can influence the unconscious collective feeling and its reflexes in social judgments.

“Urban form itself generates distinctive public feelings: desires stimulated by the visual landscape, anxieties and satisfactions kindled by the quality of public service or protection, and angers stoked by the hidden rules of supply and allocation. These affective accumulations give a city its particular cultural feel, including reflexes of social judgment. The sentiments formed in the urban unconscious become a tool of differentiation and discrimination between minorities and majorities, citizens and non-citizens, social classes and communities. They shape, in advance of thought and will, judgments of entitlement and blame, quick-fire evaluation in public space of who is entitled to the urban commons. The qualities of urban unconscious and feelings towards strangers are closely interwoven” (Amin, 2012, p. 68).

A large body of literature exists on urban policies of encounters with a focus on conviviality, which seeks ways to establish ties and bridges in order to reach recognition as the essential factor in living ‘together-in-difference’; for example (Hou, 2013, p. 9; Sandercock & Attili, 2009, p. 227; Keith, 2005, p. 156; Back, 2004, p. 31); (Donald, 1999, p. 151; Holland, Clark, Katz, & Peace, 2007). There are some in this arena, however, who question the actual social ties, and the possibility of the establishment of recognition out of spatial encounters in public.
Sennett (1994) for example challenges diversity in Greenwich Village described by Jane Jacobs (1961), and wonders if it is “a purely visual agora”, and if the politics of a diverse civic culture could be translated to everyday social encounters on the street, and finally may “become something people feel in their bones” (Sennett, 1994, pp. 358-9). Following this scepticism towards the tie-establishing of the casual everyday social interactions and spatial encounters, and building upon the theories of conviviality, Amin (2012, pp. 74-75) enunciates the “principle of convivium”, in which he argues that a politics of living together is not necessarily bound to recognition and establishment of ties between strangers in public spaces, but it can be organized through an unconscious “c civility of indifference”13 to difference, based on “living together without strong expectations of mutual empathy”. In this respect, he considers “two organizing principles: multiplicity as the defining urban norm, and co-presence as being on common ground” (Amin, 2012, p. 75).

To sum up this section, Amin (2012) defines the concept of “collective unconscious” habits of living together, what he calls a “civility of indifference”, as a general politics of living ‘together-in-difference’ in multicultural cities. In the following chapters of this dissertation, an attempt will be made to adopt Amin’s concept of a ‘civility of indifference’ as an alternative approach to the question of multiculturalism from an urban planning and design perspective. To put it another way, this concept will in the following form the basis for the search for a spatial morphology that can support the idea of a multicultural society. However, before closing this chapter, there is a need to further elaborate on “co-presence” and “multiplicity”, which Amin (2012, pp. 74-80) considers to be two organizing principles of his ‘civility of indifference’.

‘Co-presence’ and ‘Multiplicity’: two organizing principles

In framing a politics of living together, what he calls a ‘civility of indifference’, Amin (2012, p. 75) considers two organizing principles, viz. co-presence and multiplicity. On his elaboration of the organizing principles of his proposed politics of living together, Amin states:

13 - In the following chapters, this dissertation will use Amin's term “civility of indifference” in many occasions without referring to him again, rather it will suffice to use the term 'civility of indifference'.
“For multiplicity to mean more than diversity placed in hierarchical order, the commons has to be widely understood as a gathering of equals, a meeting ground and shared turf. Such an understanding may grow out of habits of daily encounter between strangers, but it also requires acceptance of a commons valued as irreducibly plural and provisioning” (Amin, 2012, p. 78).

In this definition, what Amin considers the difference between “multiplicity” and the “diversity placed in hierarchical order” will be of importance for the following chapters of this dissertation. In our search for a spatial morphology that can support the idea of living ‘together-in-difference’, we will elaborate on different types of co-presence, which could be associated to either “multiplicity”, or “diversity placed in hierarchical order”.

Based on Amin’s discussions (2012, p. 76), a politics of living together in today’s city of technological machinery must guarantee that the needs of all of the groups with less power, such as newly arriving immigrants to low income groups be met and hidden discrimination under the guise of collective benefit and protection prevented14, and moreover needs to guarantee the active participation of different groups by recognizing their right of access to different means of urban life (Amin, 2012, p. 75).

In his discussions on multiplicity in the public realm, Amin (2012; 2008) maintains that attempts to establish multiplicity should not simply be interpreted as structuring hierarchical diversity and mix of uses and users of public space since it may lead to the dominance of the more powerful groups with their own interests. This is why interventions designed to encourage multiplicity and create spaces for inclusion and participation of diverse groups may emerge as considering special and separated public spaces for groups with specific types of usage (Amin, 2008, pp. 15-16).

The central point in Amin’s discussions on multiplicity and co-presence for the purposes of this dissertation is his emphasis on different types of co-presence and multiplicity either as “placed in hierarchical order”, or as “unregulated co-...
presence” (2012, p. 78; 2008, p. 15). For example, on the subject of multiplicity and its difference with “unregulated co-presence” in public space, he says:

“Multiplicity itself is the most obvious keyword of urban civic culture [...] as well as a source of urban sociality and emergence. Unqualified multiplicity, however, is no guarantor of any of the latter outcomes. Simply throwing open public spaces to mixed use and to all who wish to participate is to give sway to practices that may serve the interests of the powerful, the menacing and the intolerant. We know this from the daily abuses suffered by vulnerable people such as migrants, minorities, asylum seekers, women and children, those who look different; all victims of the cruelties that unregulated co-presence can bring” (Amin, 2008, p. 15).

With this, his intention is to highlight the possibility for different types of diversity in public space, and to emphasise that not every type of co-presence in public space should be regarded as multiplicity. In his explanation of ‘unqualified multiplicity’, Amin refers to public spaces that, despite having mixed uses and being open to diverse groups, or in simple terms, proving co-presence, cannot address the general demands on multicultural cities. More specifically writing on urban planning’s sensitivity to multiplicity and its difference to what he calls “unregulated co-presence”, Amin writes:

“It is just this kind of consequence that has forced progressive urban planners on many an occasion to seal off particular public spaces or parts of public space for sections of society at risk, as the history of women’s public baths or parks reserved for children confirms (Watson S., 2006; Iveson, 2007). Therefore, and depending on circumstances, policy effort to promote multiplicity as a principle of urban inclusion and civic acceptance of the right of the many to public space might indeed necessitate making special, perhaps even separate, provision in public space for certain groups in order to ensure that multiplicity does not result in harm” (Amin, 2008, pp. 15-16).

Casting doubt on the feasibility of establishing empathy between strangers in the plural city of today – which, for example, the contemporary discourse of ‘interculturalism’ emphasises – Amin (2012, p. 78) tries to widen the debate on living together and argues that in the multiple city of today, achieving “an ethos of the urban as a shared plenitude” seems more feasible. In his opinion, the city
must consider living together as a collective experience and must be supported by the improvement of what he calls “sites of shared living” (Amin, 2012, p. 79), allowing the common ground to emerge and a politics of living together to be established. In his elaboration on “sites of shared living”, Amin states:

“These sites are prosaic and well known. They include associations, clubs, meeting places, friendship networks, workplaces and spaces of learning that fill cities, where habits of being with others and in a common space and stances towards the city and the world at large take shape. They include the physical spaces – streets, retail spaces, libraries, parks, buildings – in which being with other humans and non-humans shapes sensibilities towards the urban commons, unknown strangers and multiplicity. […] They include the city’s public sphere – symbolic, cultural, discursive and political – in which collective opinions and affects of community and its constituents circulate” (Amin, 2012, p. 79).

Amin’s elaboration on urban ‘sites of shared living’, together with his emphasis on ‘physical spaces’ as a part of these sites, is a point of departure for this dissertation. What are the spatial characters of such spaces? How can urban design approach the question of living together based on such ‘physical spaces’, and address spaces which according to Amin, are the “sites of shared living […] where habits of being with others and in a common space” take shape? If these ‘physical spaces’ are of importance for shaping the habits of living together, as Amin argues, then urban planning and design as the fields concerned with the materiality of urban space could play a role in shaping the ‘collective unconscious’ habits; how can we study the role of physical spaces in shaping a ‘civility of indifference’?

Closing Words

This chapter has explored multiculturalism as a set of ideas and politics for living together in multicultural societies through the lens of political theory and urban planning theory. It was discussed how the spatial dimensions of multiculturalism have attracted the attention of political theory, e.g. where Young (1999) elaborates on the concept of “together-in-difference”, and of urban planning theory, e.g. where Sandercock (2009) tries to address the challenge of living with difference through the concept of “interculturalism”. It was also described how Amin (2012) develops his concept of a “civility of indifference” as a collective
*unconscious* or *habit* of living together in diversity. Basing his idea on a criticism of the current expectations of interpersonal tie-building through everyday encounters in micropublics and in search for an urban habit that may decrease public interest in difference, Amin (2012, p. 78) argues that the two organizing principles of a ‘civility of indifference’, i.e. ‘multiplicity’ and ‘co-presence’ may “grow out of habits of daily encounter between strangers” in urban space.

Despite significant differences that these approaches to the politics of living together may have, this dissertation will highlight the two commonalities they share. First, they lay emphasis on the spatial dimensions of the politics of living together. Second, notwithstanding constant emphasis on the spatial dimensions of living together, a lack of theory of spatial form among them is evident.

In simple terms, if physical co-presence and daily encounter in urban public spaces – either with the purpose of building ‘intercultural’ ties or with the purpose of shaping an urban habit of a ‘civility of indifference’ – are of importance for the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’ and for an approach to multiculturalism, there will then be a need for a spatial theory to explain how spatial co-presence may come about in the urban space and how the urban space may play a role in establishing different patterns of *multiplicity* and *co-presence* in the urban space.

Uncovering what may be called a theoretical lacuna in this regard in discussions on the spatial dimensions of multiculturalism, the aim of the following chapters is therefore to investigate the spatial morphology of urban spaces where daily encounters come about. Adopting Amin’s ‘civility of indifference’ as this dissertation’s approach to the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’ in multicultural cities, the next chapter will discuss how urban form may leave its mark on the patterns of *multiplicity* and *co-presence*. 
Chapter Three: Urban Form and Living
‘Together-in-Difference’

Introduction

Given ‘logical argumentation’ as the research strategy chosen in this thesis to address the relation between multiculturalism and urban form, this chapter is devoted to introducing a primary logical system. The chapter therefore seeks to depict a spatial frame of reference for addressing multiculturalism in the spatial discourse. However, as a background to the formation of the primary logical system, the chapter needs to elaborate on the concept of space, and its relation to society. The main aim of the chapter is therefore to set the space syntax theory as a cohesive primary system of argumentation for the purposes of this research inquiry.

Earlier chapters have explored how the politics of multiculturalism – attempting to establish proper grounds and relations among culturally diverse groups according to viable principles of justice – have attracted the attention of urban planning theory. More precisely, the concern of accommodating cultural differences in the physical structure of cities has generated theoretical efforts regarding how to use critical ideas of multiculturalism in the discourse on planning and the built environment.
The conclusion was also drawn that multiculturalist ideas have in the urban planning discourse, speaking in general, in physical terms mainly been conceptualized as the need to provide local sites, places, in the city that can increase intercultural ties. This was by extension interpreted to mean that urban planning theory primarily discerns the achievement of recognition of cultural differences as the approach to the situation of living together with cultural differences in a multicultural context.

Later in the previous chapter, however, the position that the nub of multicultural urbanism is the provision of spatial encounters with the aim to achieve cultural recognition, was challenged. The criticism was based on the grounds that ‘the geography of encounter is not reducible to a specific moment and place’. Rather, as argued by Amin, there are many other factors, both spatial and non-spatial, that invade the moment of spatial encounter and deeply influence the interaction (Amin, 2012, p. 81). Hence, it was argued that the complexity of multiculturalism cannot be reduced to the simple question of spatial encounter. Following on from that, it was suggested that there is a need in urban planning theory to seek an alternative general policy approach on which it can, in a more comprehensive manner, re-conceptualize its sensitivity to multiculturalism.

In this dissertation, the proposed alternative approach to living ‘together-in-difference’ based on Amin’s ideas that emphasize an urban unconscious (or habit) that takes the shape of a ‘civility of indifference’ to difference (Amin, 2012), rather than the ‘achievement of recognition through spatial encounters’, typical for planning theory. In stark contrast to the latter idea that searches for the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’ in bridging cultural differences and achieving cultural recognition, Amin identifies the approach to the question of living ‘together-in-difference’ in the idea of a kind of “culture of the urban unconscious that diminishes public interest in [cultural] differences” (Amin, 2012, p. 75). That is, a collective urban culture that finds its place across the opposite ends of the spectrum of ‘blasé attitude’ and cultural recognition; or a “a collective unconscious as a civility of indifference, a skill of co-habitation without rancour, […], a politics of living together without strong expectations of mutual empathy” (Amin, 2012, p. 75).  

15 - It must be stressed here again that the concept of the ‘civility of indifference’ is within the scope of the politics of recognition.
However, to be able to explore the feasibility of interpreting central ideas of multiculturalism in terms of urban form theory – more specifically based on the concept of ‘civility of indifference’ (Bailey, 1996, p. 168; Amin, 2012) – it is necessary to address the question of how the physical structure of cities, or their urban form, can be linked to and influence social groupings, generally speaking. In other words, we need to understand how the physical built form of cities plays a role in the creation and sustainment of social groups in cities. Hence, the following section will briefly investigate theories about the relation between urban space as defined by built form – that we here call spatial form – and social groupings. The purpose of this section is to prepare the ground for a convincing relationship between spatial domains and cultural communities that may prove relevance for ideas of multiculturalism.

Before exploring the possible avenues towards such a relationship, there is need to cast a glance at some of the primary notions for this dissertation, such as city, culture, society and space. In fact, a better understanding of the notions of city and culture is the first step towards understanding their relationship and, by extension, analysing the spatial manifestation of that relationship. In the same manner, a first step towards realising the space-society relationship is to develop a clear conceptualization of the two terms space and society.

City and culture

Given an understanding of ‘cultural diversity’ as an intrinsic characteristic of cities, which we have argued for in the earlier chapters, there must also be some correspondence between such features and the spatial form of cities.\textsuperscript{16} In fact, for studying society (and its different traits like cultural aspects) through the lens of space (and the spatial organizations of the city), as is intended in this dissertation, we need theoretical and analytical approaches whereby this complexity of interrelated conceptual and physical landscapes can be described.

Urban settings have a variety of organizations such as spatial, temporal and perceptual (Rapoport, 1977, p. 21). The principles of these organizations depend

\textsuperscript{16} - Although the term city implies a labyrinth of different interwoven social, political, physical, cultural, economic and other institutions which can hardly be reduced to only one aspect, the term spatial form of the city is used to refer to the physical dimension of the built environment; or more specifically the spatial structure of cities as defined by build form and landscaping.
on multiple determinants that can be categorized as spatial and non-spatial. In order to understand and analyse the spatial organization, the non-spatial determinants, for example “perceptions, cognition and evaluation of environmental quality, images, values and many socio-cultural variables”, need to be understood (Rapoport, 1977, p. 21). Attachment of the perception and evaluation of the environmental quality to a variety of socio-cultural values and norms, on the one hand, validates the rationale for cultural studies in discussions of urban design and urban form, and on the other hand, safeguards against simplifications of common human needs at the cost of cultural variation (Rapoport, 1977, p. 22). According to Parekh (2006), Cultural differences play a significant role not only in cognition and perception of the built environment, but generally speaking in moral values and structures.

The history of urbanism has naturally been closely integrated with the social and cultural aspects of human life. It is generally acknowledged how the city, as the largest spatio-temporal product of societies, has been a collective arena for the manifestation of both the materiality and immateriality of cultures. However, it is less recognised that this arena in itself, the physical urban landscape, can be regarded as a kind of text from which the deep layers of values and norms in different societies can be read (Knox & Pinch, 2010, p. 41). There has therefore always also in this direct but profound sense been a mutual relationship between cities and cultures, where the spatial form of cities not only contains culture but carries cultural implications in itself so that any change in the container may have repercussions on the contained as well. However, in many postmodernist studies of the city and society (Ellin, 1999, p. 274), this relation is primarily not understood as a causal relation but in the form of a mutual and intertextual relation, where both the city and culture are products and intrinsic parts of each other. In addition to the complex interrelation between the city and culture, each one is a highly subjective term in itself, both in general and with regard to the specific spatio-temporal context in which they are applied. That is, both our comprehension and evaluation of the terms may be heavily dependent on the temporal and spatial context.

Having said that, despite the difficulties of arriving at an irrefutable definition of culture, this dissertation needs to clarify its standpoint on this concept, however rough a sketch it may be. As a start, a most comprehensive definition of culture, borrowed from one of the more influential policy documents concerning multiculturalism, is “a historically created system of meaning and significance
or, what comes to the same thing, a system of beliefs and practices in terms of which a group of human beings understand, regulate and structure their individual and collective lives” (Parekh, 2006, p. 143). This general meaning can be attached to constitutive elements of cultures, as for instance suggested by Knox and Pinch (2010, p. 41): values, norms and material objects, where culture: “defines the meaning or point of human activities, social relations and human life in general, and the significance or value to be attached to them” (Parekh, 2008, p. 80). Culture as a system of beliefs, values, and practices, with its both material and non-material manifestations, is inextricably interwoven also with social, political and economic institutions. Any change in any of these influential determinants therefore affects the culture of a society. This mutual relation between culture and other powerful factors is the reason for the intrinsically dynamic nature of culture, and why a stable definition of either the idea of culture in general, or any specific culture, is more or less impossible to reach (Parekh, 2006, pp. 152-3; Madanipour, 2007, pp. 141-2).

Akin to, yet different from, culture, the concept of the city has naturally to equal degree been undergoing change over time, both when it comes to its more precise definitions and the discourses that have come with it. During the period from the industrial revolution up to the 1960s, including the era dominated by Modernism in western urbanism, cities were faced with massive physical interventions and saw tremendous growth, not only the physical fabric of cities, but also the definition of urbanism per se underwent significant changes; the term city was constantly being redefined in order to be able to cope with and correspond to the massive socio-spatial changes that took place in cities all over the world. Regarding the rich production of new ideas in the discourse of urbanism after World War II and the constantly repeated efforts in reconceiving urbanism and the city, Ellin states:

“with the tremendous growth of suburbs around central cities after the World War II, the juridical term city no longer corresponded to a significant entity and was replaced by the technical term SMSA (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area), defined as a central city with at least 50,000 inhabitants and its surrounding communities which maintain a high degree of political and economic integration with the center. In 1968, the French geographer Jean Gottmann coined the term ‘megalopolis’ to describe linkages of SMSAs in the United States. Melvin Webber called this the ‘non-place urban realm’ (1964); Lewis Mumford called it the
‘anti-city’ (1962); Kenneth Jackson called it the ‘centerless city’ (Jackson, 1985, pp. 265-66); and Bennett Berger declared that we have been creating ‘an urban civilization without cities’ (1960). Echoing H.G. Wells, Francoise Choay proposed the term ‘post-urban’ to describe our current condition, saying, ‘This term would […] permit us to let go of the imagery […] of the large city of grand assemblages born of a time when technology and the economy demanded concentration’ (Choay, 1970, p. 1152). Other proposed ways of reconceiving the city (and the suburbs) since the 1960s include ‘collage city’ (Rowe and Koetter), the ‘megaburb,’ the ‘technoburb’ (Fishman, 1987), ‘cyburbia’ (Sorkin, Dewey), ‘exopolis’ (Soja), the ‘new city’ (Fishman, 1992), and the ‘100-mile city’ (Sudjic). […] Manuel Castells (1972) proposed that we define urbanization in global terms as the integration of regions into the world system and that we define urbanism as the culture of the world system. […] Along with the extended power of the state, mass media, and transnational corporations, the enclosed space of older cities was transformed into what Henry Lefebvre (1974) called ‘abstract space,’ where place became inconsequential, generalized, undifferentiated, indefinite, and undefined” (Ellin, 1999, pp. 272-3).

This development was naturally also reflected in urban planning and design theory, as a part of fundamental changes in the professional practice in these disciplines during the twentieth century (Broadbent, 1990). However, many of the emergent theories and conceptualizations were more often based on normative statements according to preferences regarding what constituted the ‘good city’, rather than analytical understanding of the complexity of cities and their real problems, which constituted the basis for Jane Jacobs’ famous critique (1961, pp. 558-585). For instance, in the early twentieth century (and in the British context in particular), the anti-urbanism movement with its tendency to reject the industrial urban society and its aim to preserve the traditional socio-spatial fabric of cities (Taylor N. , 1998, p. 28 & 47) was a typical normative response to the massive changes in society and the contemporary emergence of a new urbanism. In fact, normative theories from Howard to Le Corbusier and from Krier to Koolhaas have been the norm in urban planning and design and also play an intrinsic part in critical and semi-scientific texts such as, Alexander’s The Timeless Way of Building (1979), Lynch’s Good City Form (1981) and Allan Jacobs and Donald Appleyard’s Towards an Urban Design Manifesto (1987), also including Jane Jacobs’ The Death and Life of Great
American Cities (1961). This process of re-conceiving urban values and urbanism has never stopped; neither have its reflections in urban design practice.

In a nutshell, both city and culture are terms used to refer to pluralistic and dynamic entities, which are in constant change over time, why they need to be constantly re-conceived, re-contextualized, and re-conceptualized. Attempting interdisciplinary research on the mutual relation between cities and culture thus requires a deep investigation to ascertain which features of each can be extracted and be extended into the other. Hence, there is not only a need to specify and examine which features of culture can be identified and extended into the physical fabric of cities – what we in our particular context of multiculturalism in the earlier chapters have identified as an alternative approach to politics of living together under the concept of a ‘civility of indifference’ and its two principles of ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’ – but also what features of spatial form can be extended to attributes of culture.

Spatial frame of reference

Conceptualizations of space have formed the bedrock of many scientific, philosophical and political discussions in modern times. Space, as Crang and Thrift put it: “is the flesh that flatters the bones of theory” (2000, p. 1). But what is space? “Is space a material thing in which all material things are to be located? […] Or] if space is not matter, is it merely the sum of all spatial relations between material things?” (Tschumi, 1994, pp. 54-5). In what manner is the physical space related to immaterial processes? How is space more particularly related to society? How should space be conceptualized in a way that provides a basis for further material or immaterial analyses of this relation? These questions, as well as a myriad similar ones, have attracted much theoretical attention in philosophy, sociology, and geography, as part of what is known as the so-called ‘spatial turn’ in the social sciences. Naturally, few of these questions are settled. The aim here is therefore not to provide new insights into the theorization of space, but rather to select from this vast production a theoretical framework that can prove viable and productive for our particular intensions and needs.

In order to address the question “what is space?” in our particular context, that is, define what we mean by space in this dissertation, we need a frame of reference for the conceptualization of space. In other words, before taking a material or non-material side in the tug-of-war of defining space, we need a field of
possibility that includes a broad spectrum of possible definitions of space, from the conception of space as purely material to space as defined by visions, dreams and memories. It is only against the background of such a framework that we will be able to point out our particular definition and set it in relation to others.

One of the most commonly used frameworks of this kind in recent decades is the one put forth by David Harvey (2005, pp. 92-115). In the aim to capture the modes in which space can be realized, Harvey applies a *tripartite* division of spatial conceptions, which harks back to the classic debate about the ontology of space between Newton and Leibniz (Jammer, 1993). It divides spatial conceptions into the three categories *absolute*, *relative* and *relational* space. Within this framework, Harvey understands absolute space as rooted in Euclidean geometry and similar to Newton’s and Descartes’ conceptions of space; that is, space of “discrete and bounded phenomena including you and me as individual persons”. In social terms, this is “the space of private property and other bounded territorial designations” (Harvey, 2005, p. 94). Relative space, according to Harvey, is rooted in non-Euclidean geometry as expressed for instance in Einstein’s theory of relativity. The crux of the discussion around this category is that it here becomes apparent how space needs to be understood within an understanding of space-time, or a spatio-temporal frame of reference, due to the fact that in cases pertinent to this category, distance is to equal degree a temporal variable, as it is a spatial. The third category concerns the relational conception of space, which is traditionally associated with Leibniz’s view of space and time. The concept of space, as Harvey postulates it, is here an integrated part of processes and there is therefore no entity of space outside of such processes; there is no container, so to speak. That is, “processes do not occur *in* space but define their own spatial frame” (2005, p. 96). Contrary to the static nature of space and time within the absolute frame, relational space holds that “an event or a thing at a point in space cannot be understood by appeal to what exists only at that point. It depends upon everything else going on around it […] A wide variety of disparate influences swirling over space in the past, present and future concentrate and congeal at a certain point […] to define the nature of that point” (2005, p. 96).

After elaborating on these three conceptions of space (time-space), Harvey (2005, p. 97) finally also confronts the critical question of what space is; is it *absolute*, *relative* or *relational*? Hesitating to give a final ontological answer, he
instead emphasizes the “dialectical tension” and interplay between the different conceptions of space:

“Space is neither absolute, relative or relational in itself, but it can become one or all simultaneously depending on the circumstances. The problem of the proper conceptualization of space is resolved through human practice with respect to it. In other words, there are no philosophical answers to philosophical questions that arise over the nature of space – the answers lie in human practice. The question ‘what is space?’ is therefore replaced by the question ‘how is it that different human practices create and make use of different conceptualizations of space? [...] The decision to use one or other conception certainly depends on the nature of the phenomena under investigation” (Harvey, 2005, p. 98).

In his explanation of the dialectic tension and interplay between the different conceptions of space, Harvey (2005, p. 105) places his tripartite division of space against the threefold division of space proposed by Lefebvre ((1974)/1991, p. 38), i.e. material space (perceived space), representation of space (conceived space) and space of representation (lived space). He thus arrives at a matrix of nine different modalities of thinking about and understanding different conceptions of space and also extends the idea of dialectical tension to all nine modalities in the resulting matrix.

To summarize, Harvey does not limit the conception of space to one particular modality by which to think about space and spatiality. Instead, he postulates a spatial frame of reference for a variety of possible conceptions and emphasizes the dialectical tension between these conceptions rather than a final ontological definition. The crux of his argument seems to be that conceptualization of space “depends on the nature of the phenomena under investigation”, which may vary from bounded material space, to relative space and on to relational space (Harvey, 2005, p. 98).

With Harvey’s framework for the conceptualisation of space as a referential background, we continue our discussion, now focusing on the space-society relation. The question that arises here is how to conceptualise space when society

\[17\] - see this matrix at (Harvey, spaces of Neoliberalization: Towards a Theory of Uneven Geographical Development, 2005, p. 105).
and social relations are the primary concern. In other words, how should space be conceived for the purpose of studying the space-society relation, where the question of the space-society relation constitutes the general framework for our more specific concern, which is to investigate the possibilities of a spatial form that supports a ‘civility of indifference’. Naturally, this implies that we give the latter a particular interpretation and meaning, which furthermore can be contested. Again, the aim of this dissertation is not to argue for a particular multiculturalist stance, but to investigate how, if such a stance is reached, we can build a city that supports it.

**Space-society relation**

In order to continue our discussion on space, and to be able to conceptualize the space-society relation for the purposes of this dissertation, we need to briefly refer to the more recent framework for spatial thinking in human geography. After a long and scientifically rather bleak history primarily based in the mapping of the historical evolution of regions, the discipline of geography saw rapid scientific development during the quantitative revolution in the 1950s and 1960s (Johnston & Sidaway, 2004). Physical space was therein defined as an isolated object that could be studied and analysed by way of mathematical models and descriptive statistics (Rana, 2008, p. 266); that is, space was conceived as absolute and at times also as relative. However, in the 1970s and 1980s, as a backlash to such quantitative and often reductive approaches, the issue of the meaning of space as an experienced entity, possessing multi-facetted values, that is, space conceived as relational, returned in human geography (Johnston & Sidaway, 2004). Accordingly, space was re-conceptualized as a process or relationship and hence as a part of social, economic and other processes; space is “folded into” non-material social relations and the spatial analysis therefore includes a variety of social processes (Gregory, 2000, p. 769); in (Westin, 2014). Although analysis of physical and material space, as conceptualised during the quantitative revolution was still continued by many geographers, the theme of social relations were central and for many seen as an integrated part of what now was referred to as the production of space. In this regard, Gregory states:

“Some geographers chose to consider the production of ‘material, concrete spaces’ while others were more interested in the production of
“imagined, symbolic space’ [...]}. For all these differences, however, there was a general convergence on the socialization of spatial analysis and, hard on its heels, the spatialization of social analysis: like simultaneous equations, each was seen to require the other” (Gregory, 2000, p. 769).

In their introduction to *Re-Thinking Space* (2000), published at the height of the spatial turn, Crang and Thrift acknowledge the common understanding of space as necessary to conceive within the realm of social practice:

“What is very clear is that space is not considered by any of these writers [some of the modern philosophers and social theorists, whose ideas are discussed in the book] to be outside of the realm of social practice. Equally, the ecology of thought is no longer seen as somehow standing outside of the spatial. Geography has taken the same path, moving away from a sense of space as a practico-inert container of action towards space as a socially produced set of manifolds” (Crang & Thrift, 2000, p. 2).

The nub of the argument for many theorists of the spatial turn is that space should not be conceived as a concrete object of the physical world, but mainly as a process or set of social relations, that is, a decisive shift towards the relational side of Harvey’s spectrum. Of fundamental importance in this turn is Henri Lefebvre as one of the first philosophers to convey new ideas on the way space can be conceptualized, not least as a non-material entity. To him, space is more than anything else a set of relations. He claims that: "any space implies, contains and dissimulates social relationships – and this despite the fact that a space is not a thing but rather a set of relations between things (objects and products)" (Lefebvre, (1974)/1991, pp. 82-83). Lefebvre portrays space not as a physical or formal entity but more as a political and ideological process. Detecting the occasional indifference of physical space to its containing activities and experience, he claims that physical space is then the outcome of past social and political processes and relations, which may not be easily tangible through the formal features. In this sense:

“space is not a scientific object removed from ideology or politics; it has always been political and strategic. If space has an air of neutrality and indifference with regard to its contents and thus seems to be ‘purely’ formal, the epitome of rational abstraction, it is precisely because it has already been occupied and used, and has already been the focus of past
processes whose traces are not always evident in the landscape. Space has been shaped and moulded from historical and natural elements, but this has been a political process. Space is political and ideological. It is a product literally filled with ideologies. There is an ideology of space. Why? Because space, which seems homogeneous, which seems to be completely objective in its pure form, such as we can ascertain it, is a social product. The production of space can be likened to the production of any given particular type of merchandise” (Lefebvre, 1976, p. 31).

As stated earlier, Lefebvre’s ideas and his conceptualization of space as the product of social associations have been deeply influential in shaping current theoretical directions and general understanding of space. For instance, Shields (2006, p. 149); in (Westin, 2014), emphasises:

“We need to know space as not just about relations and distance between elements but as a social produced order of difference that can be heterogeneous in and of itself. ‘Knowing space’ is not enough […] we need to know about ‘spacing’ and the spatializations that are accomplished through everyday activities, representations and rituals”.

Inspired by Lefebvre’s ideas, Edward Soja puts “spatiality” or the production of space at the centre of social theory (Knox & Pinch, 2010, p. 300). Considering time, space and matter as three inextricably interwoven elements of the two-way process of socio-spatial dialectic, Soja (1989) finds physical space to be the product of social relations:

“Space as a physical context has generated broad philosophical interest and lengthy discussions of its absolute and relative properties (a long debate which goes back to Leibniz and beyond), its characteristics as environmental ‘container’ of human life, its objectifiable geometry, and its phenomenological essences. But this physical space has been as misleading epistemological foundation upon which to analyse the concrete and subjective meaning of human spatiality. Space in itself may be primordially given, but the organization, and meaning of space is a product of social translation, transformation, and experience. Socially produced space is a created structure comparable to other social constructions.” (Soja, 1989, pp. 79-80).
This socio-spatial dialectic, as a two-way process in which the spatial structure is produced through social relations and then influences or reproduces the social relation, has become central for many theorists on space. Gregory and Urry (1985, p. 3), for instance, postulate: “spatial structure is now seen not merely as an arena in which social life unfolds, but rather as a medium through which social relations are produced and reproduced”. This can be associated to Low’s (2000, pp. 127-8) expression “the social production of space”, referring to all the social relations that participate in the creation of physical space, and “the social construction of space”, which is about the transformation of space into experiment and action.

The socio-spatial dialectic paved the way for emphasizing the importance of spatial organization of society but in a context that it is in a mutual relation with social relations themselves. Massey (1985) for example, tries to shed light on the critical importance of understanding the spatial organization to be able to study the related social aspects: “understanding the spatial organization of society is then crucial. It is central to our understanding of the way in which social processes work out, possibly to our conceptualization of some of those processes in the first place, and certainly to our ability to act on them politically” (1985, p. 17). She challenges the assumption that the social process and structures can be conceptualized autonomously from their spatial and formal implications (Massey D., 1985, p. 18), and maintains that “social structures are in the concrete world constituted geographically […] it is vital that we accept, and continue to insist upon, the importance of space and spatial variations in concrete analysis” (Massey D., 1985, p. 19).

To summarize the discussion in this section, an attempt has been made on the one hand to show the importance of space in modern thought and on the other explain how the conceptualization of space as a social product has in recent decades dominated theoretical endeavours in both geography and related disciplines. However, there has simultaneously been a strong development in spatial research that in new interpretations can be said to continue the agenda of the quantitative revolution (Wilson, 2000), where new modes of urban modelling, such as cellular automata and agent based modelling (Batty, 2013; 2005), supported by quantitative statistics, have covered new ground, not least enhanced by the powerful tool of GIS. In the next section we will address a specific direction within this direction of spatial research that has its roots in architecture rather than geography. Not to forget, most urban policy to this day
remains based in rather conventional geographical analysis albeit produced using GIS.

**Space as social behaviour**

Following on from the previous section on the space-society relation, the discussion here turns to an architectural theory that approaches the question of the space-society relation from a spatial standpoint. By posing the question of whether space is “completely amorphous, and so nothing, until given shape by social agency”, Hillier (2008, p. 223) questions the assumption that “space in itself” is of no theoretical value and therefore useless as an autonomous object of study and analysis. Hillier and Hanson (1984, p. 9) argue to the contrary and find the roots of this, to their mind, misinterpretation of physical space in “paradoxes of epistemology”, i.e. in the quest for a relation between the immaterial minds of ‘subjects’ and concrete materiality of ‘objects’. While this is an issue with its roots in a long philosophical debate concerning a subject-based or object-based conception of reality, we can in short say that Hillier and Hanson are in concert with most contemporary theory about the need to overcome this dichotomy; however, they do this with a twist of their own. As a matter of fact, we can use the different modalities of space in the Harvey-Lefebvre matrix to illustrate this.

First of all we need to clearly state what they conceive of as their object of study, where, coming from architecture, this is exactly what we have called spatial form, that is, spatial structures or configurations, which is the term they prefer, defined by built form, such as buildings, roads and landscaping. For the pure geometric description of such spatial configurations, they understand space as ‘absolute’, which is most reasonable also according to Harvey, as we have seen. However, by emphasizing the idea of configuration, what is foregrounded is the relation between different spaces, rather than the shape or size of individual spaces in themselves, for instance, the rooms within a building or the streets within a city. Therefore, what is analysed in their research is what Harvey would define as ‘relative’ space. So far we are within the limits of conventional spatial analysis, but applied to architecturally defined space.

The twist is that they conceive of this built fabric, and the spatial configurations that it generates, not as an object outside of social relations, but on the contrary as a social relation in itself. This is so, they argue, since architecturally defined space, where we more generally should include any man-made structure that
create spatial configurations for human use, inherently reflects social relations, since the aim of built form is to support human conduct, where spatial configurations immediately mirror different social preferences in that they put people and uses in particular relations to each other. In short, we can say that Hillier and Hanson choose to overcome the subject-object dichotomy, most originally, from the side of the object rather than, as in most cases, from the side of the subject. That is, they conceive of the subject, and its manifold social relations, as written into the physical fabric of the spatial object, rather than the opposite, where the ‘object’ of space is continuously recreated in the mind of the subject. Hence, their ultimate aim is clearly a deeper understanding of relational space.

This conceptualisation of space is formulated as a criticism of orthodox approaches to the space-society relation, where, as an extension of this, Hillier (1996, p. 300) emphasises that space should not be conceived of as “a background to social behaviour – it is itself a social behaviour”. The core of the argument, hence, is that the spatial order of the built environment is itself a social behaviour, not merely a by-product of social relations:

“By the assumption that what is to be sought is a relation between the ‘social’ subject (whether individual or group) and the ‘spatial’ object acting as distinct entities, space is desocialised at the same time as society is despatialised. This misrepresents the problem at a very deep level, since it makes unavailable the most fundamental fact of space: that through its ordering of space the man-made physical world is already a social behaviour. It constitutes (not merely represents) a form of order in itself: one which is created for social purposes, whether by design or accumulatively, and through which society is both constrained and recognisable. It must be the first task of theory to describe space as such a system” (Hillier & Hanson, 1984, p. 9).

The critical thing here is that Hillier and Hanson are able through a new theoretical stand to retain the agency of the built environment while also rejecting the traditional but in the end incomprehensive conception of physical matter somehow directly influencing subjective behaviour. They manage this by allowing for an alternative conception of spatial form and the built environment: “prior to being experienced by subjects, it [the built environment] is already imbued with patterns which reflect its origin in the behaviours through which it
is created. These patterns are reflected first and foremost as spatial configurations” (Hillier B., 1996, p. 300).

Asserting that the real space, in his terminology – or “the shaped and linked spaces” – is where the mutual relation between space and society takes place in a substantive, rather than a simply contextual manner, Hillier (2008, p. 218) seeks to recapture the attention of social theory to the structured engagement of material space with social life. Therefore, the overall aim of this theoretical discussion is to study the real space, as a variable material phenomenon, its laws, and the way these laws have agency in social associations (Hillier B., 2008, p. 228). Following on from the claim that space has agency in human affairs, Hillier acknowledges that its agency implies neither a spatial determinism nor a direct causality between the physical environment and human behaviour. Rather, the spatial relations provide different conditions through which “different kinds of complexity in human affairs” emerge (Hillier B., 2008, p. 228).

Given the existence of a relation between material space and immaterial social relations, the intention here is to underline that despite that relation, both entities possess autonomous relations in themselves that can be captured and studied purposefully. In other words, in the same way that immaterial social relations can be studied independently, despite their relation to the material spatiality, there is a possibility to study the physical form of cities as well as their spatial relations independently of their embedded social relations. That is, just as spatial form is already part of human behaviour and social relations, human behaviour and social relations are already part of spatial form. This approach to the space-society relation provides us with two important advantages for studies of the city and urban processes. First, it acknowledges the existence of a relation between the physical structure of the city and immaterial social relations in society. Second, it provides a foundation from which to argue that real space – the shaped and linked physical spaces – can be analysed and understood systematically and independently in its own right.

We also see how understanding space neither as a physical object nor as a mere background to social behaviour, but as a social behaviour in itself (Hillier B., 1996, p. 300), is also a response to the orthodox criticism of the space-society dichotomy, where the general argument is that by simply dividing the space-society relation into the entities of space and society and conceptualising them
independently of each other, this will lead to loss of essential dimensions of this relation.

To summarize, there is no intention in Hillier and Hanson’s approach of spatial form as social behaviour in itself to claim that physical space is not part of immaterial processes, nor to declare a spatial determinism in the space-society relation. Rather, the overall aim is to address the space-society dichotomy through the prism of physical space and its configurations and to argue that such spatial configurations create a particular set of potentials that may trigger, direct and sustain the emergence of some types of social relations rather than others. The question that arises here is what implications such a shift in the understanding of the subject-object dichotomy, including the relation between space and society, more particularly has on theories of urban design and its adjacent practices.

**Non-correspondence space-society**

To answer the question at the end of the earlier sections, there is need for a brief recapitulation of the epistemological debate on the space-society relation in urban planning and design since the early 1960s, where the theme is an evolving criticism of modernism. However, this criticism can be divided into two steps. First, there is the criticism of the early 1960s by people like Jane Jacobs (1961), Kevin Lynch (1960) and Christopher Alexander (1964; 1965), which remained faithful to ‘modern rationality’ but questioned how it had been applied to urbanism. If anything, it constituted an argument for the need of a deeper rationality in urbanism, for instance, the need to acknowledge the complexity of urban systems. Second, there is the critical debates beginning in the early 1970s, which went beyond a simple criticism of modernism in architecture, and in fact targeted the modern conception of rational knowledge, later to become known in common parlance as postmodernism. In architecture this took the form of a decisive shift from the obsession with function in modernism, which typically asked for measurements and quantitative analysis, to a new-found interest in meaning, where we find typical contributions by people like Robert Venturi (1966), Aldo Rossi (1966) and Charles Jencks (1977), which opened up for the more fluid methodological landscape of semiotic interpretation.

While presenting their first main contribution fairly late in this development in 1984, Hillier & Hanson clearly belong to the first group, but critically addresses
both debates. They do so by summarising contemporary approaches to the space-society relation into two categories: on the one hand the *territoriality* approaches and on the other the *semiotic* approaches.

The reasoning behind their criticism of the semiotic approach is that “semiologists”, as they put it, “for the most part are attempting to show how buildings represent society as signs and symbols, not how they help to constitute it through the way in which the configurations of buildings organise space. They are in effect dealing with social meaning as something which is added to the surface appearance of an object, rather than something that structures its very form” (Hillier & Hanson, 1984, p. 8). It is obvious that their criticism here is rooted in the earlier discussed issue of the subject-object dichotomy based on which architectural artefact, such as buildings, is perceived not as social behaviour in itself, but as the product of social relations, or as in this case, human interpretation, whereby architectural form may carry social meanings through its appearance.

In the end, Hillier and Hanson spend little time on what they call the semiologists and their discussion in this direction remains rather superficial. Their main argument concerns the conception of the space-society relation theories of territoriality, which they identify as the most important for this relation in studies of the urban environment (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, p. 251). Territorial theories are, generally speaking, based on the idea that relations between spatial form and society are found as a relation between spatial demarcations and social groupings; that is, identifying the grouping phenomenon as the linkage point between society and space; for discussions on territoriality see (Gottmann, 1973; Rapoport, 1977; 1994; Sack, 1986).

However, according to Hillier and Hanson (1987), the territorial approach falls under two categories. The first group of territorial theories maintains that spatial ordering must adapt and reflect the territorial nature of human beings by corresponding to various levels of social groupings. These theories criticize the non-correspondence in modern urban planning and design between its floating and heterogeneous spatiality and the spatial demands of essential social groupings, which ignores the territorial nature of human beings. Hence, they argue that: “space and the behavior associated with it must be regulated” (Lynch, 1981, p. 205). They, moreover, consider human beings to be “territorial animals”, or social mammals who control and shape space “to manage personal
interchange, and assert rights over territory to conserve resources” (Lynch, 1981, p. 205). In summary, this group of theories is based on the idea that the influence of space on social behaviour and relations is through a hierarchical order of correspondence between bounded groups in society and different tangible demarcations of space (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, p. 254).

The second group of territorial theories challenges any significant relation between the spatial arrangement of the city and the social groupings of society (Hanson & Hillier, 1987). Given the socio-spatial urban heterogeneity, this approach recognizes no structured correspondence relation between spatial demarcations and social groupings and, therefore, concludes that space and physical form are of no significant importance in a social grouping context. These theories argue that spatial organization and social institutions are almost independent of one another and if there were any correspondence between them it would be purely arbitrary. Strands of such thought are found already in Louis Wirth (1964), who for example argues that “the settlement of human beings, the patterning of social institutions, the incidence of social problems, and the intricate network of social interrelationships, does not, except by accident, conform to arbitrarily delimited areas” (Wirth, 1964, p. 182); partially in (Hanson & Hillier, 1987). As we have seen, this theoretical standpoint has been the spatial conception underlying an abundance of more recent theoretical scholarship on space and society, not least in sociology, human geography and urban planning. Here we find the rationale behind the assumption that the spatial form of the built environment is merely a by-product of “the spatial dimensions of social processes” (Hillier B., 2008, p. 216). More precisely, according to Hillier, this approach bases socio-spatial relations on what he calls the “spatiality paradigm”, which seeks the linkage of society and space “through an examination of the spatiality of social processes” (Hillier B., 2008, p. 221).

Contrary to the latter approach, Hillier and Hanson (1987, p. 252) defend the agency of spatial form. But their own take on the space-society relation, that they call a “non-correspondence” theory, is an attempt to investigate the relation between space and society, not based on a hierarchical territorial understating of correspondence between spatial segmentation and social community, but on a systems understanding of spatial configuration and human movement in space that may work “against the tendency of social categorization to divide society into discrete groups” (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, p. 265). This dynamic quality of the non-correspondence theory, which focuses on human movement, questions
the static conception inherent to theories of territoriality of the time, most prominently expressed by Oscar Newman (1972; 1976). Since people typically move in urban space it is most unlikely to find any correspondence between social groupings and spatial demarcations. Rather, it draws attention to the system property of space due to the relations between spaces and how people navigate and move in this system, creating, as a by-product, temporary social groupings without typical social labels, but even so of great social potential.

A non-correspondence system benefits from a robustness that not only makes it able to tolerate local disorder but also “relates the local organisation of the system to the global structure without losing either its local identity or its global relatedness” (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, pp. 270-1). This is a completely different way of arguing a relation between society and space, which also asks for contrasting intervention in urban planning and design. Hillier and Hanson therefore argue that: “the structuring of the local urban environment in a more territorial direction can ‘fracture and fragment delicate social networks’, rather than offer the supportive framework for the regeneration of community life which it was hoped to achieve through design” (1987, p. 253).

According to Hanson and Hillier (1987), within the non-correspondence theory, the relations between the built environment and social organizations fall into two distinct categories of spatial orders. First, there is ‘the arrangement of space by society’, that is: “the ways in which every culture transforms its environment by means of boundaries, solid objects and differentiated spaces, into the pattern of buildings and settlements which we recognize as giving a society a distinct architectural identity” (1987, pp. 262-3). The characteristics of such spatial order are rather found as spatial patterns or configurations than particular architectural elements and signs. Despite its materialistic substance, such spatial configuration, which is by Low recognized as the “social production of space”, reflects non-material factors, such as socio-cultural, economic, political agencies (Low, 2000, pp. 127-8; Low & Lawrence-Zuniga, 2003, p. 20).

The second spatial order is ‘the arrangement of society in space’, that is: “the ways in which the members of a society are themselves deployed in space, in both social groups and networks, to construct the patterns of encounter and avoidance which are characteristic of that society” (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, p. 263). This ordering cannot simply be discerned as a spatial pattern and is therefore mainly associated with social patterns. However, although many non-
physical factors are included in people’s social activities, they finally take on materiality and construct spatial arrangements. Here Low uses the term “social construction of space” to convey the process through which space finds meaning for the members of society through social encounter and everyday use of the material setting of the space (Low, 2000, p. 128; Low & Lawrence-Zuniga, 2003, p. 20).

The dual processes of social production of space and social construction of space, come close to an essential distinction harking back to Durkheim of organic and mechanic solidarities, where the former relies on difference and division of labour typical for modern society, and the latter on similarity and deemed typical for pre-industrial society by Durkheim. This distinction is held to be absolutely central by Hillier and Hanson, since it implies a critical role for space in that organic solidarity typically is dependent on space while mechanic solidarity is not (Hillier & Hanson, 1984, p. 18). This means that we can identify two types of ‘social’ relations in society, which Hillier and Hanson call spatial groupings and transpatial groupings, emphasizing that in a non-correspondence understanding of the space-society relation, almost every individual (and group) in society typically is a member of both (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, pp. 263-4). One is a member of a spatial grouping when membership is created by spatial proximity, such as being a neighbour in the neighbourhood one lives in, or an employee at the particular office where one works or, more transiently, a member of a temporary gathering in public space. Membership of a transpatial grouping, by contrast, is independent of space. In this case, people form social groups, not due to spatial proximity but similarity in one way or another; for instance by being part of the social group of singles, independently of the neighbourhood one lives, or being part of the group of computer programmers independently of the particular office one happens to work at. In spatial terms we see how spatial grouping tends to bring together people from different social groups, while transpatial grouping unites people who are spatially separated, leading Hanson and Hillier to conclude that (1987, p. 265) “space can also reassemble what society divides”\(^\text{18}\). That is, spatial form can create spatial

\(^{18}\) - It is necessary to emphasise here how the non-correspondence theory of the space-society relation in a much more dynamic way returns agency to physical space in that it demonstrates how spatial form, by way of structuring human movement in space, generates spatial grouping of socially heterogeneous individuals and, by extension, thereby also creates a social potential for such group simply through their spatial proximity. Given the
groupings, which also imply social potential, out of in other respects socially heterogeneous individuals. We here identify a first hint of how spatial form, by extension of this can also provide support for a multicultural society by spatially bringing together culturally heterogeneous groups, that is, reassemble what society divides.

Elaborating this a little more, we here sense how the spatial form of cities can address the issue of multiculturalism by, on the one hand, in some locations in the city offering support of the identity of cultural groups through correspondence between social groups and spatial demarcations and, on the other hand, in other locations creating spatial groups of non-correspondence, that is, bringing different cultural groups together in space (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, p. 265). We will return to this issue thoroughly in the next chapter.

**Linking multiculturalism to urban form**

In the previous section we briefly discussed how critical attributes of multiculturalism, as discussed and defined in chapter two, may be reflected in the materiality of urban form, but here based on a non-correspondence relation between spatial domains and the socio-cultural identity of individual people. Earlier, furthermore, it has been argued that physical space, especially through the spatial groupings or co-presence of socio-culturally heterogeneous individuals it generates, could play a vital role in the creation of a ‘civility of indifference’ to cultural differences. In this section we will try to more specifically shed light on these potential linkages between the immaterial notion of ‘civility of indifference’ and the materiality of urban form.

If we argue that the built environment of a culturally diverse city should respond to the needs of a ‘civility of indifference’, we have to be more precise concerning what we mean by ‘civility of difference’ as well as the spatial form of the built

---

agency of physical space on the formation of spatial groupings in this way, it will in the ensuing discussions be argued that spatial form also affects patterns of co-presence and multiplicity by influencing the patterns of movement within the city structure in this manner. Furthermore, spatial groupings of this kind can either be important for the establishment of recognition among its members or for the establishment of a ‘civility of indifference’ among its members. As we shall see, in this thesis the concept of spatial grouping in multicultural society is interpreted as a type of grouping in which individuals and groups gain a ‘civility of indifference’ to cultural differences. Establishing (weak or strong) ties to bridge cultural differences is therefore not the primary purpose of spatial grouping here.
environment. Concerning the first, we first need to situate the concept of multiculturalism within a more generic framework. What we talk about is how cultural differences can be supported by spatial form; but this does not imply specific forms that correspond to particular cultures, but the much more generic aim of giving spatial support for the development of difference in general. That is, by speaking about multiculturalism here we do not introduce a new demand on spatial form specifically akin to culture and cultural variations, but rather the generic demand, typical of most cities, to provide spatial support for the development of difference, whether of a social, economic, cultural or other kind. This is so since we on the one hand will never know what particular cultural groupings that will be of concern and, on the other, since spatial form of the level we speak of here, that is, the configuration (or syntax) of spatial form rather than its semiotics, simply does not have the specificity necessary to express specific cultural demands but performs on a more generic level. Hence, we may argue that multiculturalism here is simply a specific case of a more generic demand we may have on urban form to support the development of difference.

As discussed earlier, we have here taken the route where we argue that urban planning and design should seek to address the physical requirements of multiculturalism through Amin’s conception of a ‘civility of indifference’ (Amin, 2012, pp. 75-80), rather than the idea of ‘recognition through spatial encounter’ that prevails in current literature in urban planning and design. However, this is not saying that we can decide in this dissertation whether Amin is right, but rather that we need a distinct stance on the issue on which to build our translation from theory to spatial form and we here choose Amin. In this endeavour it helps that Amin more particularly defines that he identifies two organizing principles, multiplicity and co-presence, which have as we see it distinct spatial implications, to be the bedrock of his idea of a ‘civility of indifference’. It is therefore these two principles we will aim to interpret more precisely in terms of spatial form in the next chapter.

First, however, we want to point out and further discuss how these on the one hand help us to more precisely understand Amin’s idea of a politics of living together while on the other hand, we also see how they are mostly generic principles that not only apply to the multiculturalism debates but can also be related to social differences more generally. Again there is reason to stress that even if we here deal with a particular social expression, such as multiculturalism, and even with multiculturalism in a specific interpretation, in our case according
to Amin’s argument, we have to realise that from the point of view of urban planning and design we are always limited to working on a generic level, since the central material for these disciplines, that is, spatial form, only deals with the physical substratum for such social differences and can therefore only provide the general conditions for them, but cannot express their particular specificities; in simple terms, there is no particular spatial form for multiculturalism, but there may be for socio-cultural difference in general. It is along this line that we will pursue our investigation.

Having said that, it should be clear that it is our conviction that it is naive to assume that the politics of multiculturalism, as interpreted as ‘civility of indifference’ or in any other mode, could be accomplished merely through spatial interventions; for such a complex and multi-faceted entity, there is obviously a need to also take into account a multitude of other human and non-human relations that affect the complexity of living ‘together-in-difference’. In a dissertation in architecture and urban design, however, these spatial interventions are naturally in focus. There is also an increasing interest in the relation between spatial form and social processes in cities outside these disciplines, as we have seen. As a matter of fact, the importance of urban space in generating conditions for a politics of living together in plural society is also emphasised by Amin; he argues urban space to be one of the “commons that keeps the city on the move, acts as a life support and opportunity field, ensuring that basic needs are met” (2012, pp. 77-8), in other words, as the potential site for an emergence and manifestation of the ‘civility of indifference’ or the ‘unconscious habits of living together’.

If this concerns how we need to be more precise about the concept of multiculturalism and more specifically the notion of a ‘civility of indifference’ if we are to find its linkages to spatial form, we have also seen how we need to be much more precise when it comes to what we mean by spatial form itself. Here we have argued the need for several shifts to accomplish such a linkage. First, to move from the semiotics of space to its syntax, that is to say, to move from an analysis of built forms as signs that through their interpretations can be linked to particular cultures or sub-cultures. However, history typically demonstrates a multitude of anachronistic mismatches between the semiotics of particular built forms and the social and cultural identity of their inhabitants, and we may therefore argue that this level of built form in itself has not proven to be able to sustain particular cultures.
Second, a shift from theories of correspondence to non-correspondence concerning the relation between spatial demarcation and social or cultural groups, where we interpret the first to be inherently static and unliftike, while the second pays particular attention to the most ubiquitous use of urban space there is, viz. human movement. The correspondence theory is what we typically find in social enquiries on cities based on residential statistics, where one by limiting people’s spatial location to their residential address can create a correspondence between spatial demarcations and social groups. While this may be useful and even necessary for analytical reasons, it can be deeply problematic when applied normatively, as for instance in some theories of territoriality, where based on the assumption that humans by nature need strict correspondence of this kind, there is an aim to inform urban planning and design in the development of new housing areas.

Third, we have with the distinction of spatial and transpatial groupings with its roots in Durkheimian sociology, been able to point out how social groups in principle can be defined both by social means and by spatial means, that is, we not only have social groups defined by social similarity, such as professional and occupational groups, but also social groups defined by space, such as the employees at a workplace, which typically consists of many occupational groups, that is, they are often characterised by social difference. Hence, we understand the first group as transpatial groupings and the second group as spatial groupings. The argument has been made by a long series of sociologists with roots in Durkheim (Goffman, 1963; Giddens, 1984; Collins, 2004), that even such transient spatial groupings as temporarily co-present people in urban space may form critical constituents of the social fabric, not least due to their repetitive and routine character. Here, the nub of our argument is that the spatial configuration of the city has agency in the creation of patterns of such co-presence in urban space. We may here already see a potential opening for an interpretation of multiculturalism, where we on the one hand have culturally defined groupings and on the other hand spatially defined multicultural groupings.

Taken together, we on the one hand see that by way of a particular interpretation of multiculturalism, which here is Amin’s ideal of a ‘civility of indifference’ and, by extension, the identification of two critical attributes of this notion, identified by Amin himself, that is, co-presence and multiplicity, we have two concepts closely related to the idea of a ‘civility of indifference’ that can be
made operative in our overarching aim to translate multiculturalism into spatial form, or more correctly, identify spatial forms that may support a multicultural society. Again we need to keep in mind that spatial interventions most likely only play a minor role in sustaining such a society; however, from the point of view of urban planning and development, which is the focus here, it is naturally essential.

On the other hand, we see how through the approach to the analysis of spatial form found in space syntax theory we are able to link spatial form to spatially defined social groups by way of the distinction between spatial groupings and transpatial groupings, where the first, exactly, constitute spatially defined social groups. We can then detect the outline of a way forward in trying to relate the attributes of a politics of living together detected by Amin (co-presence and multiplicity) to the socio-spatial concept of spatial and transpatial groupings identified in space syntax theory. More precisely we can tentatively and prematurely draw the conclusion that urban design can create public spaces of correspondence between social groups and spatial demarcations where cultural identity may develop, but also create public spaces of non-correspondence where people from spatially demarcated areas in the city with different cultural identity through movement in space come to meet. Again, we will return to this issue.

To summarize, spatial form has the potential to create patterns of co-presence (Hillier & Vaughan, 2007, p. 212), which according to a long line of sociologists can prove essential in the daily reproduction of society. Essential to the creation of such co-presences, however, is of course the acknowledgement of human movement in urban space, which as we have seen is absolutely central in space syntax theory but far less expressed in theories of territoriality. More precisely yet, we here rely on the theory of natural movement, developed within the framework of space syntax, where the pedestrian movement flow within urban space is demonstrated to depend on the city’s spatial form or configuration, that is, it is shown how physical space can have agency in structuring human behaviour and uses (Hillier, Penn, Hanson, Grajewski, & Xu, 1993, p. 32). More precisely, one argues that the natural movement, or the amount of pedestrian movement in public urban space, which is determined by the spatial configuration of the urban fabric, “although not always quantitatively the largest component of movement in urban spaces, is so much the most pervasive type of movement in urban areas that without it most spaces will be empty for most of the time” (1993, p. 32). Movement flow, and therefore the micro- and macro-
structure of the street network of the city, which generally speaking constitutes the main part of public urban space and the social processes it is related to, are hence perceived by Hillier (2009, p. K01:18) as: “the most critical relation of all in the ways in which the city expresses economic and social forces”.

As we soon will explore, such spatially generated co-presence can both result in spatial groupings of social and cultural heterogeneity and spatial groupings of social and cultural homogeneity; that is, spatial form can in principle generate the conditions for both co-presence and multiplicity, the two central attributes of a multi-cultural society in Amin’s interpretation. However, it is of central importance to repeat the conviction of the current study that generating and sustaining “enduring ties among people who normally live in entirely different places” (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, p. 265) is generally beyond the scope of spatial interventions; there must be more for this to happen. We have therefore argued, with support in Amin, that rather than aim to establish ‘recognition through spatial encounter’, cities through their spatial form, may satisfice in generating patterns of co-presence and multiplicity that may support and sustain the emergence of an urban unconscious or a ‘civility of indifference’.

**Multiculturalism through the prism of spatial discourse**

The thesis thus far has taken us through a review, however brief, of the general multiculturalism debate as a means to provide a theoretical and conceptual frame of reference for distilling and identifying demands it postulates that can be interpreted within the urban design discourse and more precisely be translated into spatial form. It is critical to emphasise here that we do not mean to say that the multiculturalism debate in general can be summarised into demands of that kind, rather we have chosen particular directions within that debate as a point of departure for such a translation into spatial form. Central here is, as repeatedly stressed, the interpretation from the point of view of urban geography by Ash Amin, where he questions the viability of the often repeated need within urban planning and design literature of ‘recognition through encounter’ and instead argues for the possibility of a politics of living together, which he deems both more realistic and more sustainable. Hence, what the current study concerns is not a translation of multiculturalism into spatial form but rather the translation of a specific interpretation of this broad debate.
With support in space syntax theory, it has here been described how human movement flows within the urban fabric can serve as the linkage between such an interpretation of multiculturalism and urban morphology.

What we are looking for here is, therefore, spatial form that can generate and sustain over time the critical attributes of Amin’s notion of a ‘civility of indifference’, that is, co-presence and multiplicity. A critical foundation for such an investigation is the need to understand urban space as a system of relative space, as we have already emphasised in relation to the introduction of space syntax, where the whole constitutes something other than the sum of its parts and where each part is greatly determined by its position in the system, that is, we need to understand the city as a system; again, this is in congruence with the procedure in space syntax. This does not represent a shift away from the micro-scale of urban space, albeit it does represent a shift away from an atomistic and anecdotal micro-scale to an understanding of urban space where there is a constant interplay between the micro- and the macro-levels. Hence, the macro-level of the system in total, naturally is constituted by its parts, but the micro-level is inherently also constituted by the structure of the system as a whole, hence Hillier’s dictum, “places do not make cities. It is cities that make places” (1996, p. 151).

It is essential to understand here that this is a study of multiculturalism through the prism of space, that is, it is a study in urban morphology rather than a study in cultural theory, and the critical theory in this study is therefore theory about urban form. It is clear from the discussions above that the central theory for this study in this respect is space syntax theory, which therefore constitutes its ‘primary logical system’ (Wang, 2002, p. 304). From this basis the aim is to develop a secondary logical system where features of space syntax theory are developed to be applicable to the specific study of the spatial logic of multiculturalism in cities. In the previous section, we began this effort on a principal level and we will now continue by further elaborating features of space syntax theory central to our current endeavour. Of particular importance here is the distinction between organic and mechanic solidarity stated by Emile Durkheim, which can be said to form the sociological foundations of space syntax (Hillier & Hanson, 1984).
The sociological foundations of space syntax

The analysis and formalisation of the social logic of space, which may be stated to be the continuing project of space syntax research, rests in sociological terms heavily on the Durkheimian distinction between mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity, which due to their inherent spatial ramifications forms a fruitful point of departure for such an endeavour. Durkheim’s overarching research question is: what holds society together; which was a critical issue for most of the early scholars of sociology, a discipline that can be argued to have arisen, exactly, due to the tremendous transformations set in motion by the emergence of the modern industrial societies in the West, which deeply challenged the established orders of society. With the concept of collective consciousness he tried to address the form of solidarity that held the pre-industrial society together (Durkheim, 1984). Collective consciousness is the set of ideas, beliefs, feelings, and sentiments that are common among the average group of each society through which people can share a common awareness of the world around them, a moral basis which is shaped by social interaction (Allan, 2011, p. 111 & 132). He argues that individuals, apart from society, are “self centred and driven by insatiable desires” (Allan, 2011, p. 108), and concludes that in order to overcome the individuality of modern life, society needs to find a new common moral culture. Durkheim considers similarity and difference to be the “two great currents of social life”, and argues that each can be related to different form of solidarity (Durkheim, 1984, p. 229); in (Morrison, 2006, p. 161). According to Durkheim, ‘similarity’ is the ordering principle of what he called mechanical solidarity, which is what we find in societies with only little social differentiation, and where the individual is closely attached to the collective consciousness. This type of society is hence interpreted as a homogeneous society.

The ordering principle for the type of solidarity that Durkheim connotes with the modern industrial societies with their greater heterogeneity, which he calls organic solidarity, is on the other hand ‘difference’. In these societies individual differences become dominant over individual similarities, not least due to the typical division of labour in industrial society and the cultural distinction that each form of labour creates around itself (Durkheim, 1984). Modern society therefore has fewer common sentiments as well as a weaker collective consciousness. Even so, it develops a strong form of solidarity, however of a new form, where the interdependence of these differences, for instance as
expressed in the division of labour, creates a need for individuals to keep together.

The truly interesting thing here in our current context is that it has distinct spatial implications, underlined already by Durkheim himself. The very transition from societies based on mechanical solidarity to societies based on organic solidarity is to a great degree due to the increased density of people as a result of urbanisation and new modes of transport, and in Durkheim we can therefore speak of a belief in the agency of physical space in social matters. As noted by Hillier, the core of Durkheim’s social theory lays stress on a sort of simultaneous process expansion and contraction of social life in modern society. That is, at the same time as individuals are more freely developing individualistic characters, they become more entangled with social relations of differences and inequalities (Hillier B., 2008, p. 219). We can see how this has its distinct spatial expression in the typical need we find in an individualistic society of great differentiation and division of labour for spatial proximity, due to the urgent need of the parts to recreate the whole, so to speak. In societies based on similarity, strong collective consciousness and little division of labour on the other hand, we see how there remains a need for proximity to recreate similarity but that this does not by necessity concern the whole but can be achieved by a series of smaller parts. The distinction here can be illustrated with the contrast between the life and landscape of the big city and the life and landscape of many small villages.

The Foreground and Background Networks

However, this is a simplified and exaggerated image of the two types of societies. In real life we find both mechanic and organic solidarities at work in both, but one tends to dominate over the other. It is this broad social demand that Hillier (1996) tries to detect and identify, by way of space syntax methodology, in the regularities of the spatial form of cities. This forms the basis for the rather bombastic proposition for “a new universal definition of a city as a network of linked centres at all scales set into a background network of residential space” (Hillier B., 2012, p. 130). According to Hillier it is possible to demonstrate that the spatial form of cities typically manifests some notable consistencies in its underlying pattern. More exactly, Hillier suggests that the spatial form of cities can be broken down into two networks, both still being part of the same entity. In Hillier’s words, “by some as yet unknown process, cities of all kinds, however they begin, seem to evolve into a foreground network of linked centres at all
What Hillier points out in the proposition of the universal existence of the foreground and background network is the easily demonstrated fact that the street network of cities – understood as the primary structure of public space in cities – at the same time produces both a structure of spaces (streets) of high accessibility within the system, that is, the structure he calls the foreground network, and a structure of less accessible and more localised spaces, that is, the structure he calls the background network. In reality there are naturally not two structures but just a continuity within the same street network of varying degrees of accessibility, but we can easily see how the group with very high general accessibility or proximity within the systems as a whole is likely to not only capture high movement flows of people, but also that the people who make up these flows are drawn from very many parts of the city, due to the high accessibility of the foreground network from the system as a whole. Hence we can also infer that it is likely that these spaces create *co-presences of a heterogeneous kind* since they attract movement from very many parts of the city and, in extension, that the foreground network, for the very same reason, creates good conditions for exchange in these co-presences of difference, whether it is exchange of a social, economic or informational kind.

Similarly it can be argued that the background network, that is, the spaces (streets) with low accessibility from the system as whole, which therefore gain a more localised character, are not likely to capture as high movement flows as the more accessible spaces. Moreover, and more interestingly, they are likely, due to their localised character, to create *co-presences of a greater homogeneity*, since the movement flows that they attract primarily are drawn from the local neighbourhood or city-district, that is, rather than exchange we can interpret these spaces to be spaces of *confirmation*, that is, confirmation of a local culture of one kind or another. It is based on this kind of argumentation, which as far as movement flows are concerned are also easy to support, that Hillier draws the conclusion that the foreground and background network are both essential in supporting two fundamental needs of any society, that is, on the one hand, the renewal of society through exchange and new constellations and, on the other hand, the reproduction of society through confirmation and repetition of established forms. Hillier summarises:
“In effect human space in general, and in cities in particular, can be seen to be used in two social modes: conservatively to express, and so reproduce, an existing social pattern of social relations by using space segregatively to restrict and modulate encounter; and generatively to create new social potentials by maximizing co-presence through movement. The underlying principle is that spatial segregation tends to leave things as they are, while integration creates morphogenetic conditions in which new things can happen and new social patterns can be created” (Hillier B., 2008, p. 227).

By extension, it is not difficult to see how the foreground network is the spatial condition of organic solidarity, where differences meet in the necessary feat of recreating the whole and how the background network is the spatial support of mechanic solidarity where similarity and the collective consciousness can be reaffirmed. In line with Durkheim, we should not however see this simply as an expression of these types of solidarities, that is, take the typical view of seeing space through the prism of society, but rather the opposite and see how space not only represents these solidarities but takes part in constituting them. It would simply be difficult, if not impossible, to develop an organic solidarity if there were no spaces where differences could meet for exchange and, on the contrary, it would be difficult to create these differences in the first place if there were not any localised spaces where such difference could originate and be confirmed. Naturally, we see here how the many localised parts of the city are not likely to support identical ‘cultures’, but rather how they support differences, and thus make up the very grounds for speaking of difference in the first place.

Finally, we here also see a tentative outline of how there could be a spatial form that could support multiculturalism in the interpretation we have chosen to investigate, that is, a ‘civility of indifference’, where we have identified the central attributes to be ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’. The foreground network, hence, is the spatial structure for intense co-presence of multiplicity and generation of difference, while the background network is the spatial structure for local co-presence of similarity and creation of identity, where of course the latter is a prerequisite for the first or there would be no multiplicity to begin with. Interestingly, Hillier (2012) identifies these structures to be universal for cities, why we here can see a potential interpretation of cities as typical situations of multiculturalism to begin with, especially if we leave the particular demands
of multiculturalism and look for the more generic conditions cities tend to create, that is, situations of difference and exchange.

**Closing words**

The main purpose of this chapter has been to portray the space syntax theory as the ‘primary logical system of argumentation’ (Wang, 2002) for our current research objective. The discussion began by elaborating the concepts of city, culture and space and went on to designate Harvey’s (2005) spatial frame of reference the most relevant modality of spatial thinking for the purpose of this dissertation and creates a conceptual frame of reference also for space as understood in space syntax theory.

One of the central concerns in space syntax theory – which this chapter also emphasizes – is that the physical space of the built environment should not be regarded merely as a ‘background’ to social institutions, but as a ‘social behaviour’ in itself (Hillier B., 1996, p. 300). This understanding of the materiality of the built environment paves the way for investigating the relation between urban form and multiculturalism.

Referring to Hanson and Hillier (1987), space syntax research divides social groupings into two categories: spatial groupings and transpatial groupings. By describing how spatial form, by way of human movement, can create spatial groupings of non-correspondence between spatial demarcations and social groups, the chapter aims to demonstrate that urban form can have agency in the formation of social processes in cities. On the other hand, an attempt is made to show that *co-presence* and *multiplicity* – as the critical attributes of a ‘civility of indifference’ (Amin, 2012) – can be created and sustained by such human movement patterns in urban space. Movement flow has therefore been defined as the linkage between urban form and multiculturalism.

As the closing remarks to this chapter, the theoretical concepts of space syntax – such as the duality of urban structure – provide the thesis with a means of explication of the spatial aspects of a politics of living together in diversity and difference. In other words, space syntax theory as the “primary logical system” (Wang, 2002) of this research provides a spatial discourse through which the particular interpretation of multiculturalism selected as most viable for this study – outlined in previous chapters – can be articulated and portrayed. This application of space syntax theory on the particular ideas of multiculturalism
elaborated in this study should be understood as a ‘secondary logical system’ that may have the ability to make concepts and ideas of multiculturalism open to urban form studies. In accordance with the adopted methodology of logical argumentation, the next chapter turns its attention to the challenge of further developing the secondary logical system by elaborating how the chosen interpretation of multiculturalism can be translated into the spatial theory of space syntax.
Chapter Four: Overlapping Spaces

Introduction

This chapter concerns the question of how the ideas of multiculturalism can be translated into spatial theory in order to highlight the role spatial form may play in addressing the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’. The main aim of this chapter is to elaborate on spatial form through which the urban structure may provide spatial viability of the emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’.

In the previous chapters we have discussed some ideas in the broad field of multiculturalism as found in political theory and more specifically instances of how it has been applied and developed in urban planning theory. In our search for a general policy ideal for a just and equal multicultural society, we referred to Young’s (1999) ideal common polity of living “together-in-difference”, and later, we tried to structure this ideal around Amin’s (2012) proposed concept of a “civility of indifference”. In this theoretical background, we elaborated on different aspects of a multicultural society, albeit in general terms, keeping ‘difference’ and diversity at the core of discussion.

With this as a background we have focused on the particular interpretation of multiculturalism developed by Ash Amin in urban geography (Amin, 2012), where he in contrast to the aim for ‘recognition through spatial encounter’ often repeated in urban planning and design theory, argues for a ‘civility of
indifference’ as a more viable way forward for a politics of living together. While both approaches argue for the need of encounter between people from different cultural groups in a multicultural society, Amin argues for encounters of a much less intense kind on an unconscious or precognitive level (Amin, 2012; Thrift, 2005, p. 146) that may not lead to the deep recognition aimed for in other direction of planning theory but, exactly, a habit of ‘civility of indifference’. Amin (2012, p. 75) identifies two organizing principles of such an approach, ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’, towards “a politics of living together without strong expectations of mutual empathy”.

Against this background, the dissertation aims to explore new development and new insights in the field of urban morphology as a means to translate ideas of multiculturalism into spatial form as support for future urban design. Above we therefore also tentatively discussed the translation of these two central attributes pointed out by Amin, i.e. ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’, into spatial form. In other words, the central intention is to investigate how spatial properties of urban form may have any influence on the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’ in the contemporary hybrid cities of the West. The foundation for such a translation was found in space syntax theory in its non-correspondence approach to social matters in space, where in particular the distinction between spatial groupings of people and transpatial groupings central to space syntax was pointed out as productive.

In broader methodological terms, the dissertation adopts an approach of logical argumentation (Wang, 2002), where space syntax theory takes the role of a ‘primary system of argumentation’, something that was outlined and explained in the previous chapter. In that chapter we also discussed, on a principal level, how a ‘secondary system of argumentation’ could be developed out of this, that directly involves the central ideas of multiculturalism chosen in this dissertation, more specifically, a system of argumentation that could successfully deal with the attributes of ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’ in terms of spatial form. It is this endeavour we shall continue in more detail in this chapter.

Central to any argument here, however, is the assumption that spatial form can have agency. This is a most unusual idea in both sociology and political science, or in any social science as a matter of fact, and we therefore wish to begin by making absolute clear in what sense we conceive of such agency. Central to this is the concept of generic function (Hillier B., 1996, p. 223). The example below,
borrowed from (March, 1998); in (Marcus, 2000, p. 48), serves the purpose of illustrating both the concept of generic function, and the idea of spatial agency as we understand it here.

Imagine there is an investigation into how pairs of people sit at a square table with four chairs, each at one side, while all other physical variables of the example (such as the table, chairs, room in which the table is located, etc.) are the same. We then suggest that the study shows that the number of times that pairs locate themselves at the corners of the table is more frequent than the number of times that they sit at opposite sides of the table facing each other. We may then look for explanations of why pairs of people more often locate themselves across corners than sit opposite to each other? This question can be addressed from the basis of a great variety of determinants focusing for instance on people’s psychological behaviour or cultural background. However, before jumping for psychological or cultural explanation, or better yet, parallel to it, one may notice that the configurative setting of the table, i.e. the arrangement of the chairs at each of the four sides, has already unbalanced the dice, in that this

Figure 2. Configurative setting of a table. Adapted from (March, 1998)
particular setting offers twice the number of opportunities for two people to sit over a corner rather than opposite each other. That is, the form of the table in itself, apart from such things as cultural background of the two people, conditions their choices through a bias towards the corners.

It is in this sense we imagine agency in physical objects; there naturally are no agency in such objects themselves but they do condition human agency and thereby also influence our actions and behaviour in directions that we are not entirely aware of. If this is not immediately accessible to our intuition concerning such a fairly simple case as the table above, we realise that this may be totally unintelligible when it comes to such complex spatial artefacts as cities. At the same time, this is not an argument claiming that for instance the culturally embedded aspects of the two people are of no value if we want to explain their behaviour; the nub of the argument is that for a methodologically sound approach to form-function questions (akin to space-society questions), the form-side of the question needs proper attention.

This simple yet fundamental example also paves the way for explaining the concept of “generic function”. According to Hillier (1996, p. 6), generic functions imply “the most fundamental aspects of human use of space, that is, the fact of occupation and the fact of movement”. The generic functions, such as movement and presence in physical space, define and impose spatial restraints on more specific functions, from the point of view of “what is spatially viable” (Hillier B., 1996, p. 6). Hillier calls such generic functions a “first filter” which comes between the reality of physical space (form) and the range of feasibility (more specific functions).

Given Hillier’s definitions of generic functions, this chapter explores the spatial viability for the formation of various types of social groupings. It is discussed how relational properties of urban form provide spatial support for the emergence of various patterns of co-presence and multiplicity, and consequently, contributes to the formation of different types of social groupings.

As a first step in exploring agency in urban form in relation to living ‘together-in-difference’, we will try to convey a spatial interpretation of the two principles for creating a ‘civility of indifference’, that is, ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’.

It is important to stress that there is no claim here that spatial viability for co-presence and multiplicity is the sole condition for the emergence of a ‘civility of
indifference’. Rather, it should be regarded as a “first filter” between the reality of urban form and the possibility of a collective situation of living ‘together-in-difference’. That is, such spatial viability, as this research continually emphasises, is but one of many necessary requirements for the emergence of a socio-cultural situation of a ‘civility of indifference’. What we do maintain, however, is that it is the most relevant aspect for urban planning and design, that is, disciplines dealing with the morphology of the built environment.

Social grouping – spatial demarcation

In the previous chapter we put the concepts of multiculturalism in a more generic framework of cultural differences possible to translate to spatial form. It was stated that our central aim is to provide spatial support for the development of difference in general, rather than specific forms that correspond to particular cultures. It was also argued that multiculturalism in this dissertation simply refers to a specific case of a more generic demand we may have on urban form to support the development of difference in general, typical for most cities.

This section begins with an exploration into how social groupings – more particularly spatial groupings and transpatial groupings – relate to spatial demarcation of urban form. Later in this section, it will be discussed how urban form can contribute to the formation of different social groupings. The discussion will be followed by a number of conceptual examples to convey a clearer picture of the dissertation’s ideas.

On the relation between space and society, it was described in the previous chapter that Hanson and Hillier (1987) understand different conceptions of this relation as varying correspondence between spatial demarcations in urban fabric and socio-cultural grouping of individuals. Hillier and Hanson (1987) here argue for non-correspondence, which implies that spatial lines of demarcation in urban form do not necessarily reflect social lines of division within society. They expand this idea of a non-correspondence system by defining two types of social groupings. A first type of social grouping, which is recognizable owing to the spatial commonality and proximity of its members, is called spatial grouping. Membership of this type of social grouping is dependent upon the presence of its members in spatial proximity. For instance, the presence of students in a classroom constitutes a spatial grouping due to the fact that all of them are present in the space of the classroom, and that they are in spatial proximity to
each other. A second type of social grouping finds its substance in immaterial similarities of one kind or another and is called *transpatial grouping*. Membership of this type of social grouping is not dependent upon the physical presence of its members, nor the spatial proximity. Rather than spatial proximity and presence, membership of this type of social grouping could be due to multiple socio-cultural similarities capable of overcoming the physical separation of its members. For instance, architecture students constitute a transpatial grouping since they all study in a common field regardless of the location of their affiliated schools. That is, they constitute a group even if they are spatially separated. Their social grouping here is based on their similarity, which in this example is studying in the field of architecture.

Obviously, an individual can simultaneously be a member of (a variety of) both spatial and transpatial groupings. The theory of the non-correspondence system describes a socio-spatial phenomenon in which the correlation between spatial demarcations and social groupings divulges a structured but not corresponding order (Hanson & Hillier, 1987); that is, although there is a correlation between spatial grouping and social grouping, these groupings may not directly correspond to each other. Of crucial importance for the purpose of this dissertation is that spatial form, under particular circumstances, has the power to bring together individuals from different transpatial groupings and turn them into spatial groupings for longer or shorter times. We will soon return to this point and elaborate on it.

In their explanation of spatial and transpatial groupings, Hanson and Hillier (1987, p. 264) consider two very different types of “socio-spatial possibility”. To explain these two socio-spatial possibilities, they refer to a simple example. We need to repeat their example here in order to apply it in our understanding of a multicultural society. Most abstractly, they define a simple system with two spatial groups (in two separate *locations*) and two transpatial groups (as two *categories*: As and Bs). They then go on to describe two different arrangements for this simple system. The first arrangement is to have the As in one *location* and the Bs in another *location*. According to Hanson and Hillier (1987, p. 264), in this arrangement there is a *correspondence* between spatial groups (locations) and transpatial groups (categories).
Accordingly, in this *correspondence* arrangement, locations and categories reinforce each other. That is, two spatial groups (locations) and two transpatial groups (categories) correspond to each other “locally, to produce a *unified* picture of reality in which transpatial identities are also spatial identities” (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, p. 265).

The second arrangement is to have a mix of both categories, As and Bs, in each of the two *locations*. Accordingly, there is a *non-correspondence* relation between spatial groups (locations) and transpatial groups (categories).

In this arrangement, the location and the category do not reinforce each other but are in a “warp and weft relation” (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, p. 265). That is, the spatial groups (locations) bring people together from different categories *locally*, while transpatial groups (categories) “suggest analogies across space to knit together people in different locations” (p. 265).

In the first arrangement, physical space reflects transpatial groups (categories) through discrete spatial groups (locations). That is, physical space separates groups of people *locally* who are different in their categories as well. But in the second arrangement space does not divide different categories into different
locations. Rather, according to Hanson and Hillier (1987), it produces potentials for encounters between different categories of people. That is, the spatial structure plays “an important role in social relations by working against the tendency of social categorization to divide society into discrete groups” (1987, p. 265).

As a part of this dissertation’s attempt to explore social groupings in a multicultural society in spatial terms, we here try to develop this conceptual example into a more tangible discussion. If we extend this example by considering the two categories (As and Bs) as two ethnic groups, and the two locations as two neighbourhoods – neighbourhood in its physical sense – then the first arrangement suggests that each ethnic group is located in a distinct neighbourhood, while the second arrangement suggests that there are individuals and groups of both ethnic groups in each neighbourhood. Bearing this example in mind, let us investigate how far each of these two arrangements may fit our general understanding of a multicultural society.

According to the first arrangement, people who share a similar cultural identity cluster together and establish a spatial enclave or a neighbourhood. This spatial separation of cultural communities, as Young (1999) suggests, should not per se be considered a social problem and is not in discord with the general policy ideal of living “together-in-difference”. In fact, it can be argued that it is in these spatial enclaves that the members of cultural communities find greater opportunities to express and practice their particular cultural values and get support from each other. However, the main criticism of this situation is that there is a high risk that these spatial enclaves tend towards social segregation. In other words, this situation may lead to the emergence of parallel lives, or as Hajer and Reijndorp (2001) put it, an “archipelago” of socially segregated enclaves, in which case the two ethnic identities tend to become separated from each other not only physically but also socially.

To reduce the risk of social segregation arising out of a correspondence relation between ethnic groups and spatial neighbourhoods, the second arrangement in our example sounds more reasonable; that is, to imagine a non-correspondence
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19 - For instance, there are examples of research that show that new immigrants prefer to live in the spatial enclaves where there is a majority of people with similar ethnic-cultural backgrounds in order to get support from their cultural communities (Qadeer, 2005, p. 57).
relation between the ethnic groups and their spatial neighbourhoods, by completely mixing the two ethnic groups across the two neighbourhoods to maximize the chance of encounter between their members. However, this arrangement leaves us with two concerns.

The first has to do with the feasibility of such totally mixed neighbourhoods in the reality of today’s multicultural societies. Despite the emphasis that urban design puts on design strategies related to mix, for instance ‘housing mix’ (Talen, 2008; 2006), in the European context, one can easily witness many divided suburbs around the large metropolitan cities each of which has a majority of habitants of one ethnic group. Also, the history of urbanism serves as undeniable evidence that society has a strong tendency to divide and separate social groups into separated spatial groupings. Therefore, not only is the proposition of mixed neighbourhoods as a perfect solution to achieve inclusive society questionable (Vaughan & Arbaci, 2011, p. 131), but also, achieving totally mixed neighbourhoods generally speaking sounds quite utopian. In fact, the appropriate amount of mix and diversity, according to Talen (2006, p. 245), has remained unanswered by urban planning and design.

A second concern is that by appreciating a totally mixed neighbourhood, there would be a risk that the right of different cultures to have their own domain to exercise and sustain their particular cultural differences would be implicitly disregarded. As discussed in the previous chapters, where we were talking about organic and mechanical solidarities, it would simply be difficult, if not impossible, to create ‘difference’ in the first place if there were no localised spaces where such difference could originate and be confirmed. In other words, for the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’, the right of different ethnic cultures to have their own public spaces needs to be acknowledged.

We here propose a third arrangement of our previous example of two ethnic groups and two neighbourhoods, which may better describe how urban form can spatially support co-presence and multiplicity. However, before describing the third arrangement, it is necessary to remind ourselves that living ‘together-in-difference’ in a multicultural society, as explained in the previous chapter, is an ideal of desegregation, which according to Young (1999, p. 237) assumes that “people dwell together in a common polity but are locally differentiated into group affinities. Together-in-difference both affirms such group affinity and calls for equality of life chances across space”. In other words, what we are searching
for here is an urban form, which on the one hand is able to spatially support living ‘together-in-difference’ by providing cultural communities with local spaces to practice and sustain their cultural differences and on the other is able to spatially support living ‘together-in-difference’ by providing spatial support for different cultural communities to encounter where cultural differences can be publicly expressed.

Having said that, the crux of the third arrangement is therefore that each neighbourhood (in its physical sense) can be dominated by one specific ethnic group, while simultaneously providing chances for encounter among individuals and groups of both ethnic groups. In other words, the third arrangement, conceptually, possesses the characters of both the first and the second arrangement. In this proposed arrangement, there is on the one hand a correspondence correlation between spatial groups (neighbourhoods) and transpatial groups (ethnics) where the cultural communities can express their cultural principles and values and on the other hand within the two neighbourhoods a non-correspondence correlation between spatial and transpatial groups, where space works “against the tendency of social categorization to divide society into discrete groups” (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, p. 265), and increases the likelihood of encounter between different cultural communities.

Thus, the third arrangement, as a part of our conceptual translation of multiculturalism into the spatial terms, presents a principal idea of how spatial form may generate and sustain both multiplicity and co-presence.
Overlapping in spatial structure

As an introduction to the following discussion, there is need to briefly recapitulate the core of the discussion up to this point. Thus far, it was argued that Amin (2012, pp. 74-82) suggests the concept of ‘civility of indifference’ as an alternative general policy of living ‘together-in-difference’, and designates co-presence and multiplicity as its two organizing principles. Also, it was explained that according to space syntax theory – which we designated the primary system of argumentation for this research – urban form and its spatial structure or configuration have an agency in patterns of movement flow within the city fabric by providing varying degrees of accessibility to different parts of the street network. In this regard, the street network of cities, as the primary structure of public spaces in cities, is a kind of dual structure of foreground and background networks. The foreground network, with high accessibility within the structure, is likely to capture high movement flows of people and, therefore, encourages co-presence of a heterogeneous kind attracting movement from very different parts of the urban structure. The foreground network is in this way, in principle, constituted by spaces with better spatial conditions for exchange between differences due to its higher accessibility to different parts of the city, be it of a social, economic or informational kind. By similar reasoning, we argued that the background network, with low accessibility within the spatial structure as a whole, is likely to capture fewer movement flows of people in comparison with the foreground network. Due to its more local character, the background network is therefore more likely to spatially support co-presences of a greater homogeneity drawn from the local neighbourhoods and their local culture. Obviously, this is a simplification; the street network of cities in reality is not made up of two distinct structures, but only one with parts that have varying degrees of accessibility.

With the aim to translate Amin’s proposal for living ‘together-in-difference’, i.e. ‘civility of indifference’, into spatial form, we here argue that the two organizing principles of co-presence and multiplicity can be related to different types of co-presence patterns in physical space. In simple terms, Amin’s (2012) concepts of co-presence and multiplicity are translated (and reduced) into two different types of co-presence in physical space, which earlier were described as the co-presence of a heterogeneous kind more typical of the foreground network, and the co-presence of a homogeneous kind more typical for the background network.
In order to structure our following discussions, we therefore need to distinguish between two different types of co-presence. In this research, these two types are categorized according to how urban form structures human movement in urban space so that we find different groupings of co-present people in the public spaces of the city. In other words, these two types of co-presence in physical space differ due to the ability of spatial form to attract people from different parts of the city into particular public spaces.

The first type, which we list here under the rubric ‘co-presence of homogeneity’, includes the patterns of individuals’ and groups’ presence in physical space when they are drawn mainly from local areas. Such local areas can in themselves be interpreted as already established spatial groups, for instance, a particular neighbourhood or district. Since there are often categorical similarities within a spatial group of this kind, for instance socio-economically, we are likely to find a degree of correspondence in this type of co-presence and particular categories. As discussed earlier, the background network of urban space, with its lower degree of accessibility, is likely to primarily attract local people and therefore also mostly the expressions of the ‘culture’ of the local neighbourhood. If we consider the neighbourhood as a spatial grouping of its residents, we can argue that the background network, through its spatial restraints on movement flows, tends to gather individuals from the local neighbourhood or urban area into its public space, and the co-present individuals in these spaces are therefore more likely to share ‘similarities’ of a local-neighbourhood culture as well.

The second type, which we here call ‘co-presence of heterogeneity’, concerns groupings of co-present people where these individuals are drawn from a greater radius of spatial groups, which is likely to also imply a greater variety of transpatial groups. Hence, in this type, there is non-correspondence between the spatial groupings of co-present people in public urban space and transpatial groupings in society. As discussed earlier, the foreground network of urban space, with higher accessibility, tends to bring individuals from very many parts of the city into its public spaces. These co-present people are therefore more likely to possess socio-cultural ‘differences’, that is, they are likely to belong to different social groups. That is, in this case spatial structure brings together people who are socially divided into the same space. Hence, the second type of co-presence in public space, which we term ‘co-presence of heterogeneity’ is in fact a spatial grouping that brings together individuals from different transpatial groupings.
Put differently, we see how the system of public urban space due to its structure and form creates certain spaces that are highly accessible from the system as a whole and therefore attracts movement from large parts of the city, while it simultaneously creates spaces that are far less accessible from the system as a whole that are primarily accessible from their local surroundings and therefore rather attract locals. Due to the fact that people from different neighbourhoods or parts of the city are likely to be different in categorical terms, for instance, when it comes to socio-economic differences, this, by extension, has the consequence that the more accessible spaces are likely to create groups of co-present people that also are likely to be categorically heterogeneous. We here call the first type ‘co-presence of homogeneity’ and the second ‘co-presence of heterogeneity’. Below we explain further how spatial configuration has agency in the patterns of people’s co-presence in urban space.

However, prior to that we need to point out how the two organizing principles of ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’ in Amin’s concept of ‘civility of indifference’ have great affinity to the two types of co-presence discussed above. That is, ‘co-presence of homogeneity’ can be interpreted as a spatial condition for Amin’s particular meaning of ‘co-presence’, while ‘co-presence of heterogeneity’ can be interpreted to be a spatial condition for the development of ‘multiplicity’. We should once again stress that an interpretation of Amin’s principles of ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’ in these reductive terms may sound naïve. However, as a research endeavour in urban planning and design, our intention with this study is to explain how the urban form and spatial structure of the city – by way of its influence on the patterns of movement flows – can create the conditions for a ‘civility of indifference’, while it naturally cannot determine such an outcome.

In order to illustrate the difference between the patterns of co-presence and multiplicity in spatial terms, we can refer to our previously suggested third arrangement. As proposed earlier, the third arrangement is a conceptual example of a system of two neighbourhoods (locations) and two ethnic groups (categories). It was discussed that such an arrangement possesses the character of both correspondence and non-correspondence relations between spatial and transpatial groups. That is, on the one hand, the proposed third arrangement suggests a correspondence correlation between the spatial groups (neighbourhoods) and transpatial groups (ethnic groups) where the cultural communities are able to exercise and sustain their cultural principles and values, while on the other there is a non-correspondence correlation between spatial and
transpatial groups where there is a greater potential for encounters between different categories of people (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, p. 265). Bearing such a conceptual arrangement in mind, we here try to elaborate on the spatial restraints of urban form on the establishment of different patterns of co-presence. It should again be emphasized that this research has no interest in the qualitative character of such presence or the social encounters that may occur as a result. The intention is rather to simply explore the types of co-presence that are spatially viable in different spatial arrangements.

When we study the feasible patterns of people’s co-presence in the physical space of the two neighbourhoods in our proposed arrangement, we can see a conspicuous difference in the source of their presence from the point of view of what is spatially viable or what is spatially less likely. The co-present people in urban public space can be drawn either from local neighbourhoods with greater possibility to share ‘similarities’ of a so-called local-neighbourhood culture, or from very many parts of the city with greater possibility to possess socio-cultural ‘differences’ as they are likely to belong to different social groups. But how might urban space have agency in this process? Also, what differences might it lead to? In order to answer such questions, we need to fully describe the two distinct patterns of presence we have seen in our conceptual example.

First we focus on the areas in which there is a correspondence relation between spatial groups (neighbourhoods) and transpatial groups (ethnic groups). Due to the correspondence relation, individuals and groups in such areas not only share the same neighbourhood but also the same ethnicity. That is, in such areas, spatial structure puts its restraints on the movement patterns of individuals so that they are mainly limited to one particular local neighbourhood. In this situation, although the emerged patterns of co-presence may vary from different points of view such as age, gender, political preference, etc, all still have the ‘similarity’ of ethnic background in common due to the correspondence relation between ethnic grouping and neighbourhood grouping. In other words, the ethnic diversity of the presented groups is spatially less likely to transcend one particular neighbourhood due to the spatial restraints of urban structure on movement flows.

In such a case, although local physical interventions may increase the chance of participation and presence in urban space from the same neighbourhood, however, the presence of individuals from other ethnic groups is not very likely,
due to the predominant correspondence relation. Here, urban form has agency in
the formation of social groups by restraining movement patterns from
transcending local spatial groups. Therefore, we called such patterns of co-
presence in urban public space ‘co-presence of homogeneity’.

A diagram of the third arrangement in our earlier conceptual example is shown
above. The red rectangles suggest various feasibilities for the individuals’ co-
presence in each neighbourhood, where there is a correspondence relation
between neighbourhood and ethnicity. As the diagram conceptually portrays, the
co-presence of people is here drawn from individuals within the same spatial
group or neighbourhood. That is, the source of the patterns of co-presence does
not go beyond one particular neighbourhood. Here, the established groups may
vary from different points of view, but what all necessarily share is that they all,
on the one hand, are members of one particular neighbourhood, and on the other
hand, share the ‘similarity’ of ethnicity. That is, all belong to one particular
spatial group (neighbourhood) and one particular transpatial group (ethnicity),
which in this case correspond.

Before we begin to describe the second spatially viable patterns of co-presence,
we should once again stress that the concepts of spatial and transpatial groupings
are highly dependent upon the spatio-temporal context of the particular
discussion. For instance, the members of a family living in a house can be
considered as a spatial group since they share the same house as the place to live.
However, this group of people can be considered a transpatial group too because
of their family ties, which does not depend on their presence in the house. It is
therefore of vital importance that throughout all our discussions on
spatial/transpatial groupings, we follow a particular scale, which for our previous conceptual example, is of two neighbourhoods perceived as two spatial groups and two ethnic groups perceived as two transpatial groups.

As the second type of co-presence in urban public space, we turn to areas in which there is a non-correspondence relation between spatial groups (neighbourhoods) and transpatial groups (ethnicities). Such co-presence in urban public space is drawn from multiple transpatial groups (ethnic groups) whose members are simultaneously members of different spatial groups (neighbourhoods) as well. Here the co-presence of individuals from different ethnicities in urban public space naturally is very likely. Urban form here has agency in the formation of social groups by working against the tendency towards social division among different ethnicities. In other words, here space brings together transpatial groupings, i.e. the people who are usually separated due to their socio-cultural ‘differences’. We called such patterns of individuals’ presence in urban public space ‘co-presence of heterogeneity’.

In the diagram below the red rectangles suggest different possibilities for a non-correspondence relation between spatial groups (neighbourhoods) and transpatial groups (ethnicities). These co-presences occur, in whole or in part, in the spaces where the two systems of correspondence over-lap. As the diagram conceptually illustrates, it is spatially more likely that the members of such groups be individuals from two transpatial groups (ethnic groups). We shall use the term ‘co-presence of heterogeneity’ to refer to such groups.

The examples above allow us to gain a better understanding of how we have translated the concepts of ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’ into spatial form.
However, in order to discuss the spatial agency of urban form in the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’, we need to explore these terms in a theoretically stronger context. We aim to do this by way of space syntax theory.

**Spatial pervasiveness**

Above we discussed on a highly principal level how urban form has the potential to exert influence on the formation of different types of co-presence patterns. We also outlined two different types of such patterns that we called ‘co-presence of homogeneity’ and ‘co-presence of heterogeneity’, emphasizing that the spatial structure of the city, by way of its influence on movement patterns, is able to contribute to both types of co-presence. We argued that the first type of co-presence is typical of the less accessible parts of the spatial system of cities – in space syntax theory called the background network – since these spaces typically are most accessible from their local surroundings, such as the neighbourhood, and therefore primarily gather people from the already established spatial grouping of the neighbourhood, which typically also carries many categorical similarities, for instance concerning socio-economic characteristics. The second pattern of co-presence on the other hand, co-presence of heterogeneity, we found to be typical of the more accessible parts of urban spatial systems – in space syntax called the foreground network – since these are easily accessible from large parts of the spatial systems or even the system as a whole and therefore also typically gather people from the system as a whole, which in turn implies a far greater categorical heterogeneity since it creates patterns of co-presence consisting of people from many ‘neighbourhoods’ so to speak.

In this section we will try to bring this argument further by basing it in space syntax theory as a primary system of argumentation and from this – in accordance with the methodological intentions presented in chapter 2 – also develop a secondary system of argumentation whereby we are able to more specifically elaborate how the spatial configuration of cities influences the formation of different patterns of co-presence. As discussed in the previous chapter, space syntax theory considers the spatial structure of the city as a system that due to its particular structure produces spaces of varying accessibility. In this sense, while the spatial structure of the city naturally is constituted by one single network, it is also possible to conceive of a foreground network constituted by the more accessible spaces and a background network constituted by the less accessible spaces as long as we keep in mind that they both are part of the same
network (Hillier B., 2008). It is these variations in accessibility and how they influence movement patterns in the city that is the critical point if we are to conceive of a potential agency in urban form and, in extension and closer to our current argument, to understand how it may condition the emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’.

Furthermore, according to space syntax theory, due to its high accessibility and tendency to attract movement from the city as a whole and the resulting co-presence of heterogeneity, the foreground network tends to manifest a “generative” situation since such co-presences of heterogeneity also present good opportunities for exchange and innovation (Hillier & Vaughan, 2007, pp. 219-220). In our attempt to translate the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’ in terms of urban form, the urban habit of ‘civility of indifference’ is, therefore, to a great extent associated with the foreground network. The logic behind this can be argued to be that these spaces continuously present situations of great heterogeneity, where people may become used to seeing and mingling with difference, speaking most generally, and are therefore more likely to, so to speak, develop a ‘civility of indifference’ to difference. In other words, the emergence of habits of living ‘together-in-difference’ are, speaking most principally, more likely in the foreground network due to its characteristic co-presence of heterogeneity and the generative situations they create.

Similarly, space syntax theory argues that the background network, for instance typical for residential areas, tends to produce “conservative” situations due to the limited reach and lower movement flows of these spaces, why they primarily attract people from the local surroundings, such as the neighbourhood (Hillier & Vaughan, 2007, p. 220). As discussed earlier, the urban public spaces of the background network, due to this localized character, are therefore likely to create co-presences of a greater homogeneity. Therefore, rather than spaces of exchange and innovation, as we find in the foreground network, we may understand the spaces of the background network as spaces of confirmation and re-enforcement of already established norms. Again, we need to stress the highly principal level of our argument at this stage.

Given this universal characterisation of the spatial form of cities presented by space syntax, on the one hand, and the fact that every city, broadly speaking, is a
multicultural phenomenon, on the other hand, the question that arises here is why the spatial structure of some cities tends to spatially support multiculturalism and the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’, again speaking most generally, while some others tend to manifest spatial properties in conflict with such an ideal. That is, if the spatial configuration of the city follows a certain ‘universal’ characterization, such as the presence of a foreground and background network as claimed in space syntax theory, why do all cities not manifest identical capacities to address the concerns of multiculturalism?

A possibility is of course to reject the idea that there is a relation between the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’ and the spatial form of cities. However, if we do not immediately draw such a conclusion it seems most reasonable that the answer should be sought in the differences of the spatial configuration of various cities. In other words, notwithstanding an embedded universal structure, the urban form of various cities typically embodies decisive differences in their configurational patterns that differentiate them from each other. According to our argument above, both the relation between the two networks and the structure within them individually are of the greatest importance here, due to their effect on the distribution of patterns of co-presence of various kinds in public urban space. Accordingly, the relation between multiculturalism and urban form could fruitfully be sought in the differences that the dual structures of foreground and background networks create in cities; i.e. the configurational differences that particularize the spatial structure of every city, notwithstanding the universality of the foreground and background network.

Most important here is naturally the fact that the notion of the two networks is a generalisation of a much more complex situation. Rather than being constituted by two distinct entities forming parts of the same network, the spatial form of cities takes the shape of a great variety of network-like structures where the critical property in this context is that in terms of accessibility these structures form a continuity, where individual spaces vary in degree of accessibility to the rest of the network. There are not two groups where one is highly accessible and the other less accessible; rather there is continuity all the way from the most
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20 - The term “multiculturalism idea” conveys a broad spectrum of perspectives, visions, and strategies that should not be limited to a narrow understanding of it. However, the term is used here in accordance with the political multiculturalism outlined in the previous chapters and its perception of ethnic differences in the western context.
accessible space down to the least accessible. However, a possibility naturally opens to divide these into two primary groups for practical reasons that may be called a foreground network constituted by the most accessible spaces and a background network made up of the less accessible spaces.

What is important to remember, however, is that what we may miss if we forget this continuity of accessibility is that each space carries some of the properties of the foreground network and some of the properties of the background network so that they all to varying degrees also carry a little of a generative mode and a little of a conservative mode. That is, a very inaccessible space still is a space of encounter for very local differences so that it both implies some degree of exchange and some degree of confirmation. However, in the next space up in the range there may be a little less local degree of differences, and we may therefore say the exchange is somewhat greater, or rather exchange between greater differences, while also remaining a space of some degree of confirmation. We could continue this to the most accessible space that constitutes a space of exchange between a great degree of difference but even so also a space of some degree of confirmation; that is a space where the city as a whole may find an identity and manifest itself.

Therefore, what may be truly important here is not to identify a foreground and background network in cities – while we may agree with Hillier that to some degree all cities have them – but rather to analyse to what degree cities can present a continuity of spaces with varying degrees of overlap between exchange and confirmation, so that they present the spatial conditions for both exchange and confirmation at each scale from the most local to the city as a whole. Again, the reason for this is the ability of spatial form to create varying degrees of accessibility so that spaces become accessible and part of movement of different scales, that is, trips of different lengths. It is variations and breaks in this continuity that may prove decisive when it comes to the ability of different cities to create the conditions for a multicultural society.  

Having said that, we may still see the point in generalising into a foreground and background network, and perhaps not only for the reason of simplifying
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21 - It should be stressed that although the underlying structure of the balance process between the global and the local networks is essentially spatial, there is no claim that it is not mediated through social, political and economic processes.
communication. There may be some truth in that not all spaces constitute overlapping space to the same degree in the sense above, but there are typically spaces where this property is more pronounced; for instance spaces at the boundary between housing units, neighbourhoods or city districts, keeping in mind that this can be repeated at many scales, that is, we may talk about a foreground and background network within the neighbourhood or within the city district as well as within the city as a whole.

In this dissertation, the term *spatial pervasiveness* has been designated to describe the configurational properties of overlapping spaces where a balance between what we have called the foreground and background networks is more prominent. Such overlapping spaces are then potentially the most important sites for the generative mode of the foreground network to meet the conservative mode of the background network. Therefore, it may also be that the variety in configurational spatial patterns, critical for the support of a multicultural society, should perhaps in particular be sought in these spaces. In other words, although the urban form of cities has a common or universal structure in the presence of a foreground and background network, according to space syntax, they differ in their configurational patterns and perhaps in particular and most decisively in the pattern constituting these overlapping spaces and their typical spatial pervasiveness.

We can now return to our previous question of why urban form does not manifest identical capacities to address the concerns of living ‘together-in-difference’ in all cities. By more particularly identifying that variations in urban form are to a great extent rooted in differences in the configurational patterns of its overlapping spaces at different scales, we find a potential answer to this question; the spatial conditions for cultural diversity are derived not so much from the duality of a foreground and background network as from the subtle differences in configurational patterns of spaces overlapping between the global and local properties of the system. Based on space syntax’s spatial description of the city that relates the overall socio-spatial character of the individual spaces to the balance between “the strength of their global and local properties and
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22 - Inspired by Hillier’s concept of *pervasive centrality*: (Hillier B., Spatial Sustainability in Cities: Organic Patterns and Sustainable Forms, 2009).

23 - Defining characteristics of the *Centre*, Bill Hillier (2012, p. 150) describes similar modes of balance between the global and the local networks.
reinforcers” (Hillier B., 2009, p. K01:8), the overall character of the city’s spatial structure – to the extent that is related to the emergence of co-presence and multiplicity – is related to the balance in overlapping spaces. Hence, this research effort claims that overlapping spaces are of significant importance for the overall character of the spatial configuration due to their agency in creating co-presence of heterogeneity in urban public spaces, that is, generating spatial groupings that draw from transpatial groupings of society.

In summary it is argued that overlapping spaces represent the spaces where urban structure can potentially provide the spatial viability for the emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’ and its two organizing principles: ‘co-presence of homogeneity’, which comes close to Amin’s principle of ‘co-presence’, and ‘co-presence of heterogeneity’, which comes close to Amin’s principle of ‘multiplicity’.

**Related theories and concepts**

One of the main indicators whereby to assess the authority of a ‘logical system of argumentation’, according to Wang (2002, p. 329), is the amount of the system’s connection “to a large body of voices saying related things”. The purpose of including this section is to show that the concept of overlapping spaces, which was proposed in the previous section, is not a totally new idea, but has deep roots in urban design discussions and discourse on space. In other words, the aim of including this section is to show that there is a large body of voices discussing things related to what we have conceptualized as overlapping spaces.

Before seeking the formal character of the spatial pervasiveness, which will be discussed in the next chapter, there is a need to gain an insight into the broader metaphorical conceptualization of overlapping spaces. The discussion is therefore followed by a review of conceptions related to our concept of overlapping spaces. The purpose is that such a review will serve as a platform for our configurational conception of spatial pervasiveness through the lens of space syntax discourse. In this context, overlapping spaces are more particularly understood as spaces that do not belong to one specific scale of the urban spatial structure, but simultaneously belong to many scales, that is, they may play a critical role for the local neighbourhood, the city-district and even the city as a whole.
In more formal space syntax terms this can be expressed by saying that such spaces are centrally located, or well integrated, in the spatial system at different scales. This also asks for a more precise definition of scale, which in space syntax terms is understood in accessibility terms. That is, we may analyse accessibility within different radii, for instance within a radius of 1000m, 2000m or 5000m, where these various radii represent different scales. To put it another way, we may say that scale here is measured as the reach of spaces, where certain spaces, due to the spatial structure of the city, will have a reach to large areas within a certain radius while others will reach much smaller areas. Now, all spaces are not centrally located, or using space syntax terms, well integrated, in the spatial structure to the same degree at all scales. Some spaces may be centrally located within small radii and not at large, while others have the opposite properties. However, some spaces are centrally located when measured at most radii, which here is interpreted as being centrally located at several scales.

What makes this so important in a space syntax context is that centrality in this sense has proven to attract movement; spaces centrally located at several scales are hence likely to attract movement at different scales, that is, movement within the neighbourhood, within the city district and perhaps even the city as a whole, creating an overlap, not only in spatial reach but also of movement flows within the same space, which by extension creates co-presence with particular properties. The classic example here is Jane Jacobs’ observations from her home on Hudson Street on Manhattan, where she could recognise well-known neighbours, reoccurring visitors and total strangers. This was due to the spatial overlap of Hudson Street, being important for Greenwich Village, the south-west of Manhattan and, to some extent, Manhattan as a whole, at the same time.

In architectural and urban design studies, the in-between spaces, where the change between two entities takes place, have been the subject of frequent theoretical and empirical investigations. The spaces which play the role of a border between two realities; the spaces that depict a scalar transformation; the spaces that simultaneously portray an end and a beginning; the spaces that connect the abstract conceptualization of space to its materiality; the spaces that connect and disconnect; the spaces that manifest a pervasiveness by overlapping the firm borders of dichotomization. What we have characterized as the spatial pervasiveness of overlapping spaces is but one of many efforts to emphasize the importance of such spaces in urban form studies. However, notwithstanding the
acknowledgment of their importance, as Hajer and Reijndorp (2001, p. 128) also point out, such overlapping spaces are interpreted in various ways in urban design discourse.

Integrating time and space into social patterns, Zukin (1991, pp. 16, 20) defines the term landscape as a series of “unbounded spaces” referring not only to the physical built environment but also to “an ensemble of material and social practices and their symbolic representations”. In her opinion, the work of architects and urban designers, as the “cultural map of structural change”, bridges time and space and blurs the distinct boundaries between them by giving spatiality to liminality (Zukin, 1991, pp. 39-40).

Shields (1991, p. 3) develops the concept of “marginal places”, through which he distinguishes two geographical and cultural peripheries, stressing that the marginal places are not necessarily located on the geographical periphery but on the “periphery of cultural systems of space in which places are ranked relative to each other”. The relevance of his definition to this research is his emphasis on that the social periphery and the spatial periphery are not necessarily always superimposed. However, as he also maintains, spatiality is often used as a means of manifesting social and cultural division and classification through recoding place into “imaginary geographies”, where geographical sites are associated with specific social and cultural values (Shields, 1991, p. 29).

The socio-spatial concept of edge or edge space, as a transition space in which many urban activities occur, has been another related concept in urban studies. For instance, comparing urban life to biological activities that occur in nature, Richard Sennett (1994) observes the importance of the edge “as a scene of life”; in (Ellin, 2006, p. 84). The focus on the edge space is associated with different understandings of centrality, not only in urban design studies but also in the areas of astronomy and physics (Ellin, 2006, p. 84).

Similarly, Ellin (1999, p. 190) writes about an urban design with the focus “on the edge/periphery/border” where different landscapes can meet. Inspired by the concept of “integrated personality”, Ellin (2006, p. 94) develops “integral urbanism”. Integrated personality, defined by Carl Jung (1875-1961), is a psychological process of integrating the opposites, or integrating the conscious with the personal or collective unconscious parts in order to form a whole. Different from both Modernism – which acknowledges the transparency or the elimination of the borders – and Postmodernism – which tends to brace the
borders – integral urbanism designates a *translucent* approach through which the differences and distinctions are brought together and bridged (Ellin, 2006, pp. 82-94). On the one hand, it acknowledges the differences and distinctions of identities. On the other hand, it seeks relationships and networks between individuals and groups. Therefore, the central emphasis is on the space in which the rigid boundaries can be decoded and a “smooth deterritorialization” would be allowed (Ellin, 2006, p. 84). It is in the search for borders, boundaries, margins, thresholds and in-between spaces where the flows of difference can meet and establish “a nonhierarchical network that connects microstruggles without homogenizing them” (Ellin, 2006, p. 84).

Integral urbanism seeks the ambiguity of those edge spaces of flow between opposites, where, as Jacques Derrida states, “the third can participate, it can touch the two edges. But the ambiguity of participation does not exhaust it” (Derrida, 1987, p. 34). For integral urbanism, the *third* is the process of “mending the seams” of relationships and connections that can be generated between different spaces, people and activities (Ellin, 2006, p. 87). It is an attempt to shift the focus of attention from the centre to the edge and boundary. However, as Martin Heidegger (1975, p. 154) also states, this boundary is not the ending point, but “is that from which something begins its essential unfolding”; seen in (Ellin, 2006, p. 88). The boundary and the edge should not be considered as a line for separation but as a space for negotiation in which different layers and scales flow freely. Given the idea that there is no existence in isolation, but everything is given meaning depending on its relation to others, or as Derrida puts it, from “the web of relations and forces”, the space between different steams also acquires characteristics due to the relations between them. This space is what Žižek (2011, pp. 258-9) considers to be the *third space* or the *invisible space* between inside and outside that usually gets lost “in the division between inside and outside”. To him, inside and outside can never cover the entire space without this third space that is in between.

In a more empirical approach, the liveliness of urban space is attributed to the quality of edges in city spaces; see for instance (Alexander, Ishikawa, & Silverstein, 1977, p. 600; Whyte, 1980; Gehl, 1987; 2010). Despite the tendency to assume that the *edge* or the border is located at the perimeter of the space, the spatiality of the edge does not necessary meet its conceptual connotation. Using the term *soft edge* to portray a space in which different zones, such as private and public, could intermingle and open up space for exchange, negotiation, and
experience, Gehl (2010, p. 75) states that “life grows from the edge in towards the middle”.

In describing the concept of heterotopias, introduced into the social sciences by Foucault (1967), Hetherington (1997, p. viii) writes about the “places of Otherness” or “spaces of alternative ordering”; the spaces in which the social order and the way things must be done are different from the socio-spatial order of the surrounding area; the spaces that do not belong to a specific place but have layers of relationship to the physical and non-physical surrounding spaces.

Hajer and Reijndorp (2001) address the places of otherness using similar approaches which have been of importance for the purpose of this research. According to them (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, p. 53), people’s differences have developed the cultural geography of the contemporary urban field as an “archipelago of enclaves” where spatial strategies help people either meet or avoid the groups of people they want. Different from the spatial separation through the modernism zoning ideas, the reason for the spatial segregation of the contemporary multi-functional public spaces must be sought in the fact that there is hardly any overlap between the spatial networks of different groups of people (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, p. 84). Urban plans that aim to bring diversity in public space should therefore primarily target the integration of space into the spatial configuration of cities, rather than implement symbolic transformations. Hajer and Reijndorp (2001, pp. 85-9) challenge the historical cultural-political ideology of a desirable public space as “a neutral meeting place” and argue that the public domain must instead provide the opportunity of experiencing the difference of the otherness and provide the opportunity for a “shift of perspective”. Given the essence of the modern city as a collection of socio-cultural landscapes on the one hand and the tendency of different groups to occupy or dominate certain (public) space (Hayden, 1995, p. 23) on the other, one faces an internal paradox in the definition of public space if the intention is to avoid any socio-spatial friction (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, pp. 85-88). The “parochialization” of the public domain is therefore not necessarily an obstacle to its development, but the problem could be in our definition and expectation of public space “as a neutral meeting place for all social groups regardless of class, ethnicity or lifestyle” (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, p. 85).

Hajer and Reijndorp (2001, p. 89) try to rethink public space and argue that instead of aiming for a space that is fully shared and used by different groups,
the concept of public space could be interpreted as an arena for “exchange and confrontation” through which the otherness perspective is experienced. This is a space that is usually dominated by a certain group with their own specific code of behaviour. The core of the argument, however, is that the dominance of a group or activity does not exclude others’ presence in the space but instead allows them to enter “the parochial domains of others” (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, p. 88); According to them, by entering that space, the stranger notices the dominance of a certain code of behaviour, different from their own, which not only does not impose any obligation to join, but also lets the stranger compare others’ life ideologies with his or her own and improve the skills of ‘civility of indifference’. This requires liminal spaces, shaped by the spatial overlapping of different socio-cultural landscapes, each of which may be dominated by certain civic resonances. This implies a design for spaces that at the same time as they bridge the spatiality of distinct political and cultural landscapes, also belong to different layers of urban socio-cultural multiplicity (Amin, 2006).

These overlapping spaces are in essence different from the in-between spaces, which do not belong to any group and are used merely as a means of spatial connection. Transcending the borders of socio-physical homogeneity, the overlapping spaces belong to different landscapes of urban morphology, where multiple socio-cultural geographies of urbanity melt into each other. Similar spaces are recognized by their “weak borders” (Sennett, 1990, p. 196), and easily allow socio-spatial transition between layers of “the city of plural compositional form” (Amin, 2012, p. 64). The overlapping spaces belong to different districts that despite their distinct group differentiation do not have precise borders, or as Young (1990, pp. 238-9) puts it, in the normative ideal of the city life, “groups do not stand in relations of inclusion and exclusion, but overlap and intermingle without becoming homogeneous. [...] while borders are open and undecidable”.

It is quite obvious how the many terms touched upon here – such as space of liminality, unbounded landscape, integral spaces, translucent spaces, spaces of alternative ordering, third space or the invisible space – have some fundamental differences in meaning, as well as in what they actually refer to and, therefore cannot be sorted as interchangeable concepts. However, the intention here is not to justify explaining everything under one concept, but to identify a commonality among them, and argue that they are all voices saying things related to our concept of overlapping spaces. According to Wang (2002, p. 329), one of the ways that a system of argumentation gains authority is when it is able to relate its
logical argumentation to a large body of related concepts. Therefore, the
intention here has been to explain that there have already been various related
concepts in urban design discourse. The common idea behind the mentioned
concepts can be described as that all of them try to go beyond fixed and rigid
boundaries and transcend the bounded geographies; what the pervasiveness of
overlapping spaces also tries to manifest.

To summarize, although related concepts to overlapping spaces have been at the
centre of many urban design and planning discussions, this dissertation has tried
to explain how the extent to which the real physical space has potential to exert
its autonomous influence on human activity is underestimated. This section has
therefore aimed to outline the pervasiveness character of overlapping spaces,
where urban form has been given a more significant autonomy. Accordingly,
there is no claim that spatial pervasiveness is a totally new conceptualization of
space, but to posit that within urban form discussions, the spatial property of the
pervasiveness (apart from its embedded social processes) is also of importance
and that it has an agency in the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’.

**Closing words**

Building on space syntax theory as the primary system of argumentation in this
dissertation, it has been argued that spatial pervasiveness, the particular
configurational properties of what we have called overlapping spaces, makes
such spaces vital for both the foreground and background networks in a sort of
mediating manner. Without denying the complexity of urban phenomena and
their dependency on a great variety of determinants, space syntax research has
shown how physical space, while being but one contributing factor, has an
autonomous influence on movement patterns. By extension, we make the
argument that such patterns of movement flows have a fundamental effect on
what Amin calls the urban habit of ‘civility of indifference’. More particularly
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24 - By trying to provide a list of related concepts – what Wang (2002) calls “related things”
as a part of providing authority for a logical argumentation system – we have not been
searching for totally similar concepts, but rather the idea has been to discuss some of the
concepts that are in one way or another related to our concept of overlapping spaces. For
instance, it might be argued that what we have developed here as ‘overlapping spaces’ are
typically centrally located in space syntax terms, and that it stands in contrast to some of the
examples given that are found in peripheries, on the edge or so on. We here argue that
what relates these examples to overlapping spaces, is their interest in transitional aspects of
space, whether it is to be found in the periphery or in the centre.
this happens by way of their influence on the formation of different types of co-presence. In other words, spatial configuration has agency in this context through its generation of patterns of co-presence, where we in particular have identified the two types of co-presence of homogeneity and heterogeneity as potential translations of Amin’s organising principles of ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’ into urban form.

The theoretical bottom-line of this research is the space syntax idea that the spatial structure of the city takes part in a dual process essential for any society (Hillier B., 2001); first, a generative process of innovation and change that primarily takes place in the global structure of the city, which due to its high accessibility increases the spatial potentiality for co-presence and encounter among people with socio-cultural differences. Second, a conservative process found in the local structure or in the less integrated residential areas of the city, which preserves and reinforces local socio-cultural similarities by constraining movement patterns and thereby decreases the spatial potentiality for the co-presence of people from the outside.

Within the context of the culturally plural cities of the West, such cultural differences may therefore be intensified by the conservative process of local areas in the background network. On the other hand, the generative processes of the foreground network at the same time create new potentials for greater movement flows and co-presence in public space drawn from many parts of the city (Hillier & Netto, 2002, p. 182). Consequently, the global network establishes spatial patterns through which the spatial viability for encounter and exchange between different cultural groups is increased.

We agree with Hillier in that this dual process of the city is the driving force behind many similarities found in cities, notwithstanding their formal differences. However, what catches our attention when studying cultural diversity in cities are the differences that the urban fabric tends to manifest. In other words, a question that arises is why the urban form of different cities tends to address the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’ in a variety of ways, while
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25 - As an implication of the dual process, Hillier (2008, p. 227) states that the relation between society and space is generic rather than specific. It implies that “space is created not directly by the interrelated demands of specific activity patterns, but indirectly by the different demands that kinds of activity place on the movement and co-presence that is created by space” (Hillier B., 2008, p. 227).
all are the outcome of a universal dual process. To address that question, this chapter has aimed to explain how the balancing process between the dual networks of the urban structure brings about important differences in how the urban structure supports or hinders the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’ and in extension the achievement of a ‘civility of indifference’.

The nub of the discussion on relations between social groupings and spatial structure can be articulated as: given that to an important degree, the social structure of the city is the outcome of the dual process of generative and conservative processes that take place in the foreground and background networks, then it is critical that due to any social, political, spatial or economic variable, the background network be linked to, and mediated with, the foreground network; otherwise the spatial configuration of the city may tend to develop separated socio-spatial enclaves. In that case, the conservative processes characteristic to the background network encourage and reinforce spatial groupings without being mediated by the encounter and exchange afforded by the heterogeneity of the generative processes characteristically found in the foreground network. Consequently, it may increase the spatial possibility that enclaves tend to characterize themselves more through local spatial groupings without opportunity to also identify with the larger society. However, this is not to say that spatial separation of enclaves per se is a social problem, as Young (1999, pp. 240-1) states, it is segregation, the lack of opportunity to also encounter other cultural identities, that is problematic.26

Therefore, given Amin’s (2012) concept of ‘civility of indifference’ as his proposed politics of living together, the idea is not to oppose the existence of spatial enclaves within the city fabric, but rather to emphasise the need to connect the local to the global network through overlapping spaces. Overlapping spaces are according to our definition part of both the local and the global networks. This implies that while they maintain the local character of local cultural clusters, they are also integrated into the global network of the city’s everyday life. It is here suggested that it is through such overlapping spaces that

26 - Young (1999) considers segregation to be a social problem for two primary reasons: First, it violates the principles of equal opportunity; second, it produces and grants unjust privileged access to advantages and benefits. She elaborates that “the everyday separation of the lives of the more and less privileged that is part of the process of residential racial segregation makes it unnecessary for the privileged to think about social injustice except in the most abstract terms” (Young, 1999, p. 242).
the dual processes are linked together, which may support the development of the urban *habits* of living ‘together-in-difference’.
Chapter Five: Spatial Multiculturalism

With the help of overlapping spaces in the previous chapter, we translated Amin’s alternative politics of living together into spatial terms, albeit in general terms, keeping ‘difference’ at the core of discussion. This chapter intends to narrow down our earlier general discussion of spatiality for a politics of living together to an attempt to translate some of the more detailed ideas of multiculturalism into the terms of urban form. The discussion will be based mainly on the following ideas and concepts in political theory: a) Parekh’s (2000) idea of “community of individuals and communities”, b) Young’s (1990, p. 60) idea of “cultural imperialism”, and c) the ideas of “intercultural dialogue” (Parekh, 2006, pp. 268-273) or “dialogue between cultures” (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 171) and a “shift of perspective” (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, p. 89). To be more specific, the underlying objective of this chapter is to discuss how overlapping spaces – as our general spatial translation of a politics of living together – may encompass these ideas, which according to political theory, can be regarded among specific demands on multicultural cities.

As a part of our discussion on the relation between urban form and multiculturalism, each section will begin with discussions about these concepts from the point of view of political theory. In fact, a broad elaboration of these concepts in chapter two sufficed to show their relevance to political debates on
multiculturalism. However, in this chapter, with the intention to discuss them further through the lens of spatial form, and with a particular emphasis on what we earlier explained as spatial pervasiveness of overlapping spaces, we may occasionally need to refer to political theory to advance our spatial discussions on these concepts. Moreover, it should be emphasized here that there has been no intention to claim that multiculturalism can be fully covered through these three aspects. Rather, the intention has been to argue that these three aspects – which are often discussed in political and theoretical debates on multiculturalism – can be of significant importance also from an architectural and design perspective. More specifically, the dissertation explores on a theoretical level how urban design theory, especially theories about urban form, can address and by extension translate and express multiculturalism, including its perspectives on plurality of urban life more generally, in spatial form. For this we deem the three aspects outlined above to be both promising and useful.
Spatial structure of community fluidity

Introduction

Earlier in chapter two, it was stated that in multicultural societies, generally speaking, the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’ brings about a state of condition which Parekh (2000) describes as “community of individuals and communities”, stressing a multi-faceted and fluid character for community. According to The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: Reporting on a Report a multicultural society\(^{27}\) is made up of a myriad overlapping communities, which “are fluid, overlapping, internally diverse, and subject to constant reconstitution” (Parekh, 2001, p. 696). The fluid character claims that membership of individuals and groups in communities of a multicultural society are not restricted to specific rigid groups. Rather, every individual or group can be a member of a variety of communities simultaneously. Therefore, membership of different communities may overlap and bring about a situation in which an individual can be a member of two or more communities whose other members do not share the same cultural values, beliefs and practices. It was also discussed that for ease of reference, this dissertation considers the term community fluidity to refer to Parekh’s concept of ‘community of individuals and communities’ and the emphasis that his term places on the fluid, overlapping character of community.

Given our attempt in the previous sections to discuss overlapping spaces as the spaces where the urban structure can potentially provide the spatial viability for an emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’, the question that arises here is how community fluidity can be translated into spatial terms, and how urban form may support the development of such character through overlapping spaces. To answer this question, this section aims to explain community fluidity – as one of the essential features of a multicultural society – in spatial terms. In other words, the aim is to investigate how urban form can spatially support community fluidity as a general feature of multicultural societies. However, it should here again be emphasised that although it may not be among the theoretically most developed ideas in multiculturalism discourse and is mainly a common feature to

\(^{27}\) The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain is a report specifically on contemporary multi-ethnic society in Britain, written by B. Parekh. In his book Multiculturalism, Tariq Modood (2013) considers this report to be “the best public policy statement on multiculturalism in Britain”.
represent basic demands on multicultural cities and a sort of pragmatic approach to the politics of living together, the concept of ‘community of individuals and communities’ is deemed to be of great relevance to the fields of urban planning and design in general and to our discussion on urban form for multicultural societies in this dissertation. The aim of this section is therefore to discuss how the multiculturalism’s idea of community fluidity may find its spatial form in what we have called the overlapping spaces that are simultaneously able to support conservative and generative processes.

Community fluidity in spatial terms

As extensively discussed above, this dissertation addresses the relation between urban form and multiculturalism through relations of both correspondence and non-correspondence between spatial demarcations and social groupings. Along the same line of thought, we here suggest that spatial configuration addresses the concerns of community fluidity by adopting both a correspondence and a non-correspondence correlation between membership of a spatial enclave (neighbourhood) and membership of a transpatial community (ethnic-cultural group).

Embedding our previous conceptual example into the dual network suggested by space syntax theory, the background network or the local network typical of residential areas can be argued to be the spaces where there is a correspondence relation between membership of an ethnic group (transpatial group) and membership of a neighbourhood (spatial group). The reason for this can be seen at work in both directions. We know from extensive studies around the world that there is strong tendency for groups that carry categorical similarities, whether in socio-economic or ethnic-cultural terms, to spatially cluster in particular parts or neighbourhoods of cities. While this may be the result of external forces, for instance not being able to afford housing in any part of the city, we often also see an internal preference for cultural groups to search out proximity to their own group. Hence, we see processes where categorical groups develop into spatial groups.

There is at the same time extensive research that points out what is called neighbourhood effects (Lupton, 2003, pp. 1-3), that is, the observation that people living in spatial proximity, for instance within a particular neighbourhood, develop categorical similarities; for examples see (Buck, 2001;
Dietz, 2002). This may be due to dominating categorical groups that have grouped in a particular neighbourhood according to the process described in the previous paragraph, but also and more importantly for our current argument emphasising the effects of space, it seems to be due to continuous local co-presence and exchange, whereby a local culture develops that also, so to speak, flavours the dominating categorical group. Hence, we also see processes where spatial groupings develop into categorical groups. In both cases we can see how space has a reinforcing and sustaining role.

In other words, in the urban public spaces that form part of the background network there is a greater likelihood that we will find individuals who share similarities whether socio-economically or ethnic-culturally. In these spaces the spatial demarcation corresponds to the social grouping and reinforces and sustains a local characteristic where particular individuals and groups more easily may find commonality due to both spatial proximity and cultural similarities. The particular pattern of co-presence thus provided allows the members of such an enclave to establish a cultural community that creates greater potential for communal activities and a fertile ground for the practice of similar cultural affinities. We have suggested the term co-presence of homogeneity for such situations.

We immediately wish to emphasise that there is no contradiction between spatial enclaves of distinct social or cultural identities and the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’. Rather we shall see how they are essential to such an ideal in that they provide for differences to develop and sustain themselves in the first place. What we aim to pinpoint here is rather the need for such spatially sustained socio-cultural groupings to be mediated by overlapping spaces where socio-cultural differences can meet and exchange in a broad sense of the word, or else we may end up with a simplistic correspondence situation, that is, a situation where spatial form reinforces the socio-cultural separations of groups but does not provide spaces for socio-cultural encounter and exchange.

Such a situation may lead to the emergence of ‘parallel lives’ or an “archipelago” of socially segregated enclaves (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001). That is, although the spatial separation of ethno-cultural communities per se should not be regarded as a social problem (Young, 1999), it can go from cultural identities sustained by spatial separations to social isolation provoked by spatial separation. For example, one may refer to how suburban neighbourhoods in
many metropolitan areas in Europe are not only spatially separated but also in many cases socially segregated from the rest of the city.\footnote{As an example of a study on urban form and social segregation in the context of European cities, see (Legeby, 2013).} The critical question here seems to be why spatially separated neighbourhoods in some cases sustain social and cultural difference in a positive sense and in other cases in a problematic sense.

Therefore we try to address this question by investigating the specific role of the overlapping spaces, discussed above, in providing the conditions for co-presence drawn from both transpatial groupings and localised spatial groupings, which is also in line with our emphasis on the organizing principle of multiplicity. It is argued that the \textit{co-presence} provided locally by the background network and its characteristic conservative mode due to its homogenous content, should be balanced by the co-presence provided by the globally connected foreground network and its equally characteristic generative mode due to its heterogeneous content.

In cities that provide such spaces, individuals who are members of a particular spatial enclave with a particular socio-economic identity that may benefit from the sustaining power of such spatial separation in the background network, may also be brought into contact with individuals who are members of other spatial enclaves and with other socio-economic identities in overlapping spaces. By extension, such encounter and exchange may lead to the generation of new social connections, economic exchanges and cultural forms. As emphasised by Amin (2012, p. 78; 2008, p. 15), such co-presence of heterogeneity may also lead to conflict, which again may be both productive and destructive. This situation is spatially more likely within the overlapping spaces where the pervasiveness of the spatial structure lets them possess both the local character of the background network and the global character of the foreground network. It is important to stress that although the discussion here focuses on the \textit{spatial viability} of such situations, social, economic, political, and other influencing factors are not denied.

According to our previous spatial interpretations of Amin’s organizing principles of \textit{co-presence} and \textit{multiplicity}, drawing individuals from very many different
parts of the city together and bringing them into the sight of each other is interpreted as the organizing principle of ‘multiplicity’ in terms of urban form. In other words, by increasing the co-presence of individuals from a variety of spatial enclaves, the spatial configuration of overlapping spaces is more likely to work “against the tendency of social categorization to divide society into discrete groups” (Hanson & Hillier, 1987, p. 265). Hence, the crux of the arguments is that owing to spatial pervasiveness, it is more likely that in overlapping spaces of this kind the locally attracted co-presence of individuals become mediated with the co-presence of individuals attracted from many parts of the city. The eventual claim of this section is therefore that the pervasiveness of such overlapping spaces, that is, the ability to balance the global and the local or the foreground and the background network, provides spatial viability for the emergence of co-presences of heterogeneity, which we see as the spatial interpretation of the concept of multiplicity drawn from Amin.

Similarly, it is suggested that in overlapping spaces urban structure potentially can provide the spatial viability for an emergence of community fluidity in terms of urban form. In these spaces the generative processes of the foreground network meet and establish a balance with the conservative processes of the background network. The argument is that it is due to the pervasive character of overlapping spaces that members of different localised ethno-cultural communities can establish patterns of co-presence of heterogeneity, despite their spatial affiliation with different enclaves (or neighbourhoods) characterised by patterns of co-presence of homogeneity. Hence, we understand such overlapping spaces as the primary sites where the spatial structure of the city can demonstrate its agency in the particular situation of community fluidity.

If the spatial structure of the city lacks pensiveness in such overlapping spaces, there may be a risk that the spatial structure will tend to support either extreme sides of a spectrum with generative or conservative processes at two ends. As discussed in the previous chapters, on one side of the spectrum the spatial structure may tend towards the generative processes of the foreground network. Consequently, cultural communities would have less chance to find a legitimate ground to practice, sustain and reinforce their cultural values and identities. In this case, the spatial configuration would be likely to support, we may speculate, a total ‘blasé attitude’ dominated by a washed-out mainstream culture that may ultimately serve as a source of discrimination and injustice for minorities. On the other side of the spectrum the spatial structure may tend towards the
conservative processes of the background network, where cultural communities consequently reinforce themselves in established enclaves which then are not only spatially separated but also socially segregated. In this case, these enclaves provide scant experience of or exchange with other communities and there may be a risk that people of each community seldom encounter and take interest in the differences of other communities. The spatial configuration of the city, in this case, would be more likely to support ‘parallel lives’ of segregated communities.

To summarize, the character of pervasiveness typical for overlapping spaces is of crucial importance for the emergence of situations of community fluidity as one of the commons representing basic demands on a multicultural society. At the same time, it is equally important that cities provide spaces deep in the background network that may generate and sustain differences and ‘multiplicity’ so that such situations can become co-presences of heterogeneity in contrast to the co-presences of homogeneity found in the spaces of the background network. In a nutshell, we have tried to argue how the balance in overlapping spaces of the spatial structure of cities can bring about a variety of spatial viabilities towards the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’.

A conceptual example

Thus far in this section of the chapter, we have tried to develop our discussion about overlapping spaces as an attempt to translate Parekh’s (2000) concept of “community of individuals and communities” in the terms of urban form. In other words, we have tried to see if and how the idea of community fluidity, that we deem essential for the particular ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’ chosen in this dissertation, can be expressed in terms of urban form, where essential elements are ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’.

In the previous parts of this chapter, we have explained that urban form and its spatial configuration may address the communal character of society in two contrasting processes; it can be used either to address the idea of community through a correspondence approach by reinforcing local characters by spatial groupings of individuals drawn from a neighbourhood or city district or to apply a non-correspondence approach and encourage encounters among individuals drawn from many parts of the city. Both of these two approaches, as we have seen, can be supported on a principal level by spatial properties of urban form, not least by varying relations between what in space syntax theory are called the
foreground and background networks. However, as earlier stressed, variations in the balance between these two can produce a great variety of potentials that create situations particular to different cities with important implications for the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’. The purpose of this section is therefore to explain how the spatial form of cities may create such significant differences in the conditions for community fluidity.

Regarding the relation between spatial pervasiveness – which refers to a spatial situation – and community fluidity – which is mainly a social concept – the nub of the argument has been that urban form can bolster the viability of co-presence and multiplicity by extending the movement flows from one spatial group to another. To put it more simply, the public spaces of a neighbourhood meet the foreground network through overlapping spaces that simultaneously overlap with other neighbourhoods. The spatial pervasiveness of such overlapping spaces makes the co-presence of individuals from different neighbourhoods more likely in them. Drawing individuals from different spatial enclaves (or neighbourhoods) into public spaces is in fact creating what we have called a co-presence of heterogeneity in space. It is clear how this situation then attests to a non-correspondence structure between a spatial demarcation and a social grouping.

To make this argument more transparent, the discussion proceeds with a conceptual example articulated mainly using space syntax theory. The example portrays a sort of extreme case, at an abstract level, which may help convey the overall idea. There is no intention to generalise this example to all urban forms, or to claim that all the patterns of movement flows are identical to the presented example.

In our example, we consider an intra-urban commute between three points or areas within the urban structure; first, the area of the departure, which we call the A-point; second, the area through which movement, or the trip proceeds, which we call this the B-point; third, the final point, the destination of the trip, which we call the C-point.

- **A-point** = the departure point
- **B-point** = the conduit
- **C-point** = the destination point
In our example, we choose an *A-point* within a residential area, which implies that it is part of a *spatial enclave* in the background network where people with some categorical similarities are agglomerated. For instance, it may be a residential cluster of people who have some cultural or ethnic commonalities. The socio-cultural grouping is then reinforced by the spatial demarcation of the residential enclave. In other words, a correspondence relation between spatial demarcation and socio-cultural grouping is likely. Taken in isolation, this *A-point* then belongs to a spatial grouping that, if not mediated by the co-presence of individuals from other parts of the city, might tend towards social segregation.

The location of the *C-point* on the other hand is chosen within a more centrally located space belonging to the foreground network. Based on the theory of *pervasive centrality*, such a centre may simultaneously belong to a variety of scales (Hillier B., 2009, pp. K01:4-8). In other words, based on the pervasive centrality the assumption is that each spatial enclave possesses its own socio-spatial centre, which is not necessarily located at the geometric centre and may belong to different scales within the urban structure as a whole. Hence, simultaneously being centrally located on many scales, such a location may attract movement from many parts of the city, which means that our *C-point* may benefit from the generative characteristic of the foreground network as argued by space syntax theory in that it tends to bring people with categorical differences together and creates opportunity for encounter.

It is important to remind ourselves that there are no expectations to achieve a deep understanding and recognition of difference through such encounter, rather it may result in a ‘civility of indifference’ of the kind argued by Amin. Therefore, rather than recognition, the spatial structure here seeks to mediate the co-presence of individuals with a socio-cultural diversity, that is what we have called a co-presence of heterogeneity. In this way, we argue, both Amin’s organizing principles of *co-presence* and *multiplicity* are more likely to emerge in urban public space.

Returning to our conceptual example, the *B-point*, the conduit for the movement from *A* to *C*, is a part of the urban fabric that socio-spatially links the background

---

29 - It should again be stressed that a spatial enclave is not necessarily equivalent to the social problem of segregation. Here the purpose is to investigate the circumstances under which spatial enclaves develop tendencies towards the problem of segregation.
network, where we find the A-point, to the foreground network, where we find the C-point. With the help of this conceptual example, we intend to explain how the B-point may, or may not, be part of what we have called overlapping spaces, as the spaces that manifest characteristics of both the foreground and background network, and are able to create a socio-spatial balance and continuity by way of their pervasiveness. In other words, we are searching for a type of configurational characteristics of space, rather than a particular kind of space. We pursue our conceptual example by describing the effects of two alternative characters for the B-point(s). We hope that such a comparison may illustrate the significant role of what we have called overlapping spaces when it comes to the provision of a spatial support for an urban habit of living ‘together-in-difference’.
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**Figure 8.** In this conceptual example, overlapping spaces located in one spatial enclave are less likely to spatially support the co-presence of heterogeneity.

In the first case, we consider a situation where the B-point, that is, the spatial conduit of the movement flow from the A-point to the C-point, belongs to the same spatial enclave as both the A-point and the C-point. In other words, the entire movement flow, from the A-point, through the B-point, to the C-point, takes place within one particular spatial enclave (or neighbourhood). As
mentioned earlier, our conceptual spatial enclave is a cluster of people who have cultural-ethnic commonalities. This socio-cultural grouping is therefore reinforced by the spatial demarcation of their enclave. This implies a correspondence relation between the spatial demarcation and the socio-cultural grouping.

In this case, the emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’ in our conceptual enclave lacks the fundamental principle of multiplicity. This implies that despite encouraging inner community relations and emphasizing co-presence within the micropublics of the spatial enclave, the spatial structure does not support the inter-community encounters at the B-point. The argument behind this claim is that the B-point, which is the potential site for encouraging a balance and continuity of networks form the most local (background) networks to the most global (foreground) networks, is part of an enclave where the people who cluster share socio-cultural similarities. The B-point – which is expected to be part of the overlapping spaces that simultaneously belong to both networks – is therefore spatially less likely to support the co-presence of heterogeneity. In this case, rather than ‘community of individuals and communities’, the spatial configuration tends to spatially support a collection of separated spatial enclaves each of which represents an isolated cultural or ethnic clustering. This can be associated to a situation in which the urban structure tends to develop multicultral but separated enclaves; what may be described as an “archipelago of enclaves” in Hajer and Reijndorp’s term (2001, p. 53). To put it another way, the spatial configuration is likely to separate what society already has separated and vice versa.

We immediately wish to emphasise that although the C-point as part of foreground network in this conceptual example is likely to attract people from many parts of the city, and in this way, provide spatial viability for co-presence of heterogeneity, however, due to a lack of pervasiveness, it may tends towards the generative processes of the foreground network. In this case, as discussed earlier in this chapter, cultural communities would have less chance to find a legitimate ground to practice, sustain and reinforce their cultural values and identities, and therefore, the spatial configuration would be likely to support, we may speculate, a total ‘blasé attitude’ dominated by a washed-out mainstream culture that may ultimately serve as a source of discrimination and injustice for minorities. In simple terms, what we are searching for through the B-point is continuity at different scales and between generative and conservative processes.
at two ends, where there would be spatial viability for co-presence of both homogeneity and heterogeneity, or as Amin’s terms, both principles of ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’. Moreover, it needs to be emphasized that what we refer to as the foreground and background network and as co-presence of homogeneity and co-presence of heterogeneity are heavily dependent on the scale at which the discussion is pursued. That implies that there is always a local heterogeneity also in the background network. The important point for our discussion, however, is to lay stress on continuity at all scales – what we earlier described that can be provided through overlapping spaces. Problems emerge, we may speculate, when this continuity is dissipated. In simple terms, we suggest that there will be less spatial viability for a ‘civility of indifference’ if the range in between and continuity at scales in spatial structure is fragmented, notwithstanding having spaces of co-presence.

Similar to the first type of B-point, we next consider a situation where the B-point, as the spatial conduit of the movement flow from the A-point to the C-point, belongs to the same spatial enclave as both the A-point and the C-point. However, the difference is that here the B-point belongs not only to the same spatial enclave, but also to another spatial enclave. However, those two enclaves do not share the same centre. In this case, although the movement flow, from the A-point, through the B-point, to the C-point, takes place within one particular spatial enclave, it intersects with the movement flows of the other spatial enclave within the B-point(s). It is important to mention the reason that we in this conceptual example do not consider the B-point a part of the foreground network lies in the differences of scale between the B-point and the C-point. That is, despite being part of more than one enclave, the B-point is still not part of the foreground network, particularly in comparison with the C-point which is part of the foreground network of the spatial structure of the city as a whole.

In this case, the spatial configuration directs movement flows within the overlapping spaces that concurrently belong to two spatial enclaves. Belonging to different spatial enclaves, the overlapping spaces here spatially support the co-presence of heterogeneity. Here, not only co-presence of homogeneity, but also co-presence of heterogeneity, is spatially more likely, since the conduit is not limited merely to one particular spatial enclave. That is, it is spatially more likely that both Amin’s principles of a ‘civility of indifference’, co-presence and multiplicity, are provided. In this situation, the spatial configuration of
overlapping spaces so to speak brings together individuals whom society has separated.

Following on from our earlier discussions, if each spatial enclave represents a particular socio-cultural clustering, the overlapping spaces then serve as the spatial site for practicing and sustaining socio-cultural differences on the one hand, and for the encounter and exchange among socio-cultural differences on the other hand; what, we may speculate, can occur neither in the foreground nor the background network. The aim here has been to describe how urban form influences the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’ through the influence of overlapping spaces on the movement patterns, and consequently, on the formation of different types of co-presence. Hence, we suggest that to address community fluidity in urban structure, urban form studies should address the configurational character of what we have called overlapping spaces.30
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**Figure 9.** In this conceptual example, overlapping spaces, belonging to more than one spatial enclave, are more likely to spatially support the co-presence of heterogeneity.
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30 - There may be the argument that in space syntax terms what we here call B-points are in fact found in the foreground network, that is, *B-points* and *C-points* are likely to be conceived as the same points. However, the aim here has been to show the importance of B-points, as overlapping spaces, by describing the differences that *B-points* – and not the *C-points* – can bring about in the overall agency of urban structure in the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’.
**Closing words**

Exploring possible avenues to understand multiculturalism in spatial terms, this section of the dissertation suggests that the concept of *community fluidity* – as one of the essential features of a multicultural society – can be translated into urban form through what we had previously identified as overlapping spaces. Our claim is that the spatial form of the city as well as its morphological patterns can provide spatial viability for the emergence of overlapping communities, and in this way has agency in shaping the habits of a ‘civility of indifference’. By saying that, however, it does not intend to belittle the role of social, political, economic and other determinants in shaping the urban habits of living together, but rather to highlight that urban form, as a spatial determinant, should also be taken into account in efforts to address community fluidity as one of the basic demands on the situation of living together in multicultural cities.
Visible spaces of marginality

Introduction

In our discussions on multiculturalism in the second chapter of the dissertation, recognition of the right to cultural expression in the public realm for different cultural groups has been explained as one of the general demands representing multicultural cities. It has also been explained that in the context of a culturally diverse society, there is a risk that the majority will impose their cultural values on minority groups, which may serve as a source of injustice and may give rein to what Young (1990, p. 60) calls “cultural imperialism”. Accordingly, it has been stressed that the mere legitimization of the right to cultural expression is not enough to guarantee the actual participation of diverse groups in the public realm and still carries the risk of marginalization of the oppressed groups (Young, 1990, p. 60). In this regard, Kymlicka (1995, pp. 3-4) states that a general policy approach to multiculturalism needs to challenge the neglect of most contemporary political structures of western democrat states by casting light on the importance of recognizing the right to freedom of expression. This right should not only be accorded one dominant majority group but all culturally different minority groups. In that respect, it was argued that the right to cultural expression in the public realm is an important part of Young’s (1999, p. 237) ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’.

In our attempt to translate the politics of multiculturalism into urban form, this dissertation postulates that part of the criticism directed at the liberal-democratic states in dealing with the freedom of cultural expression has its roots in spatial dimensions. That is, the aforementioned concept of ‘cultural imperialism’, which the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’ tries to address, has manifest spatial traits – given that the public spaces of cities are one of the major arenas for cultural expression (Carr, Francis, Rivlin, & Stone, 1992, p. 239; Amin, 2008).

As an early stage towards understanding the freedom of cultural expression through the lens of physical space, this section therefore aims to amplify how spatial relations of public spaces may have agency in public cultural expression. It is important to mention that, here, by using the terms space and spatial, we are following our earlier basic understanding of the real space or the materiality of space. Without denying their crucial importance, immaterial aspects of public spheres, such as media, internet, etc., are therefore excluded from the discussion.
Expression in public space

The definition of public space has been at the core of discussions in a variety of disciplines. Given the association of this term to other similar terms and concepts such as public sphere, public realm, public domain and so on, a lack of consensus on the definition of public space is noticeable. The reason for the lack of a universal definition might be best understood if one takes into account the broad discussions on themes such as public vs. private, or discussions of space as a material or abstract entity. For instance, in the context of Canadian multiculturalism policy for urban planning, Wood and Gilbert (2005, p. 686) base their definition of public not on ownership – the differences between publicly or privately owned space – but on “design and practice”.31 There is thus a need for this research to clarify its standpoint on public space, as its first step towards the discussions on public space and cultural expression.

In this section, we refer to a description of public space, provided by Carmona et al. (2004; 2010), developed for the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in London. Owing to its emphasis on the physical aspects of space, the description of public space by Carmona et al. is in accord with the purpose of this dissertation.

“Public space relates to all those parts of the built and natural environment where the public have free access. It encompasses: all the streets, squares and other rights of way, whether predominantly in residential, commercial or community/civic uses; the open spaces and parks; and the ‘public/private’ spaces where public access is unrestricted (at least during
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31 - Accordingly, they mention three facets of accessibility, visibility and collectivity as the aspects that let the space be practiced as public. Due to the relevance of their definition of public space to this research – that is, defining public space through three spatial aspects – their arguments is repeated in brief here: “accessibility must not be so limited that access is significantly and unreasonably (although what constitutes ‘reasonably’ is open for debate) restricted. It must be visible, such that what occurs within the space may be seen and known by others, in contrast to the privatizing trend of erecting walls and gating communities. Visibility is conditional to recognition, which itself is conditional to engaging with others. Public space must therefore also be collective. This entails a space in which a large number of (different) people can assemble and act as a group, but collective space also includes that in which people may assemble randomly, to simply co-exist in the same space, engaged in different activities, but visible to one another. In all of these elements, the physical design informs the public-ness of a space; poor design may limit any of a space’s accessibility, visibility and collectivity” (Wood & Gilbert, 2005, pp. 686-7).
daylight hours). It includes the interfaces with key internal and private spaces to which the public normally has free access” (2010, p. 137).

Although this description of public space might simply provoke criticism from different academic disciplines due to its narrow vision of either publicity of space or spatiality of public realm, it may serve the purpose of this research which has conceived space mainly through its physicality. That is, since the focus of the research is on space as a physical object, it is not irrelevant here to reduce the notion of public space to the physical environment in which various public activities occur. In this dissertation, our understanding of public space is indeed built upon our earlier conceptualization of space from the architectural and urban design points of view, where the physical space is perceived as a medium of intervention in the hands of architects and urban designers. However, there is no claim that public space is merely a physical entity\(^\text{32}\), but in the same vein as the rest of the dissertation, the aim is to recapture the public space of multicultural city through the lens of space (and its configurational characteristics).

The aforementioned definition of public space serves as the foundation for the following discussions in which the physicality of public space is taken into account. From his close observation of public spaces in European cities, Madanipour (2004, p. 284) proposes a “secondary” category of public spaces, which, despite their marginality in comparison with the primary public spaces, “are as significant for the function and image of the city as the primary ones”. Despite amplifying the social roles and characters of such ‘secondary’ public

\(^{32}\) - To give a few samples of different, and to some extent contrasting, approaches to envisaging public space, one may refer to the following arguments. It has been tried to select these alternative approaches to public space from urban planning and design efforts with a focus on cultural diversity. Considering public space as a metaphysical phenomenon, Hou (2010, p. 2) states: “serving as a vehicle of social relationships, public discourses, and political expressions, public space is not only a physical boundary and material setting”. He goes on to refer to the definition of public space by Hénaff and Strong (2001, p. 35), where they maintain that “public space is citizen and civic space of the common good; it stands in opposition to private space of special interests. It is clear that in this definition the word space has taken on a metaphorical meaning and designates an ensemble of social connections, political institutions, and judicial practices”. Or, where he refers to Brill (1989, p. 8) concerning the dichotomy between public life and private life, and his understanding of public life as 1) a forum, 2) a group action, 3) a school for social learning, and 4) “where the Stranger is met on Common Ground”. Having mentioned all these different perceptions of the public space, this dissertation however focuses on the physicality of public space.
spaces as the spaces which serve “local communities who live around them” (2004, p. 284), and emphasizing that the quality of such spaces is an indicator of the (social) integration of each part of the city to the urban whole, Madanipour rounds off the discussion about the spatial character of such ‘secondary’ public spaces in relation to the spatial structure of the city fabric by articulating that “often forgotten, however, are the public spaces on the margins of the European city, on the urban periphery or in the inner city” (Madanipour, 2004, p. 267). Similar statements on the spatial properties of ‘secondary’ public spaces underline the need for a further description of those spaces through the lens of the real space. Given Madanipour’s explanation, what he tries to portray as the “secondary public space”, may to a large degree coincide with the spatial network that space syntax theory identifies as the background network, as extensively discussed above. That is, although the ‘secondary’ public spaces, at least potentially, might be found almost everywhere in the urban fabric, from the inner city to the peripheries, they are mainly found within the background network or the local network of the residential areas. In these areas, according to space syntax theory, spatial form tends to lessen and limit movement flows to the local and therefore support more conservative processes (Hillier B., 1996).

Acknowledging the importance of ‘secondary’ public spaces in the city’s public life, this section of the dissertation tries to investigate how and why such spaces have significance for the urban habits of living ‘together-in-difference’. The question that arises here is whether the spatial relation of ‘secondary’ public spaces plays any role in the provision of co-presence and multiplicity. In other words, does the spatial configuration of the ‘secondary’ public spaces, in a culturally diverse context, have any influence on the quality of those places of “fragmentation and competition”33 (Madanipour, 2004, p. 267), and on the patterns of co-presence of individuals in such spaces? The aim here is to analyse the possibility of a positive response34 to these question based on space syntax theory as our primary system of argumentation. In the following paragraphs it is

33 - Madanipour (2004, pp. 271-2) states that due to the limitation of resources, public spaces can become “battlegrounds” in which two types of “competition for use” and “competition for development” are identified. Public spaces tend to be dominated by some groups, while others tend to withdraw from participation and involvement in public activities.

34 - Based on our previous discussions on the space-society relation, the negative answer to the question posed explicitly denies any potential influence of the physical space on social institutions, which is in contrast to our (previously analysed) assumptions in this research.
therefore argued how the spatial configuration of the ‘secondary’ public spaces, as well as their relation to different spatial and transpatial social groupings, may influence ‘cultural imperialism’.

**Visibility despite marginality**

‘Cultural imperialism’, as one of the forms of oppression, according to Young’s (1990, pp. 58-59) explanation, is experienced as the way in which “the dominant meanings of a society render the particular perspective of one’s own group invisible at the same time as they stereotype one’s group and mark it out as the Other. Cultural imperialism involves the universalization of a dominant group’s experience and culture, and its establishment as the norm”.[35] Although this form of oppression may manifest itself in different systemic institutionalized or non-institutionalized power structures of a multicultural society, an attempt has been made here to explain why and how the spatial relations of ‘secondary’ public spaces may influence the situation of ‘cultural imperialism’. The reason for the focus on public space is that on the one hand, public space is one of the arenas in which the concept of ‘cultural imperialism’ can be experienced by a variety of social groups. On the other hand, public space is one of the most relevant aspects of public life to urban form studies.

According to Young’s (1990, p. 60) explanation, ‘cultural imperialism’ gives rein to the situation in which the oppressed dominated groups’ ideas and values do not coincide with the devalued and stereotyped image of themselves imposed by the dominant group. This situation, according to Young (1990, p. 60), is the outcome of a process in which the dominant group does not consider their worldview merely as a perspective, but as the one or the normal way of looking at the world. That is, by universalizing their cultural perspective, the dominant group leaves little room for other groups’ cultural values and worldviews to be expressed, to the extent that the dominated group’s ideas and perspectives become invisible, marginalized and finally devalued. Similarly, regarding the use of public space by different groups, Madanipour (2004, p. 273) states that exclusion of other groups from the public space by those who use it most poses a serious challenge to (the concerns of equality in) the use of public space, “as they

---

35 - Young (1990, pp. 48-63) considers five “faces” of oppression as: 1) Exploitation, 2) Marginalization, 3) Powerlessness, 4) Cultural Imperialism, and 5) Violence. For further details of the concept of the cultural imperialism, see chapter two of the dissertation.
are seen by others as bidding to dominate the place”. On the other hand, since the dominant group perceives their own perspective to be the only valid one, they tend to assess other groups’ worldviews through the lens of their own and therefore mark them out as different or the Other; the ones who are not like us. Therefore, based on Young’s (1990) explanations, ‘cultural imperialism’ is a process of oppression in which the paradox of marginalizing the non-dominant groups as invisible while stigmatizing them as the Other takes place. In Sandercock’s interpretation, that can be explained as “the paradox of identity”; a paradox which “seeks the conformity, disappearance, or invisibility of the Other” (Sandercock, 2009, p. 213).

In debates on public space in the context of cultural diversity, one possible interpretation of ‘cultural imperialism’ can be sought along the lines of Young’s (1990, p. 60) articulation of it, where she states, “cultural imperialism involves the paradox of experiencing oneself as invisible at the same time that one is marked out as different”. She also states that encounter with other individuals and groups, however, is one of the challenges to the ground of ‘cultural imperialism’ and the universalising of the dominant group’s values, beliefs and practices (Young, 1990, p. 59).

Given the correspondence and non-correspondence relations between different types of social groupings, an attempt has been made here to address the issue of cultural imperialism in public space through the dual network of the spatial configuration discussed at length above. That is, the arguments are built on space syntax discourse and within the context of living ‘together-in-difference’ as one possible ideal for a multiculturalist society. Following the dissertation’s line of inquiry, the purpose of this section is to see if spatial relations may have an agency in the patterns of co-presence and multiplicity as organizing principles of a ‘civility of indifference’. The agency of spatial configuration in movement flow and consequently its influence on the formation of different types of co-presence is considered to be the linkage between the concept of cultural imperialism and urban form.

In conceptualising the spatiality of ‘cultural imperialism’, we also face the prospect of how the spatiality of the ‘secondary’ public spaces may be related to the principles of multiplicity and co-presence. In other words, how the spatial configuration of the ‘secondary’ public spaces may address ‘cultural
imperialism’. For that, we build our arguments within the discourse of space syntax and its discussion on the spatial and transpatial groupings.

In this section, it is suggested that if the aim is to scale down the invisibility of the Other, or to encourage co-presence of diverse groups in ‘secondary’ public spaces, which according to Madanipour (2004, p. 281) improves quality of life and projects “a positive image for a deprived neighbourhood for its residents and for others”, the spatial configuration of the ‘secondary’ public spaces needs to be conceptualized as a part of the network of overlapping spaces. In other words, the configurational properties of the ‘secondary’ public spaces should transcend the conservative processes of the background network and also be sought within the scope of overlapping spaces. But the question that arises here is why and how overlapping spaces can provide greater spatial viability for working against ‘cultural imperialism’ in public spaces?

To address this question, we first need to take a quick look at the current understanding of public space in urban design discourse. Public space serves both as a place “where identities, meanings, and social relationships in cities are produced, codified, and maintained” (Hou, 2010, pp. 15-16), and as a differentiating “mediator” (Marcus, 2007, p. 260) in cities with a high degree of cultural diversity. Therefore, the visibility of the Other in urban public space provides the society of heterogeneity with a potential common ground where different individuals can be drawn together from many parts of the city. Due to this potential of public space to provide a common arena in which equality of citizenship and civic engagement can be implanted, there has recently been a tendency to shift the attention of integration programs from the concerns of segregation in residential areas to public spaces (Phillips, 2007, p. 1147; Legeby, 2013). For instance, in this regard Qadeer (2005, p. 61) writes:

“Social integration has a new meaning, that of constructing a common ground of institutions and services for civic engagement of diverse communities. Extending equal citizenship to diverse communities, and not aiming to homogenize their differences, is, according to this perspective, in the public interest. In the spatial arena, it means pursuing policies for adequate and affordable housing for all as well as providing infrastructure and services for viable community life. Rather than focusing on residential segregation, the focus ought to be on greater mixing in schools, work places, recreation and sports and the political arena, and providing public
and commercial facilities at the boundary between different ethnic/racial clusters [...]. These policies could form the common ground for the social integration of diverse communities’.

There are two central concerns embedded in Qadeer’s description of the spatial common ground for living ‘together-in-difference’. The first concern is about the functional type of places that can serve as ‘secondary’ public spaces; the functional type of spaces that enjoy a great potential for mixing and bringing different people together; spaces such as schools, recreation areas, etc. The second concern – which serves the purpose of this argument better – is the spatial relation of those spaces. It is remarkable that Qadeer’s aforementioned description of “the spatial arena” of the public space does not suffice to explain the type of places that can be used as ‘secondary’ spaces, but it also brings up the point that these spaces must be at the boundary of (cultural/ethnic) differences. In this description, by using the phrase “boundary between different ethnic/racial clusters”, he is in fact trying to attract the attention of integration programmes to the socio-spatial relations of such spaces with the surrounding areas. Arguably the term boundary can here be neither reified as, nor reduced to, the spatial edge of a physical space. However, in our spatial interpretation of ‘cultural imperialism’, “the boundary between different ethnic/racial clusters” is perceived as the spatial pervasiveness of overlapping spaces.

The claim is therefore that the configurational character of overlapping spaces and their agency in the formation of different social groupings should exert influence not only on the community’s fluidity but also on the visibility/invisibility of the Other.

Based on Young’s (1990) explanation, the first stage in the process of “cultural imperialism” takes place when the dominant majority group makes different minority groups’ values and practices invisible to the rest of society. Later, due to their invisibility, their worldviews become devalued and their differences would make them stereotyped as the Other. Young’s explanation of the two stages in the process of ‘cultural imperialism’ leads us to two important conclusions. First, it is not the difference per se but the invisibility of that difference which underpins the formation of ‘cultural imperialism’ within society. Second, differences can be maintained and even encouraged, as the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’ emphasizes. Making difference visible to the majority, however, remains as a prerequisite to be fulfilled. This section
elaborates on these two points as what spatial configurational should address in
dealing with the problem of ‘cultural imperialism’, and in providing a spatial
structure which is more likely to support cultural expression in urban public
spaces.

The spatial interpretation of freedom of cultural expression therefore seeks its
spatiality through ‘secondary’ public spaces, which, despite their socio-spatial
marginality within the background or local network, they are simultaneously able
to manifest the socio-cultural differences of a local area to the rest of the city.
That is, they make the differences of the local network visible to the global
network. To address this concern, the ‘secondary’ public space, as a potential site
for the public expression of groups’ differences, should be a part of the
overlapping spaces where the spatial pervasiveness maintains a balance between
the foreground and the background networks. The emphasis on overlapping
spaces has two reasons that are rooted in the configurational characters of those
spaces. As discussed earlier, overlapping spaces belong to both the foreground
and background networks, which give them the potential to simultaneously
possess and manifest both conservative and generative processes. On the one
hand, the spatial configuration of ‘secondary’ public spaces preserves and
encourages the local differences, and on the other, it makes those differences
visible to other groups in society.

This research posits that the spatial configuration of the ‘secondary’ public
spaces exerts its influence over the movement flow, not to achieve a deep
understanding of the difference, nor to underestimate the existence of plurality
within society, but rather to make differences visible to society, where a respect
and civility may emerge. This respect and civility is not only towards difference,
but also to the public sites as the spatial arenas for differential expression. In this
respect, overlapping spaces, as the space of differentiation expression, should be
addressed by a non-correspondence approach, where the cultural differences of a
particular spatial group can be brought into the sight of other spatial groups. In
such a locale, the co-presence of individuals and groups is drawn from not only
one particular spatial group but from very many parts of the city. Returning to
our earlier spatial interpretations\textsuperscript{36} of Amin’s concepts of ‘co-presence’ and

\textsuperscript{36} - As a reminder of our earlier discussion, it was explained that this research uses the term
\textit{co-presence} to refer to the presence of individuals and groups who are necessarily
members of one particular spatial group and the term \textit{multiplicity} to refer to the presence of
‘multiplicity’, overlapping ‘secondary’ spaces provide spatial viability for the patterns of co-presence of heterogeneity.

A question that may arise here is why urban form should seek to make the difference visible to other groups within the overlapping spaces rather than within the foreground or background networks. Before searching for an answer, we first need to elaborate on this question by reminding ourselves that the duality of foreground and background networks is a simplification; in reality there are naturally not two distinct structures but merely a continuity within the same street network of varying degrees of accessibility at difference scales and, hence, pointing out certain spaces as overlapping spaces could be problematic if the network’s continuity at different scales is disregarded. However, in reality, as described earlier, there may be some spaces that are more strategic than others in this particular context.

To address the question, we first need to refer to our previous discussions where, based on space syntax theory, it was described, here put in very simplified terms, that the conservative mode of the background network tends to encourage the co-presence of similar individuals, or co-presence of homogeneity, by means of correspondingly related social grouping and spatial clustering. On the other hand, the generative mode of the foreground network tends to encourage the movement and co-presence of different groups, or co-presence of heterogeneity. It was also stated that, if kept distinctly separate, the conservative mode tends to provide spatial potentiality for the emergence of socio-spatial segregation or parallel lives of enclaves while the generative mode tends towards a ‘blasé attitude’ by maximizing the co-presence of individuals in urban public spaces. This duality of networks and their modes explains the need for a socio-spatial balance where the spatial structure does not tend towards supporting either side of the spectrum or as we discussed earlier, an acknowledgement of a continuity of overlapping spaces at different scales. That is, in order to reach an urban habit of the ‘civility of indifference’, as a point on the spectrum of ‘blasé’ to recognition, the spatial configuration of the city searches for a balance between the two networks and their different modes. Finally, it was claimed that the balance is found within overlapping spaces where spatial pervasiveness allows individuals and groups who are not necessarily members of one particular spatial group, but can be from different spatial groups.
the co-presence of individuals drawn from the background network to be mediated by the co-presence of individuals drawn from the foreground network.

What we here in rather simplified terms have called overlapping spaces can thus be among the main potential sites where the difference of a cultural community can be made visible to others while simultaneously being able to be maintained and practiced by its members. Given our previously described simplification about the duality of urban structure, overlapping spaces differ from spaces within the foreground network in the respect that overlapping spaces carry both the conservative and generative modes. Hence, spaces within the foreground network lack the conservative mode, which according to space syntax theory is a crucial basis for sustaining the cultural similarity of a community. Rather, the foreground network has spatial viability for the emergence of co-presence of heterogeneity and primarily encourages the urban habit of a ‘blasé attitude’ where cultural particularities may be difficult to sustain. This situation is clearly in contrast with the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’, which underlines the right of all minority groups to freely and publicly maintain and express their cultural values.

A conceptual example

In order to provide more concrete insights into this discussion, we here present a conceptual example; however, no attempt is made to extend this example to the real situation of urban fabric. Our conceptual example describes a ‘secondary’ public space within a neighbourhood or district, where there is a relatively high percentage of residents from one particular ethnic/cultural cluster. Given space syntax’s definition of the dual networks, the imagined local residential district would mainly be part of the background network where the spatial structure primarily supports conservative processes by restricting encounter and exchange mainly to local inhabitants, thus according to space syntax (Hillier B., 2008, p. 227), reinforcing the existing socio-cultural character. ‘Secondary’ public spaces therefore mainly serve the local needs of an area where people have established a spatial grouping due to both their co-presence in the same district and their ethnic/cultural similarities. In other words, the ‘secondary’ public space is here reduced to a public site within the background network where space tends to minimize movement flows and global exchange. If the ‘secondary’ public space of this spatial enclave does not overlap with the foreground network of the spatial configuration, there is a risk that this public site will be used exclusively
by the individuals of a particular neighbourhood or district. In this case, although the co-presence of individuals in public site may be provided, the spatial configuration of the public space cannot draw individuals from other parts of the city. Here, although the ‘secondary’ public site may provide people of the same spatial enclave with a public space for their cultural expression, the site is not spatially likely to make this expression visible to individuals and groups from other parts of the urban fabric. In other words, in such a ‘secondary’ public space the co-presence of individuals drawn from other parts of the city is not spatially viable, and the public space will not harbour co-presences of heterogeneity.

In such a situation, the principle of co-presence is fulfilled by a group of people who are spatially together due to their similarities; a group whose spatial division reflects their social separation; a situation in which space divides what society already separates. The ‘secondary’ public space is here reduced to a public site merely for the members of a particular spatial enclave without overlapping of the foreground network. In other words, the spatial configuration of ‘secondary’ public site here lacks pervasiveness and is spatially not likely to bring movement patterns from other parts of the city to the public space. The nub of the argument is that the spatial structure of ‘secondary’ public spaces needs to benefit from pervasiveness, notwithstanding their main service to the local needs of the background network. Otherwise, there is great risk that the public site of the local area would be dominated by one particular ethnic/cultural group whose members are mainly within the bounds of spatial groupings. Here, we would find a paradoxical situation in which public space is dominated by a group whose members are rendered invisible by groups dominating society in general. That is, situations of co-presence in public space are nurtured only by the individuals of the same spatial enclave and the difference of a stranger is seldom present. Despite having ‘co-presence of homogeneity’, our conceptual ‘secondary’ public space still lacks ‘co-presence of heterogeneity’, or multiplicity, which is the second organising principle we have found necessary for the emergence of an urban habit of a ‘civility of indifference’. This situation leads us to the conclusion that the emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’ is spatially less likely in ‘secondary’ public spaces that do not overlap with the foreground network.

Moreover, this situation, as Young (1999) explains, is not only the first stage in the process of “cultural imperialism”, but also produces segregation and keeps
the disadvantaged groups and the social injustice they are faced with “out of sight”:

“In order to see themselves as privileged, the white people\textsuperscript{37} who live in pleasant neighbourhoods must be able to compare their environment with others. But this comparison is rarely forced upon them because those excluded from access to the resources and benefits they themselves have are spatially separated, out of sight; another place defines their lives. Whites often avoid experiencing those other places, but usually we do not even need to think about such avoidance, because our daily lives and social spaces are so constructed that we have no reason to go where the others live. […] Segregation thus makes privilege invisible to the privileged in a double way: by conveniently keeping the situation of the relatively disadvantaged out of sight, it thereby renders the situation of the privileged average. […] the everyday separation of the lives of the more and less privileged that is part of the process of residential racial segregation makes it unnecessary for the privileged to think about social injustice except in the most abstract terms” (Young, 1999, p. 242).

The construction of “daily lives and social spaces”, which according to Young (1999, p. 242) separates the lives of people within the city, is to a large extent inherently spatial. The situation of keeping one group, either the privileged or the disadvantaged, out of sight – through the construction of spatial relations and the everyday spatial separation/mix of lives – is a serious challenge to the formation of the co-presence of heterogeneity. In other words, if the spatial relations of the ‘secondary’ public spaces of the city are aimed merely at meeting the requirements of their surrounding spatial groupings, without any overlapping of the foreground network, they cannot fulfil the spatial conditions of a ground for the emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’. Rather, they are spatially more likely to trigger the process of ‘cultural imperialism’ by keeping the movement flows of different groups separated from each other. Here, spatial configuration of public space is to a great degree exactly what supports its domination by one particular local community. Here, the public space, that according to Madanipour (2004, p. 271) is a kind of “battleground” for different socio-cultural groups to

\textsuperscript{37} - Young’s (1999) discussions refer to the North American context and her main focus is on the socio-spatial separation between whites and African Americans.
occupy, would be more likely to be spatially dominated by a particular group, and the consequent process of making other groups’ expression in public space invisible may commence.

Returning to our conceptual example, the domination process of ‘secondary’ public spaces by particular groups can be explained under two different categories. The first category is the domination of the ‘secondary’ public space by privileged groups. The second category is its domination by underprivileged ones. When the privileged groups dominate the ‘secondary’ public space, there is a risk that they will leave little room for the (cultural) expression of the underprivileged groups by way of imposing their (cultural) values on the norms and codes of behaviour in public space. In that situation, according to Young (1990, p. 59), the worldview and values of the underprivileged would be rendered invisible and they would be stereotyped as the Other.

In terms of urban form, this situation can be conceptually explained when the background network accommodates a socially privileged group of people, in which case the ‘secondary’ public space services a privileged group of people who have agglomerated within their own particular spatial enclave. Here, the spatial structure of the public space of the privileged enclave – which is supposed to serve as a ‘secondary’ public space – does not possess spatial pervasiveness. Lacking spatial pervasiveness, the public site of the enclave does not overlap the foreground network. There would therefore be little chance for such a public site to spatially support the co-presence of individuals from other parts of the city, and to accommodate the difference of Others. In other words, the ‘secondary’ public space here is reduced to a public site for a group of people who benefit from similarity of advantages. According to Young (1990), such a situation can be explained as one of the first steps towards ‘cultural imperialism’. Interpreting her idea in the terms of urban form, the clustering of the privileged groups within the background network without any overlapping of the foreground network, may support two outcomes:

First, due to the lack of pervasiveness, the spatial enclave of the privileged groups hardly accommodates co-presence of individuals from other parts of the city, i.e. other groups in society, such as underprivileged people, which are kept away from this particular spatial enclave. In other words, the underprivileged and their differences are kept out of the sight of privileged groups. The spatial configuration here rarely permits movement flows of underprivileged groups,
and consequently the expression of their differences, into the public sight of the privileged enclave, and therefore initiates the process of making them invisible. On this ground, according to Young (1990), the invisible underprivileged groups are more easily stereotyped as the Others, and their differences are perceived as strange. Therefore, in such a ‘secondary’ public space of a privileged enclave, the process of making the underprivileged groups invisible and stereotyping them as the Others is spatially more likely. In other words, space has agency in the process of ‘cultural imperialism’ by dividing the public life of different social groups in such a way that they are kept out of each other’s sight in their daily movement patterns and in the patterns of their co-presence in urban public spaces.

Second, a slightly different yet fairly related situation occurs when the ‘secondary’ public space is dominated by an underprivileged group, for instance within the deprived spatial enclave of a (cultural/ethnic) cluster. Although the deprived group here may benefit from the facilities of the ‘secondary’ public space provided by their own spatial enclave, the expression of their public life is kept out of the sight of society. Due to the lack of the co-presence of other groups, the deprived group here may more easily be stereotyped as the Other. It is also more likely that their spatial enclave would be considered as what Young (1999, p. 242) calls “other places […] where the others live”, implying the spatial separation of everyday movement patterns among different groups in society. In other words, what happens in this situation is that the everyday co-presence of the more privileged groups of society in such ‘secondary’ public space is spatially less viable.

This situation can be described as a public site – which is supposed to serve as a ‘secondary’ public space – that lacks the capability to let the difference be freely expressed in public. This capability, according to Madanipour (2004, p. 267), is a “significant asset” of ‘secondary’ public spaces. The paradox is that although at first glance, it seems that the public site here provides facilities for the members of a deprived spatial enclave, the invisibility of their public expression, and consequently the depreciation of their (cultural) values to the rest of society, also may follow from such spatial separations.

The interpretation of this situation in the terms of urban form is that an underprivileged group is clustered together within a spatial enclave and as a part of the background network. Owing to a lack of pervasiveness, there is hardly any
spatial overlapping between the enclave’s public site and the foreground network. In the public site of such an enclave, the co-presence of individuals from other parts of the city is therefore spatially less viable. Consequently, the patterns of co-presence of underprivileged group are forced into their own enclave where all the co-present individuals may share some social ‘similarities’. In this case, the spatial structure of the public site, due to the lack of pervasiveness, lacks the capability to spatially mediate the patterns of co-presence with heterogeneity by way of drawing individuals from other parts of the city into the enclave.

This leads to further spatial marginalization of their ‘secondary’ public site on the one hand and to the further separation of their everyday lives on the other. Consequently, it would be spatially less likely that the public expression of their cultural values and practices, i.e. their cultural differences, would be brought into the sight of the city. Being out of sight of the majority group, different worldviews and practices of the members of the spatial enclave would be veiled in mystery. According to Young (1990), in this situation, their differences would therefore be easier to stereotype as strange and themselves as the Other. Due to the lack of spatial pervasiveness, the spatial configuration of the public space would also provide less spatial viability for the co-presence of other groups. That is, spatial configuration here has agency in the process of ‘cultural imperialism’ by making the movement flows of the Others to such public sites spatially less viable.
Figure 10. In this conceptual example, owing to a lack of pervasiveness, there is hardly any spatial overlapping between the enclave’s ‘secondary’ public space and the foreground network. In the ‘secondary’ public space of such an enclave, the co-presence of individuals from other parts of the city is therefore spatially less viable. Consequently, the patterns of co-presence are forced into the enclave where all the co-presented individuals may share some social ‘similarities’. In this case, the spatial structure of the public site, due to the lack of pervasiveness, lacks the capability to spatially mediate the patterns of co-presence with ‘difference’ and heterogeneity by way of drawing individuals from other parts of the city into the enclave.

The core of the example is that the spatial configuration of the underprivileged enclave belongs only to the background network and does not permit any overlapping between the enclave’s public site and the foreground network. There is therefore little spatial feasibility for the emergence of co-presence of heterogeneity at the enclave’s public sites. A lack of co-presence of heterogeneity in such a case could spatially support two consequences. First, the members of the underprivileged enclave would remain invisible to the rest of society since their spatial grouping is out of sight of society. Second, there would be less spatial viability for the movement patterns of other groups to meet the ‘secondary’ public site of such enclave and to be able to witness the lifestyle of underprivileged groups as a part of their everyday movement in the city. In other
words, the spatial configuration of the described enclave does not spatially support co-presence of different groups in urban public spaces and therefore, does not spatially support the opportunity to make the (cultural) differences of groups more visible to each other. Borrowing from Hanson and Hillier (1987), again space here separates what society already divides. Under such circumstances, the spatial structure of the enclave supports the spatial condition for the emergence of what Young (1990) calls “cultural imperialism” as one of the faces of oppression.

The explanation of this conceptual example was an attempt to show that spatial configuration can have agency in the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’ by influencing movement pattern, and consequently the patterns of co-presence in urban public spaces. It has been tried to explain how Amin’s organizing principles of a ‘civility of indifference’, i.e. ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’, are under the influence of the spatial relations of the urban fabric. By saying that, there is no intention to deny the complexity of social, economic, and political processes in cities, rather the purpose has been to stress the role of physical space and its configurational patterns as one of the determinants in shaping the urban habits of living ‘together-in-difference’.
Figure 11. In this conceptual example, the enclave’s ‘secondary’ public site is a part of overlapping spaces, and the co-presence of individuals from other parts of the city is therefore spatially viable. In this case, the spatial structure of the public site, due to the spatial pervasiveness of overleaping spaces, has potentials to spatially mediate the patterns of co-presence with heterogeneity by way of drawing individuals from other parts of the city into the enclave. Consequently, there is spatial viability for the expression of ‘difference’ in this ‘secondary’ public space.

Closing words

To summarize this section, multiculturalism policies and the general policy ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’, emphasise the freedom of cultural expression, not only for one (dominant) or some particular groups, but for all minority groups and communities in society. However, within the multicultural cities, the right of freedom of cultural expression for minority groups may be overlooked in different ways and due to variety of determinants. Belittling this right, according to Young (1990), is a form of oppression through which some groups of people become disadvantaged. In the context of today’s European cities, this form of cultural oppression, termed ‘cultural imperialism’, is most likely to be imposed by the majority upon minority groups with differences in ethnicity and culture. That is, the cultural values and practices of the ethnic and cultural minorities are rendered invisible, and owing to their (cultural) differences, they are stereotyped
as the Other. In other words, the ‘cultural imperialism’ of the majority oppresses the minority groups by rendering their cultural expression invisible, and by marking them as the Other, whose values are different from what is accepted by the majority as the norm.

There is an element of risk that ‘cultural imperialism’ will seek legitimacy through public spaces, as one of the most crucial and visible public arenas of urban life. That is, public space has the potential to either legitimise or contest ‘cultural imperialism’ as the process of making the expression of minorities invisible within public life. There is therefore a need to investigate the spatial agency of public space as one of the determinants in shaping the urban habits of living ‘together-in-difference’.

Given different patterns of co-presence in urban public spaces – which in the previous chapters we outlined as co-presence of homogeneity and co-presence of heterogeneity – the two aspects of ‘cultural imperialism’, i.e. invisibility and otherness, can be discussed in the terms of urban form. For that, the arrangement of co-present individuals within the urban fabric serves as a crucial determinant in shaping the patterns of visibility and invisibility. It is suggested here that overlapping public spaces, due to their pervasive character, boost the chance of exposing the cultural expression of different groups to each other. In this regard, the configurational aspects of ‘secondary’ public spaces are of significant importance because of the services that such spaces give to local areas. The ‘secondary’ public spaces are among public areas at which cultural differences can find greater spatial viability to be publicly practiced and expressed.

Hence, ‘secondary’ public spaces, as part of the overlapping spaces between the background and the foreground networks, are here pointed out as the public arenas that have a particular spatial potential where cultural differences of groups can on the one hand be preserved and practiced at the local level and on the other be expressed in the sight of other groups at a wider level. Recognizing the existence of cultural differences between groups, as Parekh (2006, p. 173) also states, is among the first steps and the main required sources to allow them to be compared (and judged). It is, as Young (1999) also states, a necessity in our battle against social injustice and against the situation where people are not aware of the disadvantages some minority groups may be faced with in their everyday life.
This section closes by reminding the reader that making a group’s differences visible to other groups is pursued neither with the purpose of establishing meaningful interactions between them, nor with the purpose of achieving a deep understanding of their differences. The purpose is rather to provide a spatial ground where a ‘civility of indifference’ may be established and potentially flourish; in short, to provide a better spatial viability for the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’. Making cultural differences visible in the public space may help establish certain attitudes towards the public space as a shared space, or a common ground, which, according to Amin (2012), does not belong exclusively to one particular group but to all; it is in the public space that individuals and groups learn to see *difference* and gain a civility not only to difference but also to public space as the space of differential expression.
Adaptable spaces of otherness

Introduction

In the earlier chapters, it was discussed that multiculturalism, as but one of the politics of recognition in the context of cultural diversity, emphasizes an intercultural dialogue and negotiation as an integrated aspect of the logic for an intercultural evaluation in a multicultural society (Parekh, 2006, p. 268; Kymlicka, 1995, p. 167). As a part of general discussions on politics of multiculturalism, some argue that for living together despite differences in today’s plural society, attempts must be made to conciliate and negotiate different interests (Crick, 2000, p. 200). Rather than either constantly coerce or impose beliefs on others, or ignore the possibility for negotiation of the difference, these attempts should focus on the ways of making the negotiation and conciliation process more feasible (Crick, 2000, p. 200). Criticizing the definition of unity given by both the patriotic and nationalist creeds, Bauman (2000, p. 178) proposes that “the only formula of togetherness” in the modern plural society of today is a unity that is gained through negotiation, “not the denial, stifling or smothering out of differences”. Also, reaching a unity in general policy of living together needs constant efforts to understand, to negotiate, and to compromise (Bauman, 2011, p. 64). However, according to Sennett (1996, p. 39) those efforts may endanger the comfort of those who define their communities through “a purification ritual”; purifying from any sense of ‘difference’ and avoiding any understanding of the Other due to the fear of being challenged by the strange world outside. Within the framework of the multiculturalism ideology, Parekh (2006, p. 267) states that dialogue is realized as a basic necessity in order to “resolve deep moral and cultural disagreements”, despite emphasizing that intercultural evaluation is “necessarily messy and involves constant shifts of levels, styles and idioms” (2006, p. 294). For the purposes of this section, the key focus of dialogue within the multiculturalism ideology, as Parekh (2008, p. 165) maintains, is to help “each participant [in the process of dialogue and negotiation] to see the world from the other’s perspective”, rather than establish intercultural ties among individuals and groups.

Given our previous discussions on overlapping spaces as the spaces where urban structure can potentially provide the spatial viability for an emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’, the question that arises here is how intercultural
dialogue and a shift of perspective can be translated into spatial terms and how urban form may support the development of such character through overlapping spaces. To answer this question, this section aims to explain intercultural dialogue and a shift of perspective – as one of the common features of a multicultural society – in spatial terms. Put another way, the aim is to investigate how urban form can spatially support the idea of intercultural dialogue and a shift of perspective as a general feature of multicultural societies, and how this idea may find its spatial form in what we have earlier called overlapping spaces.

Adaptability despite dominance

As discussed in earlier chapters, the concept of intercultural dialogue has attracted the attention of a part of urban planning theory dealing with cultural diversity to the extent that attempts have been made to re-theorize multiculturalism, and rename it “interculturalism” (Sandercock, 2009, p. 219). In this regard, large parts of the theoretical debates in urban planning therefore focus their attention on public spaces in which intercultural dialogues may occur. It was also earlier argued that having reified the conception of intercultural dialogue, such theories may overestimate the capability of spatial encounter and have expectations which are beyond the potential of spatial encounter; expectations such as deep recognition and understating of difference, establishing (socio-cultural) ties and bridging the difference in public space through spatial encounter, which as we will discuss in the following sections, simply seem to go beyond what can be accomplished by spatial encounter. To put it briefly, urban planning theory emphasizes the importance of intercultural negotiation and dialogue in its approach to cultural diversity. To address intercultural negotiation and dialogue as one of the common features
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38 - As discussed in chapter two, ‘intercultural dialogue and negotiation’ is one of the common features to represent a multicultural society, which is generally discussed within different ideas and theories on multiculturalism; for instance see: (Meer & Modood, 2011; Parekh, 2006; Kymlicka, 1995). Therefore, by talking about intercultural dialogue and negotiation we do not intend to enter into discussions about differences and similarities of Sandercock’s “interculturalism” to multiculturalism. Rather, what is of importance here is that ‘intercultural dialogue and negotiation’ has attracted the attention of urban planning theory in its approach to multiculturalism; either under the concept of “interculturalism” or under other concepts.
representing basic demands on multicultural cities, urban planning theory puts its effort into regulations of spatial encounter in micropublics with the purpose of establishing intercultural ties and achieving an understanding of difference. In other words, a large body of urban planning theory focuses on the presence of individuals and groups in micropublics as the sites of dialogue and interaction, where a deep understanding of difference can be achieved.

For instance, Sandercock (2000, p. 23) seeks to manage ‘interculturalism’ through a “therapeutic” or dialogical approach as the way to build-up “co-existence in shared space” and establish a “cross-cultural understanding”. Or, Wood and Landry (2008, p. 106), inspired by ‘interculturalism’, articulate the intercultural city with the hope of “reopening channels of communication and interaction, decreasing mistrust and hostility, and promoting a better understanding between groups”. It is in the context of establishing recognition of difference through spatial encounter that Brock (2009, p. 78) emphasizes the centrality of “building cross-cultural understanding between diverse groups”. Or, as in the recent example of urban planning’s endeavour to provide spaces of recognition, Hou (2013, pp. 9-13) aims to re-understand ‘interculturalism’, calling it “transculturalism” and arguing that transcultural planning seeks “opportunities for a richer understanding of culture and place in a diverse society”.

The examples above, as well as similar theoretical arguments on establishing recognition through spatial encounter, generally speaking, assume that space serves as a neutral ground on which intercultural dialogue and negotiation may proceed. In this understanding of space, the urban public space should therefore serve as a neutral meeting place in which different people irrespective of their differences meet and achieve recognition through spatial encounter. However, this common idea in urban planning literature of public space as a neutral meeting place where people achieve recognition through spatial encounter – sketched above – can be questioned from two different aspects:

First, bonding the essence of spatial encounter to a specific time and location, as discussed in the previous chapters, ignores the complexity of its socio-spatial relations (Harvey, 1990, p. 218) and leads to the perception of public space as nodal “absolute” spaces (Harvey, 2005). This, however, is far from our earlier discussion that described public space as relational space that encompasses a variety of spatial and social relations, or better expressed, the idea that space is a
social relation in itself. Treating public space as nodal absolute spaces, rather than relational spaces, therefore underestimates the socio-spatial complexities and reduces them to a situated time and location. Understanding public space as absolute space and reducing it to a bounded time-space context limits the epistemological understating of the conception of public space into territorial theories where the focus is generally speaking placed on a correspondence relation between social groupings and spatial demarcations and on the subject-object duality\(^{39}\) of the relation between space and society. However, in their discussions on social and spatial groupings in the urban fabric, Hanson and Hillier (1987) argue that there is not necessarily a correspondence between spatial categorization and social grouping of people. Rather, people establish constantly changing patterns of social grouping due to their movement patterns in the urban fabric. In acknowledging the constantly changing character of social patterns, however, it should not be assumed that social groupings of people are totally free from spatial relations. It does, however, mean that the spatial relations should not be regarded as the sole determinant either.

Second, the conception of public space as a neutral meeting place can be questioned, as for instance, Modood (2013, p. 23 & 49) argues that the idea of public space as a “completely characterless and value-neutral” entity free from political and cultural content is incoherent. Moreover, we may refer to Harvey’s (1990, p. 239) explanation on space where he states that both space and time, and consequently spatial and temporal practices, always encompass social content and “are never neutral in social affairs”, and accordingly, we can here argue that public space and the activities in public space cannot be neutral either. As one more argument, we may here refer to Hajer and Reijndorp (2001, p. 53), where they state that the urban public spaces – among which one may consider the street network of the city – are used by people with different backgrounds as a means through which they separate themselves “along social lines, […] and develop] effective spatial strategies to meet the people they want to meet, and to avoid the people they want to avoid”. Accordingly, we can argue that the idea of regarding micropublics as neutral sites for intercultural meeting is not convincing either. Casting doubt on the idea that an ideal public space is a place for all social groups regardless of their worldview differences, Hajer and Reijndorp (2001, p.

\(^{39}\) - For further explanation of subject-object duality, see chapter three of this dissertation.
53) state that “perhaps it is not parochialization that hinders the development of public domain, but in fact an overwrought idea of the public space as a neutral meeting place for all social groups regardless of class, ethnicity or lifestyle”.

To summarize our discussion thus far, despite drawing a range of criticism, current urban planning’s theoretical approaches to the question of intercultural negotiation and dialogue, generally speaking, place emphasis on spatial encounter in public space and, hence, on co-presence of people in public space. Also, the adopted alternative approach to the situation of living together in multicultural cities in this dissertation, i.e. Amin’s (2012) concept of a ‘civility of indifference’, puts stress on achieving an urban habit of living together with two organizing principles of co-presence and multiplicity, although Amin (2012, p. 74) builds his alternative politics of living together mainly on a criticism of expectations of building intercultural ties between strangers through spatial encounter. However, making a comparison between these two approaches is not of central interest in this thesis. Rather, the crucial point for the purpose is that both approaches, i.e. Sandercock’s ‘interculturalism’ with emphasis on gaining a deep understanding of difference through spatial encounter and Amin’s ‘civility of indifference’ with emphasis on urban unconscious habits of living together, underline the importance of co-presence in public space as one of the central features in addressing the demands of multicultural cities. However, none of the approaches explain in depth how different groups of people come together in urban structure, and how the spatial structure of the city may be able to address the concerns of intercultural negotiation and dialogue through its influence on the patterns of co-presence and multiplicity in public space. Moreover, none of them show how space can bring differences together in co-presence, that is people of different socio-cultural categories.

Based on all the discussion thus far, we argue that dialogue and negotiation of difference as a part of the situation of living in multicultural society, can be spatially supported in some types of spaces, which we have earlier characterised as overlapping spaces. However, prior to elaborating on how overlapping spaces are of importance for the ideas of dialogue and negotiation of difference, there is a need to clarify this dissertation’s understanding of these ideas.

In their discussions on public space, Hajer and Reijndorp (2001, p. 88) argue that positive experiences of public spaces often spring from spaces that tend to be dominated by (relatively) homogeneous groups of people, who are not part of
one’s own group; that is, when one finds oneself welcome in a public space which is occupied by a relatively homogeneous group of people whose worldviews are different from oneself. The key experiences with public space, according to Hajer and Reijndorp (2001, p. 88), “often involve entering the parochial domains of ‘others’. Public domain is thus not so much a place as an experience. One experiences this space as public domain because one does not belong to that specific dominant group”. Due to the importance of their understanding of public space as a space dominated by a relatively homogeneous group, but open to Others, the nub of their discussion is repeated below (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, pp. 88-89):

“public domain is an experience at a location where the ‘code of behaviour’ is followed by groups with which we are not familiar. This entails an interesting paradox: the dominance of a certain group does not preclude the experience of public domain, but rather produces it […]. This means that public spaces, just like enclaves, are in many cases defined by a form of ‘parochialization’. Different groups seek to ‘occupy’ or at least dominate certain culturally significant public spaces. […] Public domain as a sphere of exchange and confrontation in society presupposes the mutual proximity of different spheres much more than the fully shared use of one and the same space. The core of successful public space thus lies not so much in the shared use of space with others, let alone in the ‘meeting’, but rather in the opportunities that urban proximity offers for a ‘shift’ of perspective: through the experience of otherness one’s own casual view of reality gets some competition from other views and lifestyles. That shift of perspective, however, is not always a pleasant experience”.

Hajer and Reijndorp (2001) argue that public space can be dominated by a particular group, while it is open for other groups to be co-present within the space and follow its behavioural norms. This conception of public space is in accord with the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’ from two points of view. First, particular groups or minorities have their own specific public space in which they can be co-present and follow their own values and sustain their (cultural) differences, while the space remains open to others as well. Second, one of the important aspects of negotiation and dialogue, as discussed earlier, is its ability to allow different groups of people to explore the Other’s perspectives on life, even though they might not be able to fully comprehend and follow each
other’s differences. This situation can be spatially supported in a public space where different codes and norms of behaviour are more noticeable due to one particular group’s dominance of the space.

Therefore, to address the concerns of intercultural negotiation and dialogue, we here refer to Hajer and Reijndorp’s (2001) understanding of public space, and their suggestion that public space can be dominated by one particular group with visible codes and norms of behaviour and be simultaneously open to other groups to be co-present in space. We shall refer to such character of public space under the rubric adaptability. The following section attempts to recapture adaptability in the terms of physical space and spatial configuration. In other words, this section of the dissertation tries to ascertain how spatial structure of the city may be able to address adaptability through its influence on the patterns of co-presence and multiplicity in public space. Following our previous approach to the question of multiculturalism, adaptable public spaces should be conceived as a public arena in which the urban habit of a ‘civility of indifference’ based on dignity and respect for difference, may flourish.40

Adaptability of ‘relational’ space

In the previous section, we tried to explain two characteristics of adaptable public spaces by referring to a number of theoretical discussions on public space: being dominated by one relatively homogenous group with visible codes and norms of behaviour and being open to other groups to be present in the space and experience others’ worldview. The discussion here is followed by exploring how we can explain these two characteristics of adaptability in the terms of urban form; or, to put it simpler, how the spatial structure of the city can spatially support the emergence of adaptability in public spaces.

Before being able to conceptualize adaptability in spatial terms, there is a need to explore how the term adaptability has already been understood in urban planning and design parlance. It should be emphasised, however, that this dissertation will employ this term differently.

40 - In the context of cultural diversity, these unconscious habits of dignity and civility may be extended to the achievement of recognition, as Allen and Cars (2001, p. 2205) maintain, “as people become used to each other, cross-cultural understanding and trust are built up, including the skills to negotiate and live with unresolved differences”.
Adaptability in urban design discourse is mainly assumed to refer to the ability of space to be responsive to the various needs of different individuals or groups, either with or without physical interventions, over different spans of time\(^{41}\) (Mehta, 2013, p. 178). Being highly comparable, the two terms *adaptability* and *flexibility* usually refer to the physical capability of the space to cope with and accommodate different uses; as two examples see (Carmona & Wunderlich, 2012; Fernando, 2007, p. 55). It is therefore assumed that adaptable and flexible spaces have advantages over spaces that are designed for single uses.\(^{42}\) For instance, acknowledging flexible public spaces with the capability to “be used for a variety of purposes” as the *best* ones, Madanipour (2004, p. 285) states that “rigid designs for single-purpose spaces are often less successful in an environment where needs vary widely”. In brief, the term adaptability within the current urban design discourse is often attributed to the physical characteristics of a space. Based on Harvey’s (2005) spatial frame of reference, explained in the previous chapters, one can conclude that adaptability is understood in the scope of “absolute space” and mainly describes how the physical shape of a particular space, such as a public square, can carry many uses in a given spatio-temporal context.

In contrast to its common connotation, the term adaptability in this dissertation is used not in the scope of “absolute space” but as a characteristic of Harvey’s “relational space” (Harvey, 2005). That is, rather than adaptability of physical material in absolute modality of spatial thinking, it is about the *adaptability of physical space in relational modality of spatial thinking*. To give a clearer

\(^{41}\) - Regarding this particular definition of ‘adaptability’, one can argue that physical interventions in a particular space, such as a building, during different spans of time, bring about fundamental changes in the nature of the *spatiality* and the *spatial relations* of that space. Therefore, the assumption that it is the ‘same’ space or building, with a variety of uses at different times and for the purposes of different social groups, is per se challengeable. However, due to the intention of the paragraph to merely convey a general image of ‘adaptability’ in urban design discourse, there is no need to penetrate this in greater depth.

\(^{42}\) - Based on Rapoport’s concept of ‘open-endedness’ (1977, p. 355), Fernando (2007, p. 55) draws a comparison between *adaptability* and *flexibility*, arguing that “adaptability refers to the potential of a space to accommodate different uses without any significant modifications to its physical attributes, while flexibility refers to a space that accommodates different uses by being easily changed. The former involves no change to the physical form, scale or character, while the latter does involve such changes. Rapoport suggests that open-endedness inherently includes both adaptability and flexibility, as some degree of change to accommodate new uses is present in both”.
picture of the discussion, the following paragraph summarizes how the physical space can be conceptualized due to different modalities of spatial thinking based on Harvey’s spatial frame of reference.

According to Marcus (forthcoming:2015), physical space – what we here call spatial form – is ‘absolute’ primarily at a representative level, i.e. the level of signs and symbols. However, at a performative level, which is about the function of space, spatial form is typically ‘relative’, in the sense that what determines the performative potential of a particular space is its relation to other spaces. The reason for interpreting the spatial form as ‘relative’ lies in the fact that the most important function that spatial form performs in relation to human activity is that it affords and structures human movement. Depending on the structure or configuration of the spatial form (of a city district for instance), movement patterns will emerge and be distributed in a particular way. Consequently, the movement patterns that emerge will create variety in terms of both the quantity and mix (quality) of co-present individuals and groups in different public spaces. This variety quite obviously concerns space as ‘relational’. In this way we see how we can move from an absolute to a relational understanding of space by way of relative space.

The term adaptability here therefore refers to the situation where the public space, due to its spatial relation to other parts of the urban fabric, displays spatial viability to make different perspectives visible to different groups, while it preserves the co-presence of a particular group within the space. Adaptability in this definition is not only a ‘relative’ relation between urban components and movement patterns but also encompasses the patterns of people’s social groupings. In this dissertation, adaptability is about the relation between urban form and social groupings. This implies a shift of understanding from adaptable absolute space to adaptable relational space.

Adaptability seeks a spatial structure for the emergence of a civility towards other groups’ perspectives despite the dominance of the space by one particular group. This in fact forges links to the overall aim of this dissertation, which is to address the emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’ through the spatial structure of the city, with a focus on overlapping spaces. To support spatial adaptability, the configurational relations of the urban form need to explain how urban form relations have agency in the formation of different types of co-presence and multiplicity in urban public spaces.
It was earlier explained how Amin’s two principles of ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’ are in this dissertation interpreted in terms of urban form as two types of co-presence, i.e. ‘co-presence of homogeneity’ and ‘co-presence of heterogeneity’. Based on space syntax’s explanation of generic functions, these two types of co-presence are here considered to be *generic functions* and therefore serve as a *first filter* between spatial configuration and social groupings. In other words, the *spatial form* should describe the patterns of co-presence in the sense of *why* those patterns occur in the first place and then amplify and describe *where* the potential sites for the emergence of such patterns are. Obviously, the qualitative questions regarding the capabilities of the spatial encounters that emerge – i.e. whether they lead to recognition of difference or the establishment of a ‘civility of indifference’ – are beyond the scope of research in urban form and properties of physical space.

Spatial structure of adaptability, as the spatial implications of negotiation and dialogue, therefore seeks to describe the relational properties of a spatial ground for the emergence of the two key factors of an adaptable public space. To discuss its wider implications, we divide spatial adaptability into two key points:

The *first* point is the emphasis on the dominance of public space by a particular group, whereby the dominant group can practice and sustain their socio-cultural commonalities. These commonalities are on the other hand what make the group different from the rest of society. That is, what has brought the group together as a *similarity* they share is exactly what distinguishes them from the rest of society. This can be associated with the public spaces within the background network, where due to its tendency to support conservative processes, as argued above, space reinforces the similarities of local groups. Based on our previous discussions, the spatial configuration in the background network tends to spatially support the co-presence of individuals who are often the local residents of the same area. That is, the source of the patterns of co-presence is here primarily their local social and cultural similarities. This type of co-presence in the public spaces of the background network has earlier been described under ‘co-presence of homogeneity’.

There is a risk here that if the provided patterns of co-presence of homogeneity were not mediated by diversity and difference, this would establish a closed, rigid community, in which case the public space would not only be dominated by one particular group but would also diminish the spatial viability for other
people’s co-presence. In other words, a public space that provides the spatial viability for the emergence of co-presence without the mediation of heterogeneity would be more likely to lead to a segregated space, or as Hajer and Reijndorp (2001, p. 56) call it a “monocultural enclave”, which would in the urban context display the structure of an “archipelago of enclaves” (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, p. 53). Here, the dominance of public space by a relatively homogeneous group should not per se be considered a problem (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, p. 88; Young, 1999) as long as it would be open to other groups to participate and be co-present; either just by witnessing the on-going activities in a public space or by actively participating and experiencing the same codes of behaviour. According to Hajer and Reijndorp (2001), the idea that an ideal public space should neutrally accommodate every group of people and suit a variety of activities is far from a plausible reality of a pleasant public space. Discussing ideas of mixed uses and diverse groups of people in public space, as discussed in chapter two, Amin also elaborates on the problems that an “unregulated co-presence” (2008, p. 15), or a “diversity placed in hierarchical order” (2012, p. 78) may bring to different minority groups in society.

This discussion leads to another interpretation of the spatial configuration of a public space. That is, if we agree that a ‘good’ public space is where it may be dominated by a certain group’s co-presence and codes of behaviour while remaining open to other groups to be co-present and experience their otherness codes of behaviour, we can then argue that in addition to the co-presence of the dominant group, it also needs to encourage the co-presence of other groups within the space. The co-presence of other groups is what we earlier explained under the ‘co-presence of heterogeneity’, or as an interpretation of ‘multiplicity’ in terms of urban form.

It should be once more emphasised that although the patterns of co-presence in public space are formed through spatial grouping of individuals, however, these patterns of co-presence may be drawn from either spatial groups (such as a neighbourhood or a city district), or from very many parts of the city. Having said that, it should be re-emphasized that the socially problematic situation, which can be explained as social segregation, is spatially more likely when the co-present individuals in a given public space are drawn only from one particular spatial grouping of a neighbourhood or district. As an example, consider a micropublic space within a spatial enclave that belongs mainly to a relatively homogeneous group. Here, there is a high probability that the co-present people
in that micropublic will be members of the same spatial grouping identical to the spatial enclave, in which case the spatial configuration of the micropublic will be unable to attract any movement patterns from outside its spatial grouping. Due to a lack of heterogeneity, and despite the existence of co-presence, there is therefore a higher spatial tendency for segregation. This would support the argument for a shift in focus from micropublics on a local scale to a broader scale that considers the spatial relations of the micropublic to the overall spatial structure of the city. This point directs the discussion towards the second key point in spatial adaptability.

The second concern of negotiation and dialogue is to address the situation in which there is a spatial viability for different groups of people to explore the Other’s perspectives on life, even though they may not fully comprehend and follow each other’s differences. For that, we suggest that adaptability can spatially be supported by providing public spaces in which the dominance of one particular group’s codes and norms of behaviour is distinguishable by other individuals and groups who are not members of the dominated group. In other words, the suggestion is that the spatial configuration of an adaptable public space must spatially support the mutual proximity or co-presence of other groups within public spaces already dominated by a group. In that way, according to Hajer and Reijndorp (2001), people can experience the public space through the perspective of others than themselves; a shift in perspective, even if it is limited to merely observing others’ expression and practices in public. This implies that spatial adaptability needs to govern the patterns of co-presence beyond the spatial groupings of the background network.

Returning to our earlier discussions, overlapping spaces, owing to their pervasiveness character, link the conservative mode of the background network to the generative mode of the foreground network. In this way, they provide a ground for bringing individuals and groups to the overlapping spaces from many parts of the urban fabric, mainly through movement patterns, where the dominance of public space by particular codes of behaviour is distinguishable. This brings the co-presence of ‘difference’ into a public space where the co-presence of a dominant group is already provided. It is therefore suggested that adaptability should seek its spatiality in overlapping spaces where the pervasiveness of the spatial structure lets the locale possess both the local character of the background network and the global character of the foreground network.
A conceptual example

Similar to the previous sections, the discussion here continues with a conceptual example with the aim of providing a better understanding of the conception of spatial adaptability. What we here consider as our conceptual example for the discussion on adaptability is a religious public space for a particular group of people within a spatial enclave. For the purposes of this conceptual example, there is no need to be more specific regarding any particular religion or ethnic group. It is sufficient to refer to Parekh (2006, p. 321) where about the role of religion in today’s society he states that not only are the religion’s issues of importance in today’s social life but they are also politically involved in the modern states of the west despite their secular approaches. Accordingly, neither the contemporary multicultural societies of the West with their diversity of religious communities nor their political structure can ignore the religious concerns of their citizens (Parekh, 2006, p. 327).

Earlier in this section, we stated that our understanding of adaptability in this dissertation is different from the contemporary predominant notion of adaptability in urban design discourse. With the conceptual example below, we try to describe why the current understanding of adaptability within urban design and planning theory should be re-addressed.

According to our earlier discussions in this section, a large body of theories in urban planning and design argue that an adaptable public space should on the one hand be a neutral meeting place for all groups of people regardless of their differences, and on the other hand possess a physical flexibility to be used simultaneously for other purposes. Extending this assumption of adaptability to our conceptual example, this dissertation suggests that such an interpretation of adaptability might reach far beyond the reality and possibility of a religious space. One may consider two reasons for this claim. First, the function of such a space targets only specific groups of people who share some religious commonalities (which may also be accompanied by similarities in ethnicity). It can therefore never serve as a neutral meeting place, but always carries one particular group’s ideological perspective of life. Second, due to its functional demands, the physicality of such spaces should adhere to relatively firm restrictions. Physical flexibility in this example, in the sense of what Harvey
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43 The term ‘flexibility’ implies physical and material change.
(2005) defines as “absolute space”, is not only infeasible but also undesirable. In a nutshell, even if we reduce the discussion from relational space to absolute space and disregard the criticism levelled at both territorial and semiotic approaches to space-society relations – as discussed in the previous chapters – such a conceptualization of adaptability and flexibility is still not particularly feasible in our situated example.

Returning to our defined conception of spatial adaptability, which is based on Harvey’s (2005) relational understating of space, the purpose here is to elaborate on the configurational aspects of an adaptable public space. Our example of religious public space fulfils configurational adaptability only if it provides spatial viability for the co-presence and dominance of one specific group with its own norms and codes of behaviour in the public space, and if it also provides spatial viability for other groups’ co-presence within the space and supports a spatial feasibility for a shift of perspective in their casual views of the world.

Given the space syntax theory on the duality of urban networks, the geometric location of the religious public space within a spatial enclave certifies its embedment in the background network. Being a part of the background network of residential areas, as extensively argued above, the spatial configuration of the public space is associated with a conservative mode to maintain and encourage cultural factors of the surrounding area (Hillier B., 2008, p. 226). It is therefore sensible to conclude that the religious public space can easily become dominated by the co-presence of individuals drawn from the same spatial enclave who attend public activities in the space as a part of their religious rituals. In other words, the co-presence of the dominant group is provided through spatial grouping of the individuals within the spatial enclave. Here the public space spatially supports its dominance by a particular group with similar codes of behaviour, as one of the previously discussed aspects of relational adaptability.

However, if the provided patterns of co-presence are limited only to that particular spatial enclave, according to our previous discussions, there would be a risk that this dominance of one group would hardly include the co-presence of individuals with socio-cultural differences from other spatial enclaves in the public space. In other words, there would be spatially less likely for the individuals to be co-present in the public space if they are not members of the same spatial enclave. The spatial configuration of the religious public space supports the co-presence of individuals drawn from the background network,
while it is incapable of overlapping the generative mode of the foreground network in order to boost the spatial chance for the co-presence of individuals from other parts of the city. According to Young (1999), this situation could, in certain circumstances, be regarded as a social problem, due to the separation of public space both spatially and socially. Referring to our previous discussion, here the public space would be regarded as a place for the Others due to a dual process. First, the spatial dominance of a group over the public space may barely welcome individuals from outside their religious community. Second, from the point of view of the rest of society, this religious public space may be interpreted as a place for the Others, who are often out of sight and, according to Young (1999), are more likely to be stereotyped as strangers.

In the aforementioned situation, speaking most principally, it is spatially more likely that a (ethno-culturally) particular group of people manifest and reinforce their religious commonality within a public space. In other words, in the example described, the relation between spatial separation and social division may be reduced to a correspondence relation between space and society. As a consequence, it is more likely that urban planning and design interventions would regard such a religious public space as a nodal micropublic and would try to address the concerns over its space-society relation through an absolute understanding of space. To put it another way, by dealing with this religious public space as a nodal micropublic, the importance of its spatial configuration and the way it relates to other parts of the spatial structure would be overlooked.
However, in order to attain the second aspect of configurational adaptability, the provided patterns of co-presence in public space need spatial support to overlap with the co-presence of individuals from other parts of the city. In other words, the religious public space, as a part of the background network, should be able to simultaneously overlap with the foreground network where the generative mode of space supports the co-presence of heterogeneity. In that way, the co-presence of individuals from other parts of the spatial structure would mediate the co-presence of the dominant group in the public space. The co-presence of other individuals within the religious public space, which is already dominated by a particular group and their norms and codes of behaviour, as Hajer and Reijndorp (2001, p. 89) postulate, spatially supports a chance for a shift of perspective in people’s view of reality. This shift in perspective, however, cannot be interpreted as a sudden change in people’s ideological perspectives but merely as a chance
to realise that public life is a shared experience of living with others who have different perspectives. It is a shift in how difference is understood. It is a shift in urban habit in order to achieve the civility and dignity of indifference to people with whom we do not share life views. On the other hand, the group that has dominated the public space may find the chance to perform their religious practices and express part of their cultural differences where others can see. Here, with the help of overlapping spaces and their agency in the formation of co-presence and multiplicity patterns, the spatial structure is more likely to sustain adaptability.

Closing words

To summarize, this section of the dissertation claims that the concept of dialogue and negotiation – representing one of the demands on a multicultural society – can be translated into urban form. Along the same line of argument that dialogue and negotiation of difference emphasize the importance of maintaining the difference rather than deny its existence or stifling debates on it, spatial adaptability seeks to provide spatial possibility for expression of difference in urban public spaces. Akin to the previous discussions on visibility of difference and fluidity of community, an attempt has been made to address adaptability through overlapping spaces and argue that urban structure can provide spatial viability for the emergence of the urban habit of a ‘civility of indifference’ through its influence on movement patterns, and on the patterns of co-presence and multiplicity in public spaces. Adaptability, as suggested in this dissertation, should be comprehended as a relational property of public spaces.

This section was an attempt to show how the spatial configuration of a public space can provide a ground where the emergence of negotiation and dialogue between different groups in a multicultural context is spatially more likely. It posits that spatial structure can have agency in shaping the habits of a ‘civility of indifference’ by providing spatial viability for intercultural negotiation and dialogue. By saying that, however, the research does not intend to belittle the role of social, political, and economic determinants in shaping the habits of living together. The intention is rather to emphasize that urban form, as a spatial determinant, should also be taken into account in efforts to address the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’. For that, it is suggested that urban planning and design discussions on the politics of living together can devote their efforts to understanding the spatial properties of public sites where the urban habits of
living together may take shape, rather than focus on the qualitative characteristics of spatial encounter in such spaces which, as discussed earlier, may be beyond micropublics’ spatio-temporal reach.
Introduction

The interdisciplinary inquiry of this research has been structured around the *logical argumentation* strategy in order to address some tentative concepts and ideas surrounding multiculturalism through the lens of spatial theory. The main findings therefore tend to frame a conceptual system with levels of *explanatory applicability* in our understanding of the situation of living together in multicultural cities from an urban design perspective. According to Wang (2002, p. 303 & 309), if the explanatory system of argumentation is successful, its results provide new insights into our understanding of some aspects of “human interaction with the built environment”, as well as providing new ways of “looking at old facts or existing phenomena”. However, the logic behind the claims of cultural/discursive systems, as Wang (2002, p. 307) describes, are usually founded on broader transcendental realms. Hence, the research has adopted a type of “definitive tone” when illustrating existing phenomena, which according to Wang (2002, pp. 313-314), is a common trait of argumentation systems – particularly within the scope of cultural/discursive ones in extending their explanations and principles into a broad scope of phenomena.
Being intended to shed new light on understanding of multiculturalism from an urban design perspective, the main findings of this research fall into the following themes:

**Uncovering a theoretical lacuna**

In search for the spatial dimensions of multiculturalism, the dissertation explores some of the ideas surrounding the politics of living together from different perspectives. As an attempt by political theory to set a spatial framework for multiculturalism, Young (1999, p. 237) defines the concept of “together-in-difference” as an ideal of desegregation and argues that despite being locally differentiated into a variety of groups, people can live together in multicultural cities in a ‘common polity’ which, she states, confirms both group differentiation and life equality across the urban space. In this dissertation, Young’s ideal of living “together-in-difference” has been interpreted as an attempt by political theory to address the spatial dimensions of multiculturalism.

The dissertation also tries to explore how urban planning theory approaches the politics of living together and puts an interpretation on the ideas of multiculturalism. The substance of the argument is that there is a growing trend in current urban planning debates towards emphasizing public spaces as neutral meeting sites for the presence of diverse groups. By narrowing down the geography of encounter to a specific time and location, the perception is that people gain a deep understanding of their cultural differences through spatial encounter in public spaces. According to this perception, bringing people together in urban public spaces generally speaking leads to intercultural ties among culturally diverse individuals (Sandercock, 2006; Wood & Landry, 2008).

However, as discussed earlier, this approach to the politics of living together in multicultural cities has been questioned basically from two standpoints. First, whether the feasibility of establishing intercultural ties between culturally diverse groups through spatial encounter in public spaces is defendable (Amin, 2012). Second, whether bridging differences and establishing ties between diverse groups in contemporary plural society can be claimed as a convincing approach to living together – given the previous century’s intellectual and political efforts of different groups to legitimize the right to their differences (Parekh, 2006; Amin, 2012).
Referring to some of the existing literature on this subject, the thesis tries to elaborate on the criticism that may be levelled at urban planning theories with such an approach to multiculturalism. However, regardless of arguments for or against this criticism, what is essential for this study is that encounters in urban space and co-presence of people in everyday local ‘micropublics’ are of crucial importance in several urban planning approaches to the politics of living together in general, and to multiculturalism in particular. Hence, it can be claimed that in its various approaches to the politics of living together, urban planning lays emphasis on the spatial dimensions of multicultural cities.

Thereafter, the thesis refers to Amin’s (2012) concept of a “civility of indifference” which is an alternative politics of living together, built on criticism levelled at interpersonal tie-establishing expectations of spatial encounters. Proposing the two organizing principles of ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’, Amin (2012, p. 75) argues that this approach places emphasis on an urban habit of living together that “diminishes public interest in difference” rather than having strong expectations of building ties through spatial encounter in ‘micropublics’. However, what here again attracts the attention of this thesis is Amin’s emphasis on the importance of encounter in urban space, which he describes as “habits of daily encounter between strangers” in urban public spaces.

Despite significant differences that these aforementioned approaches to the politics of living together may have, this dissertation suggests that all on the one hand acknowledge the spatial dimensions of living together in multiculturalism by stressing the importance of encounter in ‘micropublics’. On the other hand, due to a lack of spatial theory, these approaches have not been able to thoroughly explain the role that the spatiality of the built environment may play in regulating encounters in ‘micropublics’. Accordingly, the dissertation identifies a lack of a spatial theory in explaining the relation between urban form and multiculturalism as a theoretical lacuna.

The suggested theoretical lacuna is, in simple terms, based on the idea that if spatial co-presence and daily encounter in urban public spaces – either with the purpose of building ‘intercultural’ ties, or with the purpose of shaping an urban habit of a ‘civility of indifference’ – are of importance for the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’, then there will be a need for a spatial theory to explain
how urban space may play a role in establishing varying types of social grouping in urban space.

To address the uncovered theoretical lacuna, the thesis mainly refers to the concept of “civility of indifference” to cultural differences, alongside its two organizing principles of “co-presence” and “multiplicity” (Amin, 2012) as an alternative politics of living ‘together-in-difference’. In this way, the thesis tries to paint a very general picture of the political and philosophical substance of multiculturalism, with the emphasis laid on some of its facets with the potential to be extended to urban planning and design debates.

It goes without saying that any attempt to narrow down the ideas of multiculturalism into a specific number of facets may sound naïve. The thesis therefore uses the concept of multiculturalism within a more generic framework rather than being more specific. When the thesis argues for multiculturalism in urban form terms by saying that it should respond to the needs for a ‘civility of indifference’, it in fact puts stress on cultural differences but in terms of spatial form. Here the intention has not been to define specific forms that correspond to particular cultures but the much more generic aim of giving spatial support for the development of ‘difference’ in general. That is, by speaking about multiculturalism the thesis does not intend to introduce a new demand on spatial form due to specific cultural variations but rather the generic demand, typical of most metropolitan cities, to provide spatial support for the development of difference, whether it be of social, economic, cultural or any other type. Multiculturalism here is simply a specific case of a more generic demand we may have on urban form.

Uncovering a theoretical lacuna in research efforts on spatial dimensions of multiculturalism, the discussion aims to investigate the morphology of urban spaces where daily encounters come about through the lens of spatial theory.

**Framing a conceptual system**

Despite a variety of potential avenues, the thesis has adopted a *spatial* approach to the question of living ‘together-in-difference’ in multicultural cities. That is, in order to address an alternative politics of living together through the lens of spatial relations, the research situates its ‘logical argumentation strategy’ (Wang, 2002) in a larger spatial conceptual framework. Given the *relational propositions*...
used in this research’s argumentation system, there is a need here to briefly repeat some of the key points in the dissertation’s conceptual contour.

Referring to Hillier and Hanson’s (1984) elaboration on physical space, the built environment is not perceived as a by-product of social relations but as an intrinsic part of them. That is, the idea that the built environment “is not simply a background to social behaviour – it is itself a social behaviour” (Hillier B., 1996, p. 300) has shaped this dissertation’s approach to living ‘together-in-difference’. Following this understanding of physical space, the thesis looks at urban fabric as spatial patterns imbued with social and behavioural patterns. In a nutshell, referring to space syntax theory, spatial relations are here regarded as “what we think with, rather than what we think of” (Hillier & Hanson, 1984, p. 2). That is, an attempt has been made to approach the question of multiculturalism in urban planning and design discourse through the lens of physical space and spatial relations.

What has been stated thus far – viz. a) detecting a theoretical lacuna in addressing the situation of living together in multicultural cities, and b) spatial relations as what we think with (rather than what we think of). – can be considered the warp and weft of the research’s conceptual framework to re-address multiculturalism.

Space syntax, as the ‘primary system of argumentation’ in this thesis, describes how spatial relations in the urban structure are contributing factors in shaping social groupings through their influence on movement patterns. In other words, the research’s conceptual framework relies upon space syntax regarding how movement patterns are perceived as the linkage between spatial form and patterns of individuals’ and groups’ presence in urban space.

**Spatial perspective on living together in multicultural cities**

As its main contribution, this dissertation intends to provide new insights into understanding the relation between urban form and the political framework of multiculturalism. Accordingly, the ‘secondary system of argumentation’ goes more deeply into the described domain mapped by space syntax to analyse how spatial relations may provide spatial viability for the emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’. The thesis hence focuses on how spatial relations of urban form
may exercise influence on formation of different patterns of ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’.

**Overlapping spaces**

The secondary discussions, representing the core of this research’s contribution, approach the question of living ‘together-in-difference’ in spatial theory by arguing that for shaping the urban habits of a ‘civility of indifference’ the spatial relations need to be acknowledged as a contributing factor, rather than as a by-product of social, political, and economic processes. In saying this, there is no intention to underscore a *causal* relation between space and multiculturalism. Rather, it is about relational propositions of different contributing factors, one of which is spatial viability as a condition for multicultural cities and societies. Spatial relations should therefore be taken into account as an inseparable part of efforts intended to boost viability of a ‘civility of indifference’.

This interpretation is based on the idea that if urban form is to provide spatial viability for the emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’, it needs to address the principles of both ‘co-presence’ and ‘multiplicity’, as its two organizing principles. These two principles, however, are translated into urban form terms as different types of co-presence patterns, i.e. ‘co-presence of homogeneity’ and ‘co-presence of heterogeneity’. The first pattern corresponds to the co-present individuals in a public space who are brought together from a local neighbourhood or a district. The latter corresponds to the co-present individuals who are drawn from a greater variety of transpatial groups.

Building upon the characterization of the spatial form of cities developed by space syntax, such as the presence of a foreground and background network, the conceptual framework of this thesis argues that the principles of co-presence and multiplicity are spatially viable if there is some degree of *overlapping* between the global and local properties of the system. In overlapping spaces, patterns of presence of individuals are derived from both local areas (as already established *spatial* groups) and from many parts of the city (as a greater variety of both *spatial* and *transpatial* groups). In the framed conceptual system, the term *spatial pervasiveness* is used to describe the configurational properties of overlapping spaces.
By conceptualizing *overlapping spaces* as the spaces where the urban structure can potentially provide spatial viability for an emergence of a ‘civility of indifference’, the discussion tries to narrow down the general discussion on co-presence and multiplicity to an attempt to translate some of the more detailed ideas of multiculturalism into the terms of urban form. The discussion will be based mainly on the following ideas and concepts in political theory: i) Parekh’s (2000) idea of “community of individuals and communities”, ii) Young’s (1990, p. 60) idea of “cultural imperialism”, and iii) the ideas of “intercultural dialogue” (Parekh, 2006, pp. 268-273) or “dialogue between cultures” (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 171) and a “shift of perspective” (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, p. 89).

a) *Spatial structure of community fluidity*

The conceptual framework of this thesis provides new insights into a spatial understanding of the concept of “community of individuals and communities” – what Parekh (2000) describes as one of the common features of a multicultural society. The nub of the argument is that it is through overlapping spaces that the spatial structure of the city can provide spatial viability for the multi-faceted and fluid character of communities.

The dissertation also argues that if there is a lack of spatial pervasiveness, the patterns of co-presence may become limited to one type of social grouping, i.e. bringing individuals only from local areas and districts. This situation may run the risk that the urban form will spatially support the emergence of an ‘archipelago’ of divided communities, at each of which ‘parallel lives’ are spatially reinforced while there may not be enough spatial viability for encounter among individuals and groups from different communities.

b) *Visible spaces of marginality*

The conceptual framework of this thesis provides new insights into a spatial understanding of the idea of freedom of cultural expression, stating that the right to cultural expression for all social groups – which is one of the basic demands on a multicultural society – articulates with the spatial visibility of marginal groups within the urban structure.
The interpretation is based on the idea that if urban structure is to provide spatial viability for public cultural expression, it needs to address the concerns over “cultural imperialism” (Young, 1990, p. 60). An attempt is made here to provide new understanding of the way urban form may exert influence on ‘cultural imperialism’, through which, according to Young (1990), the paradox of marginalizing minority groups as invisible while stigmatizing them as the Other takes place.

The thesis describes how the spatial configuration of urban form may provide spatial viability for concentrating a social group – either privileged or unprivileged – to a spatial enclave and how it spatially separates their daily movement patterns and keeps their public presence out of sight. By keeping a social group out of sight, according to Young (1999), the urban structure instigates spatial viability for making one group’s cultural differences and values invisible to society.

The thesis argues that if the spatial configuration of public spaces – those that provide services mainly to a particular residential enclave – is part of overlapping spaces: i) It would maintain higher spatial viability for the enclave’s members to be present in the given public space and practice and sustain their cultural differences. This articulates with having the principle of co-presence of homogeneity on the ground. ii) It would maintain higher spatial viability for the given public space to be part of daily movement patterns in the city. In other words, there would be spatial viability for other groups to be present in the given public space and witness the cultural differences of the enclave’s members. The public expression of the enclave’s members would then be visible to other individuals and groups in society and their cultural differences would not remain spatially invisible to the rest. This articulates with having the principle of co-presence of heterogeneity on the ground.

This section claims that by being a part of overlapping spaces, the spatial configuration of public spaces can influence the situation of living ‘together-in-difference’. In other words, urban form can influence the situation of living together by working against spatial viability for ‘cultural imperialism’.
c) Adaptable spaces for otherness

The conceptual framework of this thesis casts light on a spatial interpretation of dialogue and negotiation of difference. It elaborates how intercultural dialogue and negotiation of difference – which is emphasized by multiculturalism politics as a basic necessity to resolve cultural disagreements – can be translated into urban form terms.

The interpretation is based on the idea that if urban form is to provide spatial viability to encourage intercultural dialogue in public space, it may focus its attention on opportunities for “a ‘shift’ of perspective” in one’s worldview and lifestyle (Hajer & Reijndorp, 2001, p. 89), rather than attempt to establish intercultural ties among individuals and groups.

The argumentation elaborates on how the spatial configuration of public spaces can influence the ideal of living ‘together-in-difference’ by providing spatial viability for the following conditions: i) cultural (and experimental) dominance of a particular group with visible codes and norms of behaviour over a public space, ii) simultaneously encouraging other (cultural) groups to participate and experience the public space through others’ perspectives on life. The term adaptable public space is used to refer to a public space that can spatially fulfil the aforementioned conditions. In other words, adaptable public spaces seek a spatial ground for the emergence of a civility to other groups’ perspectives despite the dominance of the space by one particular group.

The conceptual argumentation describes how the spatial configuration of a public space can provide a ground where the emergence of negotiation and dialogue between different groups in a multicultural context is spatially more likely. It posits that spatial structure can have agency in shaping the habits of a ‘civility of indifference’ by providing spatial viability for intercultural negotiation and dialogue through overlapping spaces.

Closing words

This dissertation is a research effort to translate some ideas and politics of multiculturalism into urban form terms by adopting a logical argumentation strategy. Regarding multiculturalism from an architectural and urban design
perspective, the study provides new understanding of the relation between urban form and living ‘together-in-difference’.

The central argument of this research is that some aspects of multiculturalism – as one of the ideologies and politics of living together in diversity and difference – should be understood and addressed through the prism of physical space. That is, notwithstanding being a political complex, multiculturalism encompasses spatial traits which need to be addressed through spatial theory. The thesis therefore frames an interdisciplinary conceptual system, through which some spatial dimensions of a politics of living together are conceptualized and explained.

This thesis underscores the necessity to consider spatial relations as one of the contributing factors in dealing with the complexities of living together in diversity and difference. However, it goes without saying that there has been no intention to claim that spatial consideration is a sufficient determinant in addressing the politics of living together in a plural society.

The framed conceptual system in this thesis opens up avenues for future empirical research. Given that cultural/discursive logical argumentation systems set goals – implicitly or explicitly – to affect normative guidelines for design actions (Wang, 2002, p. 310), future empirical research inquires can be used for testability for the claims of the developed conceptual system in this dissertation.
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