Reviewing Premises on Public Spaces in Democratic, Inclusive, Agential Cities illustrated by Amsterdam

Harteveld, Maurice

Important note
To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

City Space Architecture

Reviewing Premises on Public Spaces in Democratic, Inclusive, Agential Cities, Illustrated by Amsterdam

Maurice Harteveld
Delft University of Technology, Department of Urbanism, Netherlands
m.g.a.d.harteveld@tudelft.nl

Abstract

This article highlights the dynamics of values in our reasoning on public space. By means of an epistemological study, illustrated by examples in the Dutch city of Amsterdam, it tests the contemporary premises underlying our ways to safeguard the inclusive, democratic, agential city, and, as such, it aims to update our view on public space. The article raises three subsequent questions: [i] Is the city our common house as perceived from the Renaissance onward, containing all, and consequently are public spaces used by the people as a whole? [ii] Is the city formalising our municipal autonomy as emphasised since the Enlightenment, in an anti-egoistic manner, and in this line, are public spaces owned by local governments representing the people? And, [iii] is the city open to our general view as advocated in Modern reasoning, restricting entrepreneurial influences, and synchronically, are its public spaces seen and/or known by everyone? Inclusiveness, democracy, and 'agentiality' are strongholds in our scientific thinking on public space and each issue echoes through in an aim to keep cities connected and accessible, fair and vital, and open and social. Yet, conflicts appear between generally-accepted definitions and what we see in the city. Primarily based upon confronting philosophy with the Amsterdam case for this matter, the answering of questions generates remarks on this aim. Contemporary Western illuminations on pro-active citizens, participatory societies, and effects of, among others, global travel, migration, social media and micro-blogging forecast a more differentiated image of public space and surmise to enforce diversification in our value framework in urban theory and praxis.

Keywords: public space, value conflicts, inclusiveness, democracy, agentiality

An Epistemological Study

Public space is a fundamental notion in the organisation of many cities. All over the world, we share the idea that public space is publicly-used, publicly-owned and publicly-known space. When our colleagues, urban theorists and professionals concerned with public space, aim to make sure that everyone is included, that everyone has a say, and that everyone is familiar with the space, colleagues are building upon the same premises: Public space pertains to the people as a whole, it is protected by a body representing them — the government — and it is open to the general view of all. This article argues the dogmatic use of these premises, by raising three subsequent questions which have been derived from previous research (Harteveld, 2014): [i] Is the city our common house as perceived from the Renaissance onward, containing all, and consequently are public spaces used by the people as a whole? [ii] Is the city formalising our municipal autonomy as emphasised since the Enlightenment, in an anti-egoistic manner, and in this line, are public spaces owned by local governments representing the people? And, [iii] is the city open to our general view as advocated in Modern reasoning, restricting entrepreneurial influences, and synchronically, is its public spaces seen and/or known by everyone? Given remarkable mismatches between an understanding that public space should be absolutely all and observations in our cities, in essence, the study behind the article has broadly questioned if such public space really exists at all, and/or to what extent. From one point of view, this reportage aims to update our current knowledge by unfolding generally-accepted propositions in our international discourse on public space in reverse chronological order. From another, the work compares these to an illustrative and near-random collage of observations in the Dutch city of present-day Amsterdam, and searches for alternative understandings by mirroring the international narratives to Dutch lines of reasoning. Both the confrontation to a real city and to local but coeval shifts in scientific thinking seem to constitute an essential approach in reviewing the premises underlying our ways to safeguard the inclusive, democratic, agential city: a public space which is absolutely public.

The answering of the three questions is, and can only be, specific to a particular case, which presents an alternative way of thinking. Amsterdam is used as such a city. It showcases a diversity of public spaces, among others echoing times of pro-active citizens, participatory societies, and effects of global travel, migration, social media and micro-blogging. In this article it is shown that such diversity argues against a common premise on public space. This may not mean that there is not one dominant image of the city, turning towards absolute public space. Amsterdam is for example known for its canal city, isn't it? This image immediately pops up in the minds of a lot of people when the city is discussed. Of course, numerous local and global people have moved along its quays and crossed its bridges and will continue to do so. These spaces are very populated almost every day. These spaces are publicly-used. Even from a distance, people share the same image of the city. Searching the internet for Amsterdam one finds predominantly canals. The urban spaces with the artificial waterways are magnets for people visiting the city, sharing snapshots and liking them online. These spaces are publicly-known. These spaces also belong to the local government. It may be a *'pars-pro-toto'* for a city in the Netherlands. Facing water threats in the country below sea level, the Dutch have to do it together and the City administration assures shared interest and safeguards the common good. These spaces are publicly-owned. As such, the Amsterdam

canals may be prototypical *'public spaces'*, because these urban spaces are used by a lot of people, known by many, and owned by the public government. It showcases Dutch design along the lines of value systems in which public spaces are essential for the inclusive, democratic, agential city.

In the Netherlands, the value system is covered by public law. Technically public space is described as "*all foot-, bicycle -, and towpaths, walks, mill and church roads and other restricted traffic lanes*", as well as *"bridges"*. Ownership, as far as the contrary is not proven, is presumed to be with the province, municipality or water-board, by which the road is maintained. On the one hand, this means that all roads or paths have to be open to public traffic. On the other, law elaborates that all parts in the living environment which are accessible to the public should be considered as such too. And when using *'open to all'*, it means to be used by all, hence without exception. According to the Netherlands Constitution everybody should be treated equally.[1] (Wegenwet Art, 1, 4 and 13, Wegenverkeerswet Art, 1.1b, Besluit Omgevingsrecht Appendix, 2 Art. 1.1, Grondwet, Art. 1, 6, 7 and 9) All people have to be able to use it. Still, by illuminating Amsterdam, rhetoric questions rise. Is the public space really of all, for all? Is it able to be? Who are the people using it as a whole? Currently, the City and citizens are turning against the 17 million people visiting the city: "*Tourism is 'destroying' Amsterdam*", "*We don't want to have more people*". Pro-active community associations have become unsympathetic to short-term visitors, their carry-ons, waste, noise, being there. United in a platform called *Wij-Amsterdam*,[2] they complain about the many taxi ranks, and stops for coaches or hop-on-hop-off in the canal district. It's a confrontational image of the city: Amsterdam may be a global place that hates tourists the most. In this line, the city's new memorandum on public space is subtitled: *"The Living Room of All Amsterdam Citizens"*. Amsterdam shall stay for *'everyone'* its acting Mayor announced (Amsterdam Marketing, 2016; Van Loon, 2016, 7 July; Coffey, 2017, 15 May; Gemeente Amsterdam, 2017, 8 Juni; Couzy and Koops, 2017, 9 September; and *www.wij-amsterdam.eu/category/toerisme*, as consulted 26 September 2017). So, more rhetoric questions help to introduce the validity of the illustrative case: Is the public space of all citizens, for all citizens? And again, is it able to be? The public seems the citizens only. The public government observes a *"renaissance of public life in the inner city, and with that of public space"*. Yet, while the City draws consequences and invests in places of stay and transport, they mainly focus on the gentrifier. That is to say, the design of public space is approached as a *"co-creation by or with residents and entrepreneurs"*, the city's marketeers branding the public space are guiding people through cultural offering to *"hidden pearls"* and *"unknown neighbourhoods"*, and the usability of communal grounds like allotment gardens and sports parks is increased (Amsterdam Marketing, 2016, 4 January; and Gemeente Amsterdam, 2017, 8 June). To say

---

[1] Defining *'public space'* is originated in this case in respectively defining *'openbare wegen'* in The Road Act (Wegenwet) as directly derived from the one issued on 1 October 1932 and the Road Traffic Act (Wegenverkeerswet) of 21 April 1994; and in *'openbaar toegankelijk gebied'*, naming squares, parks, green plots, public waters and other areas alike, in the Environmental Licensing Decree (Besluit Omgevingsrecht) of 25 March 2010. The freedom of speech and public assembly is articulated in the Constitution of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, firstly issued on 24 August 1815. Government is allowed to limit freedom of speech outside buildings and closed places when for example traffic circulation is at stake of to prevent public disorder.

[2] Translated as *'We Amsterdam'*, as statement against the popular *'I AMsterdam'* slogan in branding the city.

it popularly; public space is particularly made accessible for the pro-actives following the latest trends and fashions, the cycling young urban professionals lounging outdoors while drinking a latte macchiato. So, within this frame, only that group seems to constitute the public. There seems to be an ignorance towards people and groups with other lifestyles. *"Tourism and Global Hipsterism have transformed the City where I once lived. But not entirely — The Canals endure"*, as a New York Times reporter observes. He explains that in the past Amsterdam shaped itself around the power and needs of individuals, especially when the canals were designed, and argues that perhaps this is still true. (Shortoaug 2016, 4 September) The author raises concerns related to what has been called 'the right to the city'. (United Nations, 2017: 5) Although public space is for all individuals, the focus turns to only one specific group in the Amsterdam example. In conjunction to the short intro to the illustrative case, this critical remark forms a stepping stone to the larger search for ways to understand premises behind safeguarding the inclusive, democratic, agential city.

Publicly-Used Public Space

If one thinks of public space, one hopefully first thinks of the people. A gathering of people makes space public in the first place. Following reasoning in Modern urban sociology, particularly established in times of emancipation and secularisation, people's presence and their interactive behaviour defines the public quality of a public space. It sets the most recent era in the diachronic review in this study: the Age of Modernism. Two notions which are fundamental to grasping this understanding are: on one hand *'public realm'* and on the other *'public sphere'*. Both can be found in the dominant German-American schools of thought. The first term came from Hannah Arendt, defining *'public realm'* as the sphere of action and speech. It stands in contrast to the *'private realm'* of the household, as the sphere of necessity, existence, survival and the reproduction of life. Interaction between people and public interdependence as part of *'being'* form the basis. This is further illuminated by her teacher Martin Heidegger, who advocated for a *'public world'* as an accessible one. Similarly, public realm is one of seeing and hearing others; *'common to us all'*[3] (Arendt, 1958: 2, 46-47, 52-67, Heidegger, 1927: 67, 1958: 55, and 1962: 66). By using *'realm'*, one could perceive people as part of something big, and the public as the all-embracing. – The second term came from Jürgen Habermas. He likewise started with people's behaviour, but obviously antipathetic to Heidegger and disagreeing with Arendt, he put the emphasis on the place or position people have in the whole, each claiming to have interest. He used *'sphere'*. Metaphorically, it could be the orbit of individual people, set in groups and forming the larger whole, containing all. In reviewing Arendt's work, he shifted lenses on intersubjective shared life: *"the 'realm of appearance' which the agents enter and in which they meet and are seen and heard"*, spatially *"determined by the fact of human plurality"*. Given this, public sphere *"stood or fell with the principle of universal access..."*(Habermas, 1962, 1971: 233-234, 1983: x, xix, 174-175, and 1991: xv, 70, 85). So in short, *'public realm'* was seen as an area controlled as a whole, and *'public sphere'* referred to the circuit or range of action, knowledge, or influence of people. In both, public space was more than just a physical volume defined by absolute

---

[3] Heidegger used notions as *'dasein'* and the *'being of being'*.

public qualities, presuming a use by all people (Harteveld, 2014: 67-69). Public space safeguards *'the city for all'* versus *'the city of all'*.

The urban sociological definitions of public space as publicly-used are quite understandable if one considers the Renaissance Humanistic founding of the notion of *'public'*. It's the founding era in the diachronic review of this understanding. It carries a long — but steady — evolution of subsequent definitions accumulating in the abstract meaning of *'the people in general'*[4] (Harteveld, 2014: 77). Based on reinterpreting ancient philosophy, the architect-philosopher Leon Battista Alberti introduced this notion in the field of architectural and urban theory in 1452. Practicing the notion *'publice'*, or *'publick'* in English, he underlined that all citizens should be concerned with everything of a public nature being part of a city. Although, he acknowledged that society may have a wide variety of people, setting arguments for differentiation in design, he stated strongly that public spaces should concern all. This statement had been built upon his essay *'De Iure'*, discussing safeguarding the public interest by means of a *'republic'*, while reflecting on the Florentine Republic where he lived[5] (Alberti, 1437 and 1437/38, and Alberti, 1452, as transcribed by Jacobi 1521: xlbc-xbc, and as translated by Leoni 1755: 64-68). Alberti formed a base point for the Modern thoughts on public space, and, by placing Modern and Renaissance values close together, one can confirm a certain continuum in our value system: public spaces have to relate to all, be open to all, thus be *'inclusive'*. It presumes open space *'for all'* people to gather, hence *'of all'* too. Influenced by the work of Alberti, two views on public space were interpreted. Transcendentally, *'realm'* was represented in paintings of The Ideal City attributed to several artists. They showed universal open spaces in a centric linear perspective of individual buildings recalling the Florentine Romanesque style of Alberti. And, *'sphere'* was denoted in the drawing of the *Vitruvian Man* by Leonardo da Vinci. Portraying a symmetrical human body, yielding a circular outline and inscribed in a superimposed square figure, an Albertian analogy for the human influence on the universe. (n.a. [Laurana?] c.1470, n.a. [Di Giorgio Martini?], 1477, n.a. [Carnevale?] c.1480/1484, and Da Vinci, 1487) The whole housed different people and spaces, each having individual influence. Vice versa, individuals made the whole. Alberti tied it together by approaching the city as a house: "*For if a city, according to the opinion of philosophers, be no more than a great house*"[6] (Alberti, 1452, as transcribed by Jacobi 1521: xiv). Humanistically approached, defining public space was less dogmatic than what we got out of the Modernist reasoning. Sharing different *'spheres'*, people

---

[4] In the dawn of the English Renaissance, the word *'pupplik'* appeared as an adjective in the English language. It had the meaning of 'open to general observation, sight or knowledge' (1394). Soon it had transformed into the meaning of 'concerning the people as a whole', as in *'publiqué'* and in the spelling *'publike'* (1427 and 1447). It was borrowed from the old French *'public'* and *'publique'*, which on its turn came from the Latin *'pūblica'*, an alteration of the Old Latin *'poplicus'*, meaning 'pertaining to the people'. In the sixteenth century, the English word appeared as a noun; to converse in *'publike'*, meaning to converse in a common place (1500), and subsequently evolving in meaning *'the people in general'* (1665).

[5] His interpretation of the publican concept echoed loudly in his writings on designing cities: "*It will not be amiss to recollect the opinions of the wise founders of ancient republicks and laws concerning the division of the people of different orders*", as Alberti started one of his books. In other words, Alberti made a plea to learn from ancient philosophers when it concerns the treatment of different groups in society.

[6] The Ideal Cities seemed like a window onto another, better world. Especially so-called Baltimore panel emphasised this idea by some human figures walk in the centre of a square demarcated by statues representing Justice, Liberality, Moderation, and Fortitude.

could assemble in multiple rooms in the city. They might be part of a diverse *'realm'*. The Renaissance value base tests contemporary premises underlying our ways to safeguard the inclusive city closely related to Modern reasoning. Again, rhetorically: Does public space for use of the people as a whole exist? No. Can we envision a public space which is used by all? Most literally, this means one room where the world population is. Of course 7.7 billion people won't fit anywhere. So, no again. Nevertheless, Amsterdam, used as an example, does assemble several geographies of centrality, and wider networks, ranging from global and continental to the metropolitan and local. One may argue that global public space is approached here. When looking to its citizens, the local population includes most nationalities in the world.[7] (Trouw, 2007, 22; August, Hylkema, Bosveld, De Graaff, Beentjes, and Slot, 2016 November: 56-57) Amsterdam may have more qualities of a global city (Sassen, 1991: 175-177). Still, bluntly said, when it concerns a space there is little chance to see one of the three Amsterdam Bahamian really meeting one of the two Amsterdam Bhutanese.[8] The definitions of Arendt and Habermas may have taken a wrong turn. Maybe it has to be less strict, and following the Florentines; the city may be a house with different rooms used by different people.

Notwithstanding critiques and limitations on these Modern definitions, ideas on public space were persistent and found their way across the border. International channels were open. In the Age of Modernism, their thoughts spread easily to the Netherlands too[9] (Atanassievitch, 1930: 149-166, Algemeen Handelsblad, 1930, 18 March, Leendertz, 1933). The Dutch urban sociologist Paul Kraemer was for instance convinced by the work of Arendt: *"when people are restrained in the possibility of acting in the public domain, they are deeply deprived in their being"*. Positioned at MIT Boston, he warned Dutch academics apocalyptically for the creation of *'half-people'*, soon to be *'un-beings'*. He felt obliged to act in order to open-up public space (Kraemer, 1968, October: 496). Despite such examples, within Dutch thinking alternative value sets emerged simultaneously. It unfolds cross-cultural confrontation in the recent era reviewed in this study. Closer to practice, urban and architectural designer Aldo van Eyck broke international hegemonies stating synchronically that *'openness'* and *'enclosure'* only mattered if they assisted people in alternating inclination towards inside and outside. By observing behaviour in cities, Amsterdam in particular, he concluded that cities extended as much inward as dwellings extended outward: *"Space has no room, time not a moment for man"* (Van Eyk 1956, Mei-Juni: 133, and 1962, December: 600-602). Public space was defined as rooms where people are. His close Delft colleague Herman Hertzberger argued in the same line, explicitly against the black-and-white definitions of public and private argued by Arendt.

---

[7] Amsterdam counted 169 nationalities, and 834.713 inhabitants within the municipality boundaries in November 2016.

[8] Actually they met on Monday 21 November 2016. As part of the 180 Amsterdam-based project, the mayor of Amsterdam invited representatives of each of the hundred-eighty nationalities in the city to have dinner at the Royal Tropical Institute.

[9] German-Dutch relations were tight, when the work of Heidegger was introduced at first. It was boosted by two lectures in 1930 for de Vereeniging voor Wijsbegeerte in Amsterdam His lectures on *"Die Gegenwartige Lage der Philosophie"* and on *"Hegel und das Problem der Metaphysik"* were held on 21 and 22 March 1930 in the School voor Maatschappelijk Werk. The latter lecture was also given in The Hague on 24 March. It was embedded in reasoning at the University of Amsterdam. Later, the American influence became omnipresent due to recovery programmes for Europe, intercontinental broadcasting and air travel. This included philosophical and urban sociological works.

In his view, collectiveness was always formed by individuals in relation to each other. Also illustrated by Amsterdam examples, the public could gather within interiors and people could domesticate streets. He stated that the dichotomies public-private, collective-individual were false (Hertzberger and Steenkist (ed). 1984, March: 5, 58-87). Different gatherings, different collectives, different public spaces... *"Make every city into a big house and every house into a small city"*, as Van Eyck rephrased Alberti (Van Eyck, as quoted in Ellenbroek 1989, 17 November). Dutch social-geographers, cultural philosophers, and designers joined in illuminating issues from this viewpoint. "*The traditional opposition between valuable public space and secure private space can no longer be assumed as an axiom*", an architectural magazine rephrased. Practitioners and academics agreed on the "*extension and dispersion of the 'place' for publicity*". One would speak of a '*diverged*' public space, not just simply consisting of streets and squares (e.g. Tilman 1992, Summer, Gall 1993: 9, and Oosterman 1993: 77, 105-106). It gives us an alternative way of thinking, and although it may seem like an acculturated answer drifting away from Modernism, it is on its turn in line with local values and part of a longer history.

There was also cross-cultural exchange in the era that enhances this relation between public and people. Renaissance Humanistic philosophy from Florence had reached the Dutch before.[10] Its arrival had boosted Renaissance in the larger Low Countries, and as soon as the Republic of the Seven United Netherlands emerged in the north, it shifted to among others booming Amsterdam. Cross-cultural confrontation is discovered in the founding era too. Here, alternative Humanist ideology was expanding thinking through the vehicle of pure-language, confirming independence. This effected thinking on the city too. The Dutch designer-thinker Simon Stevin would mirror Alberti in a better way. He also related the design of a house to the design of a city, and he also learned from ancient philosophers. However, in an attempt to understand a common mother tongue, he avoided Greek and Latin. The Roman notion '*res publica*' was translated in Dutch[11] as '*ghemeensake*'. Consequently '*public issue*' became more a '*common issue*'. By substituting public for '*gemeen*' (common), Stevin took explicit position against the doctrine and meaning of ancient philosophers. He plead for a republic safeguarding the equality of Dutch cities and places, wherein no one gained power over another, and at no places people's privileges were limited by others. This differed from Alberti's reasoning on the republic, wherein public interest is protected by central power. In Stevin's view, individual liberty and freedom would increase by embracing '*civicness*' and increasing commonalities. He envisioned a differentiation of common spaces in cities (Stevin, 1590: 32-33; and 1649: 17-37, 62), and this was applied in designing the Amsterdam canal city extension in 1613. (Taverne, 1990) Dutch values differed: cities had to be open to all in order to have the freedom to act. It may be a contextual continuous search of the human free will, pioneered by Dutch philosopher-theologian Desiderius Erasmus; '*diatribe de libero arbitrio*' (Roterodamus, 1526).

Today, it is difficult to find absolute publicly-used public space as internationally dominant in our thinking. On the contrary, the concept of humanistic space is still echoing. It does particularly in the illustrative example of Amsterdam, but it has many forms here: we can

---

[10] Also in the Fifteenth Century, international channels were open. International trade and booming textile industry made cities in the Netherlands economic and cultural centres of gravity. The nobles and rich traders were able to commission artists, leading to frequent exchanges with Northern Italy.

[11] Stevin introduced a lot of new words and notions in Dutch, what he called '*plat Duytsch*'.

learn from the groofy places for/of the hipsters at the edge of its inner city (e.g. NDSM-Warf, De Ceuvel, Kop Dijksgracht and De Tuin van Bret). These public spaces have become showcase of something we may call co-designed public spaces for/of a particular public. We can learn from the ancient and emerging collegiate campuses used by the academics and students (of the University of Amsterdam, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, and AMS Institute); typically representing a kind of domesticated public space, again made and used by a specific public. In another way, schoolyards, soccer fields and playgrounds, supported by non-governmental organisations, provide examples of public spaces designed for kids (respectively the Jantje Beton, Cruyf, and Krajicek foundations). The 'good'ol' market places can be added too. These commercial public spaces can be reinterpreted as pop-up urbanism and gathering the bargain hunters and cheap jacks, 'ecosophers' and urban farmers. Another specific public. Residential community gardens as crowdsourced public space, reception places for refugees and asylum seekers as temporal public spaces bringing together all kinds of humans, elderly places, and so forth. In a free flowing dialogue, the listing can become endless, and with many doublings and many blurring boundaries. From a simple and short saturated set of these exemplary observations in Amsterdam, we have to accept that people gather in many spaces, yet no space gathers all. In this way, space is theirs when they are there, and publicly-used public space is not so different to what is considered as privately-used. Although the reasoning does not yet reach out to other territories, cultures and cities, the estimate is that public space always has its own public wherever when active. Hence, theoretically the common house may be still there, with different rooms with very different public qualities as it once was put forward. This means that the desired public gathering space continues to exists as an abstract value, not excluding any individual or group of society, yet being confronted with current reality in which publics always involve in some space in the city somehow. This impacts the inclusive city, different publics have different spaces in a common house.

Publicly-Owned Public Space

If one thinks of public space, one may secondly reason that, no matter what, the space should be in the hands of the public government safeguarding the public interest. Taking care that everyone is involved somehow. Questioning if a space is really public often resolves in a normative discussion on private ownership versus public ownership. Most of all debaters will argue for the latter, implying that a public institution representing the people is of greater value. Especially when referring to the recent era echoing Modern values, particularly established in the years of fast urbanisation, when local public governments started to control initiatives on the private property to maintain public accessibility. The French civil engineer Georges-Eugene Haussmann, supervisor of the modernisation programme for Paris, signed for the demolishment of large parts of the city to make room for the increasing need of people movement. It was seen as turning point. The new boulevards, avenues and squares, designed with Adolphe Alphand, were publicly-owned public spaces. Private streets devoted to public use were expropriated. *'La via pública'* and *'öffentlichen Verkerseinrichtungen'* became the new norm. Internationally the value of public ownership for spaces of public interest was adopted by a larger European-American community of prominent designers (Cerda, 1867; Alphand 1886,

Baumeister 1890, Stübben 1890, and e.g. The Royal Institute of British Architects 1908). Public spaces owned by local governments representing the people became one of the most important means to ease accessibility.

Despite this Modern regulation, decades later, both Arendt and Habermas concluded that the public realm or sphere was something in which not everybody could participate as promised by the government, but: "*Every citizen, by virtue of his citizenship, receives besides his private life a sort of second life, he belongs to two orders of existence, there is an sharp distinction in his life between what is his own and what is common*", as Hannah Arendt elaborated her reasoning on the public good. Although public ownership was a less explicit concern to them, being part of public *"stood or fell with the principle of universal access ..."* (Habermas, 1962: 16 and 66, Arendt 1958: 52-67, 243-247, and Arendt 1974, 15 February). Following this German-American thought, Richard Sennett did shine the urban sociological light on the ownership issue. In his vision, newly emerged privately-owned public spaces had absorbed public life. Consequently, streets had become sole places for mobility and transportation, losing *"any independent experimental meaning of its own"*. Urban spaces were not places devoted to public life anymore, as he perceived this not only as a violent disruption made by planners, but he blamed people too, *who were* moving away from the street. *'Public man'* had fallen. He accredited individuals to have active influence on the public quality of urban space. These ego interests must be suspended, following Sennett's previous study of the effect of city life on personal identity. Adding to Habermas and pointing to the legacy of Haussmann, *'public sphere'* was seen as a common domain of influences. This implied democracy and, in Sennett's view, active participation should be facilitated. In a further aim to pinpoint at contemporary problems of social isolation and spatial fragmentation, he appealed designers, to create clear boundaries between the publicly-owned and privately-owned space, helping to bring dead urban spaces back to life (Sennett, 1970: 198, 262; Sennett, 1976: 12-16, 31, 134-135; and 2008: 225-235). Public space as defined by planners, shaped by designers and formed by people is qualified as of greater value when it is *a priori* publicly-owned. It ought to facilitate *'the city by all'*, while safeguarding a *'democratic'* city.

The urban sociological definitions of public space as publicly-owned are clearly understandable if one considers the Enlightened Humanistic use of the notion of *'public'*. It introduces the founding era for this definition. Sennett's emphases on active participation in the public space even indirectly related back to the Renaissance strive for liberty and freedom by the rebirth of the *'res-publica'*. Following age-old models alike the Florentine Republic, a pioneering example was the establishment of the Dutch Republic in 1581 as a first way to regain *"old freedoms"*. The new free republic attracted new people from all over the world. Cities became liberal cosmopolitan places. The predecessor of the Netherlands pioneered in the reconceptualised theoretical model, as well as in practice. In the case of the city of Amsterdam, the consequent growth of the number of people generated not only a growth in the size of the city, but also in the municipal government, including the council of citizens. To house the increasing new government, several neighbouring city blocks were prepared to house the growing representation of the people. A majestic new city hall with Roman and Greek architectural references – recalling ancient republican buildings – was designed to replace the old. Its geometric footprint created a Classic virtually orthogonal public space in the middle of the city, and facing its dam in the river (Asseliers, 1581, July; and

Commelin 1693: 210, 254-260). More than in the canal city extension, freedom was tested by urban redesign. At the time, the idea was that people's privileges ought not to be limited, still the government took action and razed houses. Within this societal context and given such cases, the Dutch philosopher Baruch Spinoza tested the free will, as defined by Desiderius Erasmus. If authority is able to do something that ordinary human beings could not, and everyone would be eagerly following their action, then legitimacy had been found in a republic. Otherwise people would always have to obey. Spinoza relies on active participation too, as for him *"obedience has no place in a social order where sovereignty is in the hands of everyone and laws are enacted by common consent"*. It tested governments. The *'ius democratia'* should be part of the republic. With that, and following the focus of his teacher Franciscus van den Enden, he laid an important base for a *'democratic'* city[12] (Spinoza, 1670: 60, 175-186; n.a. [Van Den Enden] 1662: 3-4; and 1665: 48-49). Enlightenment Humanistic philosophy was born.

The English Republic, American Republic and French Republic followed the Netherlands, respectively in 1649, 1776, and 1789. The notion of public was related to the abstract meaning of *'community, nation or state*'[13] (Harteveld, 2014: 77, 88-94). These subsequent convulsions marked the Age of Enlightenment supported by theorists. The Genevan philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau reasoned in Amsterdam on the established republican values: As long as by nature ordinary people could not be the sovereign government as well, a republican representation was the answer. Because: "*The people would be far less often mistaken in its choice than the prince"* (Rousseau, 1754, 12 June, and 1762: 130-132). Only in freedom, people could develop themselves, as his younger German colleague Immanuel Kant would add. More than Rousseau, he aspired to the freedom for all people by means of voices of the population, self-governance and reason regarding public order and harmony in the commonwealth (Kant 1784, 30 September). Democracy for all. The English-American philosopher Thomas Paine reasoned likewise. As he opposed the presence of lords and monarchs in his country, he opposed stadtholders in the Dutch Republic as well. The new-found system of representation should be more radical and democratic. A republic ought to be instituted on what it is to be employed, "*res-publica, the public affairs, or the public good; or, literally translated, the public thing*". One could relate this to the republican spaces of Federal City, or the young capital city of Washington. Though its grand avenues and principal streets *"leading through the public appropriations"* exposed a paradoxical dilemma. Is the public interest served by appropriating land of local people, undermining their interest? As one of the Founding Fathers of the United States, Paine was clear: *"Society in every state is a blessing, but government even in its best state is but a necessary evil"* (n.a. [Paine] 1776, 14 February; Paine 1792: 18-20; and Ellicott 1793). Confronting subsequent developments in the founding era with the Dutch forerunner case, a series of evidences come to the table in which people's influence on the government increased. Public governments democratically representing the people in other countries, like municipalities representing their citizens, may own public space, yet this does not avoid conflicts. As a matter of fact, in a cross-cultural confrontation in the Modern era, one can again

---

[12] His teacher Franciscus van den Enden introduced him to the notions on 'equality' and 'liberty, similar freedom for all alike and freedom from arbitrary government.
[13] The abstract meaning of 'the community, nation or state' was founded in 1611.

find the influence of general-accepted Modern reasoning in the Netherlands too. On the other hand, international accepted values defined by Sennett were literally recognised in quotes of Dutch academics. Planner and political scientist Maarten Hajer parroted Sennett by stating that "*the public space of cities must be designed in such a way that all peoples are encouraged to use it"* and urban designer and planner Riek Bakker echoed him by stating that public space should be an *"objective and neutral space"* designed for all people. In this ideal, *'privately-owned public space'* would work contra-productive (Hajer, 1989: 7, 45; and Bakker, 1993: 95, 102-103). Yet on the alternative path of the Dutch reasoning, social geographer and planner Ton Kreukels proposed a different value definition. He stated in his central thesis that "*the public domain is not per se, nor per definition only or even predominantly, the resort of the government*". All kinds of facilities and institutions relate to the public interest, but this does not mean that governments have dominant voices in them (Kreukels and Simonis, 1988: 11). This thought somehow got an audience and was followed by a persistent multidisciplinary discussion underlining pluralistic spheres. Debaters of all kinds accepted privately-owned public space by framing it as a third kind of space. They introduced new notions like '*semi-public space*' and '*collective space*' to position this space between private and public space, still presupposing a dialogic dichotomy (Sola Morales, 1992, 12 May, as translated by Bet 1992, Summer; Moscoviter, Van Beek and Geuze, 1992: 30; and Heeling, 1997, April). At a certain moment even Dutch Ministers adapted these definitions of '*new public space*' and with that the assessment of public space was less negative compared to Sennett: "*Right now the public space balances between vitality and decay*", *as* they stated in a national memorandum (Remkens, Van Boxtel, Faber, Korthals, Van der Ploeg and Pronk 2002, May).

Today, it is difficult to find absolute publicly-owned public space. Especially Amsterdam displays a wide variety of public ownerships. Hence, they show more mismatches with the dominant international Modern definitions. The concept of humanistic space is omnipresent in Amsterdam in many forms too, thus another list of supporting examples can be given: we can learn for example that underneath a majority of buildings in the city lies public land. Hundreds-thousand citizens have bought the right to occupy these privately-built municipally-owned public spaces via a leasehold-system. This public property is not public assessable at all. Space is occupied by inner-city mansions or townhouses (e.g. in recent IJburg, Eastern Dock and South-Axis). We can also learn from strategies to make private property assessable by means of a legal right to pass along through grounds or property belonging to another, under certain circumstances. Apart from back alleys, also gloomy tunnels under the rail-infrastructure and its sterile overpasses represent right-of-way public spaces.[14] One could also learn from the privately-owned transit-oriented public spaces as smooth commuter places. Although, public-use is differently formalised, many of these public spaces have been developed

---

[14] So-called *'erfpacht'* (leasehold-system) and *'recht van overpad'* (right of way) are based on the Civil Code of the Netherlands of 22 November 1991, supported by the Disclosure of Impediments under Public Law Act of 17 June 2004. See: Burgerlijk Wetboek Boek 5, resp. Titel 7. Erfpacht, art. 85-100, and Titel 6. Erfdienstbaarheden, art. 70-84, with Wet Kenbaarheid Publiekrechtelijke Beperkingen Onroerende Zaken.

under public-private partnerships[15] (for instance the renewed Amsterdam Central Station or Rokin station project). Same goes for the just-off mainstream privately-developed public spaces in the heart of the city (Kalvertoren, Magna Plaza, and Beurspassage etc.); shiny public interiors exemplifying mass-class places. Continuing the demonstrative listing in the illustrative case of Amsterdam, one can find public space cooperatively-owned by social housing corporations or common grounds owned by associations of self-made denizens. In every case, one may state that free will or even democracy is limited, but these spaces serve publics. On the contrary, the government limits these too at other sites. For example, it demolishes buildings for roads or for another city hall, for the sake of all, and it establishes pedestrian-only spaces outdoors or restricts public spaces to public transport or residents only. Road-blocks, bollards, and mandatory signs are everywhere. Lastly, based on use and behaviour, informal ownership is clearly visible around the city.[16] Appropriation of public space can be avoided nowhere. Occasionally the government anticipates on these feelings of belonging by formalising participatory planning processes. It's a kind of co-determination right on publicly-owned public space which feels like 'your' room (Amsterdams Volkshuisvestingsoverleg, 2010, 2 April; and Gemeente Amsterdam, Stadsdeel West 2012, 17 July). Neutral public space hardly exists in our cities. Public space is not necessary made autonomous and publicly-owned by the government. Even if so, people feel affiliated and appropriate space. The abstract democratic value related to space has got many forms, because publics own spaces in a variety of ways and in each public interest is safeguarded in another representative way. In achieving the democratic city, public representation and municipal autonomy have many forms.

Publicly-Known Public Space

Thinking of public space, lastly, one will have certain understanding of what this means, being familiar to and/or aware of certain cities and places. In that sense, a public space is like a *'public figure'*. Its image may be famous from *'public media'*, but impressions will not be the same for all people. In reviewing the recent era again, Modern thinkers accept this human plurality exists. Moreover, it discloses the phenomenon of *'the agent'*; different actors participating in the public. Agency relates to behaviour, hence interest and influence (Arendt, 1958: 175-176; and Habermas, 2001: 27). Elaborating on *'public realm'* and *'public sphere'*, asymmetries have to be accepted. Sennett qualifies for instance some people as *'dominant agents'*, others as part of *'collective agents'*. Yet, in all Modern premises, the aim is to engage people to be part of an entirety: *'vita activa'*. This includes regulating the power of entrepreneurial as well as collective agents. Being in spaces of commercial developers, of specific groups or even families are seen as withdrawals from society. Modern thinkers see safeguarding the agency of people in the city of value. Built on the

---

[15] The concept of *'publiek-private* samenwerking' (public-private partnership) has been adopted by Dutch governments in 1986, establishing agreements for certain and indefinite periods between public and private parties, in order to establish, maintain, manage and operate infrastructure from a shared risk acceptance and with respect to estimated costs and expected revenues. See: Knoester et al 1987, May.
[16] The notion *'informeel eigendom'* (informal ownership) relates to outdoor space belonging to a group of people, redefining public space as a chain of common spaces or *'gemeenschappelijke ruimtes'*. See: Van Dorst 2005: 292.

premise that this means acting in the outdoor space, it presumes an *'open city'*, open for all, open to interact, open for those outside its boundaries. Sennett expresses that: *"When the city operates as an open system – incorporating principles of porosity of territory, narrative indeterminacy and incomplete form – it becomes democratic not in a legal sense, but as physical experience."* Thus, in his view, designing an open city means shaping the narratives of urban development, creating physical incomplete forms, and moulding the experience of passages from place to place, including walls defining and delineating (Sennett, 1977: 179; Sennett, 2008: 73; and Sennett, 2006, 10-11 November). The contemporary suggestions from Sennett on the address of the planner-designers are practical, but seemingly bound and restricted to the publicly-owned public space. Again, we see Modern ideas landing in the Netherlands. The open city of Sennett is among others adopted by the Dutch architect and urban planner Kees Christiaanse.[17] On one hand, he highlights likewise actions in public space and whatever happens in buildings. The open city needs to challenge the increased attention on marketability, proliferating commerce, and the unprogrammed congregation and encounter. Designing coexistence is consequently also his answer. Yet, on the other hand, with the support of others, he explores the open city concept much broader than Sennett. He acculturates it to a Dutch context in which *'open'* not only means *'accessible'* but also *'open-minded'*. Although, the concentration of people leads to the valuable *"exchange and accumulation of knowledge"*, Christiaanse sees human diversity also as a threat: *"An open society is both friend and enemy of the open city"*. He relates to the observation of Sassen that in the global city trans-local geographies connect spaces with multiple others elsewhere, so that virtual cohesiveness may be stronger than the physical bond sometimes. So, whereas Sennett is quoted to emphasises the physical, his wife Sassen emphasises the non-physical. Both show that *'openness'* causes conflicts, and cities are triaged through conflicting commercial and civic activities (Rieniets, Sigler, and Christiaanse, 2009: 25-36, 147-156, 202). In an open city people move from one place to another, adding experiences, and while they meet others, their knowledge accumulates. The rise of global travel and migration has further increased scopes. Whatever people think of a public space, relates to what they already know. Besides experiencing cities, their knowledge generally derives from sources to which they have access to. Mass-communication and open internet eased the collection of observations and ideas in the recent days of Modernism. The galaxy of knowledge on cities and spaces exploded, to be shared by all, and at any position. It is permeating everyday lives of societies. With this, ways of *'being there'* have exponentially multiplied. People have second-lives and alternative places to be while being in a place. The present popular prerogatives are putting the emphasis on who's connected, …where, to where and to whom. Evidently, *'the being of public'* is tested. While people have different interests and influences, informing and involving themselves, suddenly intellectuals and professionals can discover many publics – many opinions. Theories on public space are turning to the agential city. Who are the actors in public? Do we know the public?

The above urban sociological definitions of public space as publicly-known emerged

---

[17] Christiaanse was curator of the 4th International Architecture Biennale Rotterdam (IABR), 25 September 2009 – 10 January 2010, in Rotterdam – Amsterdam. The theme was *'the open city'*: *"a city that is diverse, lively and socially sustainable, where people can productively relate to each other culturally, socially, as well as economically"*.

recently and particularly from a Modern Humanistic use of the notion of *'public'*. Although as such the reasoning on publicly-known space seems rather young, Dutch roots are slightly older. At the dawn of the Modernism, the Dutch philosopher Gerard Heymans argued against *'the truth'* or *'the known'*. He stated that scientists might have developed enlightened ideas, but *'people's opinion'* could be different. He questions the universally known. Governments could have the best intentions to safeguard freedom and liberty, still people-people and people-government conflicts remained. Reasoning on the thoughts of Spinoza, in the view of Heymans, differences in being, in terms of spheres of influence and knowledge, would be part of human nature. He explained difference as an *"established social phenomenon, which could be explained psychologically in any particular case"*. Thus, as long as people are human, having different personalities, subjectivity will always play an important role (Heymans, 1883: 89-90, 96, and 106). Each person has an innate view on the public world. This comes out in their visions, converged trough experiences and learning. So, concerning public spaces, personal views determine the public quality of space too. All people have images created upon their own interpretations based on all they know, as do representatives, theorists, and planner-designers (Harteveld, 2014: 535, and 549). Public spaces are known differently by different people because of diversity in their nature and knowledge. Based on these subjective viewpoints, discussing the *'public'* sphere becomes ambiguous and the perception of a *'realm' is* questionable. There's no realm – that is to say not shared by all –, and many spheres. Heymans emphasises that *'the known'* is not universal.

Traces of this Dutch ratiocination are found among German thinkers too[18] (e.g. Gadamer, 1960). Especially in the work of the contemporary philosopher Peter Sloterdijk. In reference to the private and public, he sees *'the known'* old-homely sphere being destroyed and the *'all-knowing'* universal being exploded. Diachronic comparison can only be juvenile. Still, like Heymans, Sloterdijk identifies Spinoza as a way out. Yet, generally, he avoids the use of *'public'*. Public space may relate to ancient European cities, defining *"itself as the continuation of domesticity by other means"*, presuming that *"the house's sources of warmth, the heart, also permeates the public world to its limits, however remote these may be"*. For him people have created their own gathering space. His reasoning on *'spheres'* examines places *"that humans create in order to have somewhere they can appear as those who they are"*. Again, by using the term sphere, one rediscovers an emphasis on positions people have, and - while ignoring Sennett, fighting Habermas and by-passing Arendt - he bases thoughts on Heidegger's *'being'* too. While now highlighting subjectivity, he identifies multiple spheres. Sloterdijk makes *"use of foam metaphor to examine the republic of spaces"* (Sloterdijk, 1998: 28; 1999: 235-237, 465, 467-468; and 2004: 23-25). Self-evidently, generally the term foam refers to cell-pockets in versatile multiscale media, thus metaphorically created through dispersion in society, capturing people in a physical matter, as if they are gas in a liquid or solid. He puts emphases on physical representations of these plural spheres throughout his thinking. Exemplary are what he calls macro-interiors and urban assembly buildings. Groups and even larger wholes share an orbit, hence a *'private sky'*, like individuals (Sloterdijk, 2004:

---

[18] Also schools of thoughts mix and disperse. In Germany, particularly the emphases on subjectivity by Hans-Georg Gadamer supported the paradigm shift as described by Heymans. Gadamer, who was educated by Heidegger together with among others Arendt, questioned *'Wahrheit und Methode'*.

604-670 and 733).

Today, it is also difficult to find absolute publicly-known public space. The Amsterdam canals may come close, as their images pop-up on the internet, searching for hashtag public space in Amsterdam. Nonetheless, on the base of such fairly superficial correlations – googling for pics only - hollow spheres with iridescent surfaces may be formed. Canals keep dominating the top results for web-searches on the city, based on past online searches and popularity rankings.[19] These images may attract travel junkies, adrenaline seekers, exhibitionists and random bloggers to visit these public spaces too, sharing more of the same and thus making them more publicly-known. In this way, very known spaces relate to very publicly-used and publicly-owned spaces in a mutually reinforcing way. Still, the most recent concept of humanistic public space is based on who knows the space. Then, in second review, even the canals in Amsterdam have many faces: we find the same canals filled with boats, with people respectively dressed in orange at the annual King's Day, or enjoying evening concerts on stages on the water during Amsterdam Sail.[20] These particular mass experiences show how spheres can differ whereas physical space stays the same. The orange visitors of open-air fun share a different image than the nautical lovers. Thus, the public spaces are differently known. In this line, more examples can be given: we can learn this too from impressions we get from the ArenA, the main stadium of Amsterdam, and its nearby concert hall. Given the number of views during performances on their stages , these mass-event public spaces may be the most well-known spaces in Amsterdam among YouTube users. They bring performer and public together.[21] Still, celebrities, crowds and fans change continuously, their views and perceptions too. Public spaces, like this one, are fluid. We can learn from the waterfront public spaces developed in Amsterdam in the recent decade by *starchitects*. An assemblage of different iconic landmark buildings seem to add to the plurality of publicly-known space. They seem to attract the eyes of specific people, yet also specific familiarities, knowledge and understanding. Again, even such a building is known in many ways by different persons and publics. Stories behind the images may matter. Separated conscious minds may correlate knowledge on certain spaces. In this way, we can learn from sphero-chromatic public spaces in a snapshot, selfie-blocked public spaces, or 140 character public spaces as posted on Instagram, Tumblr or Twitter. These spaces are known too, amongst specific publics. People publish more personalised experiences in space via these platforms, and relate them to others by semantic self-tags embedded in media sources. They make the spaces public. When people seem to agree on sets of meanings and their posts are agglomerating geographically, then dynamic

---

[19] Canals are shown while searching for Amsterdam, because the Google search method premises that popular web-sources are more desirable than others. This is based on a sable 2,240,000 monthly web-searches via Google, world's largest web-search engine. See: https://adwords.google.com; https://trends.google.com/trends/ explore?q=amsterdam. Searching for e.g. Amsterdam Waterfront shows a certain plurality of spheres.

[20] During King's Day on April 27th,, 700,000 people are present in the city. During the free quinquennial maritime festival Sail 2015 two- to three million others have been in-situ. The Canal Festival's concerts are performed on stages by or even on the water. Research on Social Urban Data by AMS Institute show a correlation between places where people share data via social media and ways crowds are formed and flow through the city. Pictures were uploaded predominantly at the riverfront, as well as at Prinsengracht. Research included crowd monitoring for Sail2015.

[21] Based on largest number of views for a YouTube search for 'amsterdam'.

public spheres unfold: public space is created.[22] On the contrary, we can learn from public spaces in the villages in the city (like Oudekerk, Betondorp, and the philosopher's eponymous place Sloterdijk[23]) where parochial communities may breathe the slow pace, and public space seems to be known by a very limited public. Again, things and people do not exist in autonomous spheres. Even the most introverted communal parishioner has a wider orbit than just one set on public spaces to act in. Locals have always unexpected encounters with non-friends, passers-by and outsiders. They distribute knowledge. Locals also read magazines, watch the news or, who knows, follow vlogs. Knowledge flocks in multiple ways, thus even less known space has its public. People are rarely prisoners in a cell. They are never caught in Facebook-groups only, for instance. There are always strangers. On the base of all kinds of information *'being there'* exists without being there. All the more, publicly-known space is not always placed geographically. One may remember a bridge with love padlocks in Amsterdam, but forgets the so-called Staalmeesterbrug where they have been. Similarly, publicly-known space is also not always coeval. One may know Amsterdam scatter places, but it is hard to find them today. As such subjectivity becomes manifest. A public space can never be open to a general view, universally-known and understood. This list of last examples showcases a variety in agential information forming the public space. The list saturates to an understanding of public space, which is open to whoever forms a public, and adding to intersubjective views people share. Via *'a culture of open-mindedness'*[24] (Gemeente Amsterdam, Dienst Ruimtelijke Ordening, 1997; and Bosma and Davids, 2000), the open city concept links to the affiliations and relations of people, entrepreneurial or not, collective or not, familiar or not. Mediation and interaction between the people forming publicly-known space is a premise in the agential cities. These impacts aiming for the agential city, different publics have different views in an open city.

Conclusion and afterword
In the end, reasoning on public space makes us user-oriented, owner-oriented and knowledge-oriented by origin. [i] The city is still our common house, but public spaces are not used by the people as a whole. People share rooms, though. [ii] The city is still formalising our municipal autonomy in an anti-egoistic manner, but public spaces are not owned by local governments representing the people. Other representatives and bodies play a role too, while municipally-owned space is appropriated by specific publics. And [iii] the city is still open to our general view too, but public spaces cannot be seen and/or known by everyone.
Maybe we can accept that the city is always our main learning lab. We observe and learn here. We review and learn here. We analyse and learn here. Cities provide real status quo's on which designers can act while theories only reflect temporal understanding or

---

[22] An example is the SocialGlass project of the AMS Institute.
[23] Sloterdijk, by change namesake of Peter Sloterdijk, is a village established in 1465 in the west of Amsterdam. Betondorp is established between 1923 and 1925 as garden village in the east of Amsterdam. Both are part of Amsterdam now. Oudekerk aan de Amstel is older than Amsterdam, established in the 11th Century, and currently divided over two municipalities, southeast of Amsterdam.
[24] In Amsterdam, *'open-minded'* is seen as a cultural achievement, and related to urban design and planning. .

aims. Instead of considering 'public space' as an absolute given notion, maybe we can accept reality, like some colleagues already do. Some of them co-create narratives on inclusive public spaces by inviting and counting on the present users, and their ways of doing. They work *with* the related people. Some add to democratic public spaces by including the present stakeholders, who are safeguarding the public interest with different roles. They work *with* all representatives of present publics. Some even contribute to the agential public spaces by incorporating different levels of present understanding. They work *with* public intersubjectivity. In those cases, the city becomes a living lab.[25] Every professional and academic in the future can question: (i) who uses the space? How are people interrelated? Can we cooperate in improving public space by better facilitating its interrelated use of all kinds, of all kinds of people? (ii) Who owns the space? How is the public interest safeguarded? Can we improve public space by better work with its interrelated ownerships, allowing all kinds of appropriation? (iii) Who knows the space? How do they perceive the space? Can we improve public space by better facilitating its interrelated knowledge, meanings, and ultimately values? The answer to these questions gives an alternative and specific understanding of public space. This approach follows a recent line of Dutch Humanist thinking. It accepts that not every person uses, owns and knows our academic reflections or professional insights, while every person does use, own and know public spaces. It brings people into a multiplicity approach to understand public qualities, updating our value framework based on inclusiveness, democracy, and the city. Not everyone is included or acts actively with influence in a public space. Designing public spaces reflects equilibrium, which consequently is provisional due to publics that continue to evolve.

References

Alberti, Leon Battista (1437). De Iure, ad Franciscum Coppinum Pratensem. *Albertiana, Con il Patrocinio dell' / Sous le Patronage de l' / Under the Patronage of the, Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici*, Vol. III, 2000, Paris: Societe Internationale Leon Battista Alberti, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore, p.165.

Alberti, Leon Battista (1437/38). *Vita*. In: Alberti, Leon Battista, as translated by Christine Tauber, 2004. *Vita. Lateinisch Deutsch.* Frankfurt am Main: Stroemfeld I Basel: Roter Stern

Alberti, Leon Batista (1452). *De Re Aedificatoria.*

Alberti, Leonis Baptistae, transcribed by Jacobi (1521). *Leonis Baptistae Alb erti Fiorentini viri Clarissimi De Re Aedificatoria: Opus Elegatissimu et Maxime Utile*, Parihisiis (Paris): Jacobi.

Alberti, Leon Batista, as translated by Edward Owen Giacomo Leoni (1755). *The Architecture of Leon Batista Alberti in ten Books*, London: A. Tiranti.

Algemeen Handelsblad (1930, 18 March). Lezingen – Professor Heidegger, *Algemeen Handelsblad, Nieuwe Amsterdamse Courant*, 103de Jaargang, No. 33432, Dinsdag 18 Maart 1930, p.10.

Amsterdam Marketing (2016, 4 January). *Strategisch Plan 2016-2020*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam Marketing.

---

[25] Projects like Future of Public Space, Democracy by Design and Amsterdam Smart Citizens Lab - From Needs To Knowledge, as developed by AMS Institute within the Amsterdam LivingLab bring those practices together.

Amsterdam Marketing (2016). *Bezoekersonderzoek Metropool Amsterdam 2016. Amsterdam Metropolitan Area Visitors Survey 2016*, as published online http://amsterdam-marketing.instantmagazine.com/kerncijfers-2016/boma-2016#! consulted 26 September 2017.

Amsterdams Volkshuisvestingsoverleg (2010, 2 April). *Leidraad Participatie, Amsterdamse Leidraad voor Participatie bij Wijkvernieuwingen Complexgewijze Aanpak.* Amsterdam: Amsterdams Volkshuisvestingsoverleg.

Alphand, Adolphe (1886). *Ville de Paris. Recueil des Lettres Patentes, Ordonnances Royales, Décrets et Arrêtés Préfectoraux concernant les Voies Publiques, dresse sous la Direction de M. Alphand, par MM. A. Deville, Hochereau,* Paris: Impr. Nouvelle.

Arendt, Hannah (1958). *The Human Condition,* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press I London: Cambridge University Press I Toronto: The University of Toronto Press.

Arendt, Hannah (1974, 15 February). *no title [notes in response to a paper on Private Rights and the Public Good given by Charles Frankel, a Professor of Philosophy and Public Affairs at Columbia University, 15 February 1974].* Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., Hannah Arendt Papers (ID No.: MSS11056), Subject File, 1949-1975, 1938-1968, BOX 55, Conference on Private Rights and the Public Good, 1973-1974, undated (1 folder).

Asseliers, J. van (1581, July). *Placcaert vande Staten Generael vande Gheunieerde Nederlanden: Byden Welken, Midts den Redenen int Lange int Selfde bebrrepen, men verclaert den Coninck van Spaegnien vervallen van de Ouerheyt ende Heerschappije van dese voors. Nederlanden, ende verbiet sijnen naem ende zeghel inde selve Landen meer te ghbruycken, &c. Scrutamint.* Leyden: Charles Sibius, ghesworen Drucker des Staten s'Landes van Hollandi.

Atanassievitch, Xenia (1930). Hedendaagsche Wijsbegeerte: Standpunten en Stroomingen. *Tijdschrift voor Wijsbegeerte,* Vier-en-Twintigste Jaargang, 1930, pp. 149-166.

Bakker, Riek, 1993. De Openbare Ruimte, In: Gall, Stefan, Roy Bijhouwer, Jan Dirk Hoekstra and Jan Geuskens (ed) (1993). *Stedebouw in Beweging,* Rotterdam: Uitgeverij 010.

Baumeister, Reinhard (1890). *Handbuch der Baukunde, Eine Systematische und Vollständige Zusammenstellung der Resultate der Bauwissenschaften mit den Zugehörigen Hülfswissenschaften, Veranstaltet von der Herausgebern der Deutschen Bauzeitung und des Baukalenders, Abteilung III, Baukunde des Ingenieures, 3. Heft, Städtisches Strassenwesen und Städtreinigung,* Berlin: Kommissions-Verlag von Ernst Toeche.

Bosma, Koos and Karel Davids (2000). *Historisch Tijdschrift Holland, 32ᵉ Jaargang, Nr. 3/4 (2000) Werken aan een Open Amsterdam.* Haarlem: Historische Vereniging Holland, 2000.

Cerdá, Ildefonso (1867). *Teoriá General de la Urbanización, Y Apltgaigion de sus Printcipios y Doctrinas á la Reforma y Ensanche de Barcelona, Tomo I,* Madrid: Imprenta Española.

Coffey, Helen (2017, 15 May). Eight Places that hate Tourists the Most, *The Independent,* as published on www.independent.co.uk.

Couzy, Michiel en Ruben Koops (2017, 9 September). Wethouder Kajsa Ollongren: 'Amsterdam moet van Iedereen blijven'. *Het Parool,* 9 September 2017.

Commelin, Isaak (1693). Van alle de Stads Oude en Nieuwe Gebouwen, In: Commelin, Casparus (1693) *Beschryvinge van Amsterdam, Desselfs Eerste Oorspronk uyt den Huyse der Heeren van Amstel en Amstellant, Van haar Leven en dappere Krijgsdaden; Amsterdams Kleyne Beginselen, Oudheyt, Bemuring, en Verfcheyde Vergrootingen: De Gelegentheyt en Hoedanigheyt der Stad, de Voornaamste Gebouwen, en Wijze van Regeeringe. Beneffens een Historisch Verhaal, Vervattende 't Geene in, en om de Zelve, van den Beginne af, tot in de Jare 1691. toe, is Voorgevallen. […]* Amsterdam: Wolfgang, Waasberge, Boom, Van Someren en Gortmals, pp. 251-419.

Da Vinci, Leonardo di ser Piero (1487). *Le Proporzioni del Corpo Umano Secondo Vitruvio* [pen and ink with wash over metalpoint on paper, Gallerie dell'Accademia, Venice].

Ellenbroek, Willem (1989, 17 November). *Maak van een Huis een Kleine Stad!, riep de Dichter uit*, In: De Volkskrant, Vrijdag 17 November 1989, 68e Jaargang, No. 19847, p. 9.

Ellicott, Andrew (1793). *[Territory of Columbia].* [Map retrieved from the Library of Congress, G3850 1793 .E4].

Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1960). *Wahrheit und Methode, Grundzüge einer Philosophischen Hermeneutik.* Tübingen: J.C.B.Mohr, (Paul Siebeck).

Gemeente Amsterdam (2017, 8 June). *Visie Openbare Ruimte 2025. De Huiskamer van àlle Amsterdammers. Richtlijnen voor Ontwikkeling en Beheer van de Amsterdamse Openbare Ruimte.* Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam.

Gemeente Amsterdam, Dienst Ruimtelijke Ordening (1997), Juli. *Amsterdam open stad : structuurplan 1996.* (three volumes: Deel 1, Het Plan; Deel 2, De toelichting; Deel 3, Overzicht van de Bedenkingen) Amsterdam: Dienst Ruimtelijke Ordening (Afdeling CST).

Gemeente Amsterdam, Stadsdeel West (2012, 17 July). *Ruimte voor Burgers in West, Kaders en Uitgangspunten voor Participatie bij Plan- en Beleidsvorming en Uitvoering.* Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam, Stadsdeel West.

Habermas, Jürgen (1962). *Strukturwandel der Offentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der Bürgelichen Gesellschaft.* Neuwied am Rhein | Berlin: Hermann Luchterhand Verlag GmbH.

Habermas, Jürgen (1971). *Philosophisch-politische Profile.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Habermas, Jürgen (translated by Frederick G. Lawrence), 1983. *Philosophical-Political Profiles.* Cambridge | London: The MIT Press.

Habermas, Jürgen (1991). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Habermas, Jürgen (2001). *Begründete Enthaltsamkeit, Gibt es Postmetaphysische Antworten auf die Fragen nach dem 'Richtungen Leben'?* In: Die Zukunft der Menschlichen Natur, Auf dem Weg zu einer Liberalen Eugenik? Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Hajer, Maarten A. (1989). *De Stad als Publiek Domein,* Den Haag: Wiardi Beckman Stichting.

Harteveld, Maurice (2014). *Interior Public Space, On the Mazes in the Network of an Urbanist. A Scientific Journey of a Designer, following the Evolution of Greco-Roman Thoughts, through some Remarkable Indo-European Cities, including those in The Americas, crossing the Turkic and*

Arabic Spheres in their Proximity, and Abridging to the Japanese Capital as Introductory Exemplar, to reconstruct Today's reasoning on Public Interiors by means of Defining Types, interrelating People and Actions, describing Socio-Spatial Transformations, and Comprehending Cultural Meaning. In Nine Books. Delft : Delft University of Technology.

Heeling, Jan (1997, April). *Een Zoektocht naar de Grondslagen van de Stedebouwkunde*, Delft: n.p.

Heidegger, Martin (1927). *Sein und Zeit*, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Heidegger, Martin (1956). *Zur Seinsfrage*, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.

Heidegger, Martin (translated by Jean T Wilde and William Kluback) (1958). *The Question of Being*, Albany: NCUP, Inc.

Heidegger, Martin (translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson) (1962). *Being and Time*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Hertzberger, Herman and Erik Steenkist (ed) (1984, March). *Theorie en Practijk van het Ontwerpen, Samenvatting Colleges Architectuurbeschouwing 1973-1982, Deel A: Het Openbare Rijk*, Delft: Vakgroep 13 Architectuurbeschouwing.

Heymans (1883). *Volks- en Staatssouvereiniteit.* In: De Gids. Zeven en Veertigste Jaargang, (Vierde Serie, Eerste Jaargang), Eerste Deel, Amsterdam: P.N. van Kampen & Zoon, pp. 84-118.

Hylkema, Cor (ed), Willem Bosveld, Laura de Graaff, Rob Beentjes, and Jeroen Slot (2016 November). *Amsterdam in Cijfers 2016, Onderzoek, Informatie en Statistiek*, Amsterdam: Gemeente Amsterdam, Onderzoek, Informatie en Statistiek.

Kant, I. (1784, 30 September). *Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung? (S. Decemb. 1783. S. 516.)*, In: Berlinische Monatsschrift, IV, B.6, Zwolftes Stük, December 1784, pp. 481-494.

Knoester, T., et al (1987, May). *Publiek-Private Samenwerkingsvormen in de Grond-, Water- En Wegenbouwsector 1. Eindadvies.* [Client: Ministerie VROM, Directie Bouwbeleid]. Utrecht: Adviseurs voor Organisatie & Informatica (Arthur Young International).

Kraemer, P.E. (1968), Oktober. Chicago Journaal. Wending, Maandblad voor Evangelie en Cultuur, Jaargang 23, nr. 8 . Oktober 1968, pp. 491-502.

Kreukels, A.M.J. and J.B.D. Simonis (1988) Publiek Domein: De Veranderende Balans tussen Staal en Samenleving. In: A.M.J. Kreukels en J.B.D. Simonis (red.) *Publiek Domein: De Veranderende Balans tussen Staal en Samenleving*, (B en M Jaarboek 1987/1988), Meppel/Amsterdam: Boom, pp. 9-29.

Leendertz, W. (1933). *Dogma en Existentie, Openbare Les Kweekschool der Algemeene Doopsgezinde Sociëteit Amsterdam*. Amsterdam: H.J. Paris.

Moscoviter, Herman, Paul van Beek and Adriaan Geuze (1992). Het Genot van de Leegte, In: Van Stokkom, H.C., A.H. van Steijn, R.W. Spee, F.M. Spruijt, W.C.A. van der Walle, R.Ch.J. Widderhoven and H.A. Meeuwig (eds), 1992. *Stedelijke Openbare Ruimte*, 1992, Kerstnummer Grafisch Nederland, Amstelveen: Koninklijk Verbond van Grafische Ondernemingen, pp. 30-47.

Paine, T. (1792). *Rights of Man, Being an Answer to Mr. Burke's Attack on the French Revolution, Part I*, London: J. Parsons.

Remkens, J.W., R.H.L.M. van Boxtel, G.H. Faber, A.H. Korthals, F. van der Ploeg and JP. Pronk (2002, May). Preambule, In: Werkgroep Openbare Ruimte in Revisie (2002, May) *Pleidooi*

voor de Openbare Ruimte, De Opgave Verkend, Den Haag: Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieubeheer / Ministerie van Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschappen / Ministerie van Landbouw, Natuurbeheer en Visserij (Grote Projecten, Ontwerpen aan Nederland), pp. 9-39.

Rieniets, Tim, Jennifer Sigler, and Kees Christiaanse (2009). *Open City: Designing Coexistence.* Amsterdam: SUN Publishers.

Roterodamus, D. Erasmum (1526). *Hyperaspistes Diatribæ adversvs Seruum Arbitrium Martini Lutheri.* Basileæ: Io. Frob.

Rousseau, Jeanjacques (1754, 12 June). *A La Republique de Geneve*, In: Rousseau, Jean Jaques, 1755. Discours sur l'Origine et Jes Fondemens de l'Inegalite parmi Jes Homrnes, Par Jean Jaques Rousseau, Citoten de Geneve, Amsterdam: Marc Michel Rev. pp. iii-lxxii.

Rousseau, J.J. (1762). *Du Contra! Social ou Principes du Droit Politique, Par J.J. Rousseau, Citoyen de Geneve, Frederis Aquas Dicamus Leges, Æneid XI, Edition sans Cartons, à laquelle on a ajoúté une Lettre de l' Auteur au seul Ami qui lui reste dans le Monde*, Amsterdam: Marc-Michel Rev.

Sassen, Saskia (1991). *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Shortoaug, Russell (2016, 4 September). Amsterdam, Revisited. Tourism and Global Hipsterism have transformed the City where I once lived. But not entirely — The Canals endure. *The New York Times*, Sunday September 4, 2016, p. TR1.

Sennett, Richard (1970). *The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity & City Life.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Sennett, Richard (1976). *The Fall of Public Man.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Sennett, Richard (2006, 10-11 November). *Housing and Urban Neighbourhoods, The Open City [Newspaper Essay]*, presented at Berlin: Towards an Urban Age (sixth conference of Urban Age, a Worldwide Series of Conferences investigating the Future of Cities organised by the Cities Programme at the London School of Economics and Political Science and the Alfred Herrhausen Society, the International Forum of Deutsche Bank).

Sennett, Richard (2008). *The Craftsman.* New Haven I London: Yale University Press.

Sloterdijk, Peter (1998). Sphären, Microsphärologie, Band I, Blasen, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Sloterdijk, Peter (1999). Sphären, Macrosphärologie, Band II, Globen, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Sloterdijk, Peter (2004). Sphären, Plurale Sphärologie, Band III, Schäume, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Sola Morales, Manuel de, translated by Eis Bet (1992), Summer. Openbare en Collectieve Ruimte, De Verstedelijking van het Prive-Domein als Nieuwe Uitdaging, In: *OASE 33, Over de Transformatie van de Metropool, Tijdschrift voor Architectuur*, Zomer 1992, Rotterdam: NAi Uitgevers, pp. 3-8.

Spinoza, Benedictus de (1670). *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, Continens Dissertationes aliquot quibus Ostenditur Libertatem Philosophandi non tantum Salva Pietate, et Reipublicae Pace Posse*

Concedi : Sed eandem Nisi cum Pace Reipublicae, Ipsaque Pietate tolli non posse. […] Hamburgi: Henricum Künraht.

Stevin, Simon (1590). *Vita Politica, Het Burgerlick Leven*, Leyden: Franchoys van Ravelenghien.

Stübben, J., 1890. *Entwerfen, Anlage und Einrichtung der Gebaude. Des Handbuches der Architecture Vierter Theil. 9. Halb-Band: Der Stiidtebau.* In: Durm, J., H. Ende, E. Schmitt. and H. Wagner (1890). Handbuch der Architektur. Unter Mitwerkung von Fachgenossen. Darmstadt: Verlag von Arnold Bergsträsser.

Taverne, E.R.M. (1990). Mercator Sapiens. De Amsterdamse stadsuitleg (1613) in het Licht van Humanistische Opvattingen over Stad en Koopman. *De zeventiende eeuw.* Jaargang 6 (1990).

The Royal Institute of British Architects (1908). *International Congress of Architects, Seventh Session, Held in London 16-21 July 1906, Under the Auspices of the Royal Institute of British Architects, Transactions*, London: The Royal Institute of British Architects.

Trouw (2007, 22 August). Amsterdam Stad met Meeste Nationaliteiten (177) ter Wereld, *Trouw*, 22 Augustus 2007.

Van Dorst, Machiel Johannes (2005). *Een Duurzaam Leefbare Woonomgeving, Fysieke Voorwaarden voor Privacyregulering.* Delft: Uitgeverij Eburon.

Van Eyck, Aldo (1956, May-June). Over Binnen- en Buitenruimte. *Forum, Maandblad voor Architectuur en Gebonden Kunst*, Elfde Jaargang, No 4, Mei-Juni 1956, CIAM Nummer, p.133.

Van Eyck, Aldo (1962). December. [no title]. *Architectural Design*, Volume XXXII, No. 12, December, Team 10 Primer, pp. 600-602.

Van Loon, Marissa (2016, 7 July). Aantal Bezoekers Amsterdam in 5 jaar gegroeid tot 17 Miljoen. *NRC*, 7 July 2016.

United Nations General Assembly (2016). New Urban Agenda, (A/RES/71/256), New York: United Nations.

n.a. [Carnevale, Fra? (or Francesco di Giorgio Martini)] c.1480/1484. *The Ideal City* [oil and tempera on panel, The Walters Art Museum, Baltimore].

n.a. [Di Giorgio Martini, Francesco?], 1477. *La Veduta di Città Ideale* [oil and tempera on panel (reframed), Gemäldegalerie, Berlin].

n.a. [Laurana, Luciano? (or Francesco di Giorgio Martini, or Melozzo da Forlì)], c.1470. *La Città Ideale* [oil and tempera on panel, Galleria Nazionale delle Marche, Palazzo Ducale di Urbino, Urbino].

n.a. [Paine, Thomas] (1776, 14 February). *Common Sense, Addressed to the Inhabitants of America.* Philadelphia: R. Bell.

n.a. [Van Den Enden, Franciscus] (1662). *Kort-verhael van Nieuw-Nederlants Gelegenheit, Deughden, Natuerlycke Voorrechten en Byzondere Bequamheidt ter Bevolkingh […].* Amsterdam: n.p.

n.a. [Van Den Enden, Franciscus] (1665). *Vrye Politijke Stellingen en Consideratien van Staat […].*Amsterdam: Pieter Arentsz. Raep.