Planlama 2017;27(2):141–151 | doi: 10.14744/planlama.2017.02486

ARTICLE / ARAŞTIRMA

Public; Up in the Air or in the Ordinal Scale

Kamusal; Alan / Mekan

Meriç Demir Kahraman, Handan Türkoğlu

Department of Urban and Regional Planning, İstanbul Technical University, İstanbul, Turkey

ABSTRACT

The terms "public sphere" and "public space" are often used interchangeably in academic and daily language. However, there are important differences in how the term "public" is conceptualized in the social and spatial sciences. Iveson (2007) frames these distinct conceptualizations as the "procedural and topographical" approaches. In the topographical approaches, "public" is considered "a specific kind of place" in a city, and can be coloured on a given map as a "public space". On the other hand, procedural approaches describe the "public" in reference to "any place" used for "collective action and debate" using the term "public sphere". Thus, as a further step beyond this confusion, this paper aims to establish common ground and explore the similarities and differences between these two terms, offering a multi-disciplinary interpretation of them. Based on the assumption that the city and the public are socio-spatial phenomenona, as the main contribution of this study we introduce an in-depth theoretical study combining the insights of both approaches to better decode, design and defend the public spaces of our cities.

Keywords: public sphere; public space; topographical and procedural approaches; urban planning and design.

ÖZ

Kamusal alan ve kamusal mekân terimleri, günlük ve akademik ifade biçimlerinde çoğunlukla birbirinin ikamesi olarak kullanılan kavramlardır. Esasen bu kullanım Türkçe'ye özgü bir durum değildir; Batı literatürü temelinde gelişen kamusal alan (public sphere) ve kamusal mekân (public space) terimlerinin İngilizce'deki kullanımı da aynı ifade karmaşası içindedir. Bu ikiz kavramların birbiri içine geçmesindeki temel sorunsal, sosyal ve mekânsal bilimler çerçevesinde geliştirilen çalışmaların her birinin kendi çerçevesinde konuyu ele alışlarından kaynaklanmaktadır. Kamusal alan ve kamusal mekân kavramlarına dair bu birbirinden farklı ele alışları Iveson eylemsel ve topografik yaklaşımlar ayırımıyla tanımlamaktadır. Buna göre topografik yaklaşımlar "kamusal" kavramını mekânsal boyutlarıyla herhangi bir kent dokusu içerisinde, o kentin haritalarında belirli bir renkle ifade edilebilecek yine "belirli bir mekân türü" olarak ele alırken; eylemsel yaklaşımlar ise kamusal olanı, kolektif eylem ve diyaloğun gerçekleşebildiği "heryer veya herhangi bir yer" olarak ifade etmektedir. Kent ve kamusallık olgularının sosyo - mekânsal fenomenler oldukları kabulü ile bu makale, hem sosyal, hem mekansal bilimler çerçevesinde gerçekleştirilen kamusal alan ve kamusal mekân çalışmaları üzerinden teorik bir tartışma ile söz konusu ikiz kavramların birbirleriyle bağlarını ve farklılıklarını ortaya koymak amacındadır. Bu anlam karmaşası içerisinde, kamusal olanın herhangi bir kentteki mekansal karşılığının daha kapsamlı tanımlanması, tasarlanması ve savunulması için; bu çalışmanın da temel motivasyonu olduğu üzere, farklı disiplinleri ortak bir zeminde biraraya getiren bütüncül bir yaklaşım çerçevesinin tariflenmesi gerekmektedir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Kamusal alan; kamusal mekan; kent planlama ve tasarım; topografik ve eylemsel yaklaşımlar.

Received: 13.02.2017 Accepted: 21.06.2017
Available Online Date: 17.08.2017
Correspondence: Meriç Demir Kahraman.
e-mail: mericdemir@gmail.com

TMMOB
Şehir Plancıları Odası

Introduction

There is a rising concern that different points of view and academic domains have tended to draw a strict line between what is social and what is spatial. However, one might even say there is not a strict line, but rather a continuous zig-zag between what is social and what is spatial. Ultimately, as citizens and/or denizens, at some point we are all aware that what we have been through shapes and changes our built environment. Yet, as professionals and users, we hardly experience urban spaces as we have discussed and idealised in papers and lectures; actual production of space does not overlap with idealised definitions of space from the domain of the spatial sciences. On the same grounds and understanding, Madanipour (2005) claims that one should see the built environment as a socio-spatial phenomenon. The social dimension of space is undoubtedly not captured by numeric calculation of the dimensions any given or by studies to determine the user profile of that space; it is necessary to understand both the social and actual production of space (Lefebvre, 1991) synchronously from a multi- disciplinary approach.

The aforementioned strict line between social and spatial sciences has been crystal clear from the confusion between the terms "public sphere" and "public space." There are important differences in conceptualizing "public" from the perspectives of social and spatial sciences which Iveson (2007:2–3) frames also as "procedural and topographical approaches". Topographical approaches frame "public" spatially, as "a specific kind of place" in a city which can be coloured on a given map as "public space". On the other hand, procedural approaches use the term "public" in reference to "any place" used for "collective action and debate," and typically refer to "public spheres" rather than "public spaces." Indeed, the issue of public spheres has been a great concern of the social sciences beginning in the late 1950s, whereas extensive discussion of public space only took place in the spatial sciences literature starting in the 1970s. Basically, in the social sciences, the "public sphere" has been discussed in regard to the act of "creating public opinion," whereas in the spatial sciences "public space" has been deliberated on the level of "ownership and accessibility." Given this discrepancy, the main motivation of this paper is to identify common ground between these perspectives to facilitate a multi-disciplinary approach that will enable us to better decode, design and defend the public spaces of our cities. Based on this motivation, our main research question is: "How can the domain of spatial sciences (urban planning, architecture, geography) deal with the physical reflections, requirements and affordances of the complex structure of production of the public sphere and/or how it affects the social production of space in turn?" To answer this question we review discussions of the terms "public sphere" (in Section 1) and "public space" (in Section 2) as the basis for a critique of both, and to bridge the gap between them.

Up in the air (public sphere)

The term "public sphere" is used to describe aspects that reach beyond the physical limits of "publicness," addressing its inherent political nature. The roots of the discussion of publicness arose from insights of political theory rather than spatial studies. In its simplest form, the word "public" has been used in opposition to the term "private" in varying combinations such as; public sphere, public realm, public interest, public opinion, etc.

Today, contemporary definitions of "publicness" and "public sphere" refer to the two most citied masterpieces of German political theorists, "The Human Condition" by Hannah Arendt, originally published in 1958, and "The Structural Transformation of The Public Sphere" by Jürgen Habermas, originally published in German in 1962, and translated into English and published in 1991.

In Human Condition (1958), Arendt stressed the human capacity for political action and participatory democracy. She emphasized what Aristotle called "bios politikos," namely, action (praxis) and speech (lexis) (Arendt, 1998:25). She saw biopolitics as a kind of obligation for human beings; in acting and speaking humans demonstrate who they are and thus make their appearance in the world (Arendt, 1998:179). According to her, action is never possible in isolation (p.188), and appearance always requires the presence of others, which is essentially "making the public realm" though it is a matter of "to be seen and heard in the material human world" (Arendt, 1998:49–50).

There is more to this quotation than it seems, and here, the key word is "world." For her, the term "public" indicates the "world" itself, as it is common to all of humanity. Here the world is related to "the human artefacts and human affairs of those who inhabit the man-made world together" and "to live together in the world means essentially that a world of things is between those who have it in common." The world we live in is "common to all of us and distinguished from our privately owned place in it" (Arendt, 1998:52). This understanding is based on the assumption that people have lived collectively since the era in which men began hunting, and thus the continuity of one's existence can only be realized by his/her togetherness with others.

The terms "public" and "private" were first mentioned during the Hellenistic period of Western history. "Koine" and "Oikos" were two different spaces and strictly separated from each other; polis was public (koine) to all free citizens while oikos was considered to belong to individuals and represent private life and domesticity (Arendt, 1958:24, Habermas, 1991:3). Specifically, public life was centered in the agora for the limited portion of the population who were fortunate enough to be citizens (Carr et al., 1992:52–53; Mumford, 1961:138–139).

Arendt idealised the origins of the public sphere in the ancient Greek polis as "the sphere of freedom" (Arendt, 1998:29–30), but as Martin highlights, without criticising the division of labour in which only young free male Greek citizens were involved in political life in the public space of the agora (Arendt, 1998:160, Mitchell, 2003:51,131). It is basically because for her "the space of appearance is potentially ubiquitous" (Martin, 2013:43). She considered not only the agora but the whole polis as public space; to be public was a matter of human capacity for political action so it was here and there, it was everywhere. It was up in the air to be actualised at any moment, so to speak.

In parallel to Arendt, Habermas also provided a framework about the term "public sphere," tracing its history. According to Habermas, "a portion of the public sphere is composed in every conversation performed by private individuals who assemble to form a public body" which "mediates between society and state" (Habermas, 1974:49–50). However, his main interest was to question and criticise the transformation of the institutional character of the public sphere beginning from 18th century in Western society, which he called "Bourgeois Public Sphere" (Habermas, 1991–1974).

In the middle ages, although the distinction between the terms public and private had always been familiar dating back to the terms' origins back in the ancient period, there was not a common understanding of their usage. During the period when the feudal mode of production based on manorial authority was dominant, it did not make a distinction between public and private in the sense that the ancient period did. Social labour was dominated and power was centered in the hands of lords and church. However, as Habermas indicates, the position of lords and church within the process of production was not that private in comparison to ancient times. That is because (1) there was no status defined by private law for ordinary people to be included in the public sphere and (2) in the feudal mode of production that fully developed in the high middle ages, there was not a private landed property model for the peasants. Yet, increasing political tension through the middle ages brought private ownership as a shift from feudalism to capitalism gradually took place (Habermas, 1991:5).

In comparison with the ancient period, the distinction between private and public was blurred, forming an indivisible unity created by the same authority during the feudal mode of production. In this sense, we see that authority was neither public nor private; it was both. However, things that represent authority were public, as the act of representation occurred only in public. Habermas defines this evolution of publicity as "Representative Publicness" and the feudal powers, the lord, the church, the prince and the nobility as the carriers of representative publicness to the capitalist mode of production (Habermas, 1991:6–7). The emergence of "Representative Publicness" during the middle ages was followed by its consolidation during the Renaissance, and it was crowned by the Baroque festivity. Beginning from the 15th century, humanism led to the change of the palace lifestyle through the tutors who taught the princes and this humanist-educated royal type took the place of domination (Habermas, 1991: 8–9).

People as ordinary human beings, namely labourers, were considered to be in a passive position; they were just listeners and watchers. They were expected as a respectful audience at manorial and religious ceremonies, which are considered to be examples of representative publicness. Representations of sovereignty and power were not acts made in the name of people; they were, rather, acts made in the presence of people. In other words, what were represented was not the people; it was power itself that was represented.

These two studies of Arendt and Habermas were followed by "The Fall of Public Man" by Sennett (sociologist) in 1977 in which Sennett revealed how at the end of the 17th century the dichotomy of public and private had many shades, similar to the way the terms are used today: "public meant open to the scrutiny of anyone, whereas private meant a sheltered region of life defined by one's family and friends" (Sennett, 2002: 16). In parallel to Habermas, Sennett expresses that the use of the word public has changed; now meaning "a special region of sociability." In the middle of the 17th century, in France, "le public" referred to "the audience for plays"; this "theatrical public" was composed of an elite group which was still very small in number then (Sennett, 2002:16–17).

Along with the Baroque festivities that arose after the Counter (Catholic) Reformation, there was also a change in palace life. All the elements of the representative publicness continued to exist, and remained concentrated in the life of the courts of kings and princes; the general public remained outside of this life except as spectators. It was detached from the outside world but it required the presence of people to be seen and heard; thus, there were monumental and grandiose church squares and royal palaces with sophisticated courts and gardens. The idea of openness and dominance of the Baroque concept of spatial organization, as in the examples of Versaille, Piazza di San Pietro or Place Louis XV (Place de la Concorde), was intentional in that it created its own interface where civil individuals and aristocrats crossed each other's paths but never integrated. Representative publicness consolidated in church squares and courts of royal palaces that functioned as "show-off and display spaces" with their overwhelming scale.

The period between the end of the 17th and the mid of 18th century was also the Age of Enlightenment; applying the scientific methods to their studies, philosophes criticised the existing situation of societies and developed new ideas of religious, cultural and economic freedom, representative institutions, and legal equality (Mason, 2015: 429–552; Merriman, 2009a). What happened during this period is that groups of people came together opposing the policies of the governments in power; that did not happen and end in a day; it was an accumulation of increasing social and political tension through history that we may say still continues to accumulate.

Out of these accumulated tensions with the ambitions of rising bourgeoisie for political power and positions of honour together with the inhuman conditions of the peasants came the rise of a new phenomenon, "creating the public opinion" or "making the public realm" that Arendt and Habermas emphasize (Habermas, 1991:25, Mason, 2015:563).

The whole system of feudalism and colonialism was seriously challanged at the end of the 18th century, first by the US Declaration of Independence in 1776 and then by the French Revolution and the Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1789; the whole socio-economic system of the Western world has changed over time. A revolutionary wave of political upheavals happened especially throughout Europe in 1848 that was known as the "People's Spring" or "Spring of Nations"; both the domestic and the international system was seriously challenged during this period. Many historians even call the period between 1776 and 1848 "The Age of Revolution" (Hobsbwan, 1992).

Habermas indicates two important developments during this period that contributed to the formation of the public sphere, and so of public opinion, which is critically the spatialization of the bourgeois public sphere and the emergence of the literary public sphere. First, by the end of the 17th century, there were coffee houses in Great Britain and salons in France as the new institutions and centers of literary and also political criticsm where aristocratic society and bourgeois intellectuals were engaged (Habermas, 1991:32). Second, the rise of the traffic in news enabled them to become public by means of the development of regular press, political newspapers and journals appeared by the end of the 17th century (Habermas, 1991:16–20).

In this period, we see the power of the act of writing and the press in the creation of a critical public opinion, however, parallel to its power we also see extensive censorship on these political newspapers and journals (Habermas, 1991:67, Merriman, 2009b). Beyond the rise of literary publicness, we should consider here that "ordinary people" saw and heard the displays of both the church and the palace; thus we may mention the accumulative contribution of "seeing and hearing" to the need of "to be seen and heard" to be risen.

This conjuncture has been discussed as first the rise and then the fall of the public sphere beginning from the 18th century on. According to Sennett, the rise was embedded in the formation of the 18th century cities of "becoming a world in which widely diverse groups in society were coming into contact". As he states, despite all of the "exceptions, deviations, and alternative modes" present in any period, a sort of consensus and a coherent culture could be constituted out of the tension between the claims of public and private spheres in this connection. However, this balance between what public and private were about to change in favour of what is private under the rise of national industrial capitalism in the 19th and 20th centuries (Sennett, 2002: 17–19).

This period was characterised by the invasion of privileged private interests into the realm of politics and so the public sphere in the long run, beginning in the 19th century. Habermas defined this proccess as a kind of "refeudalization" of societies and the "downfall of the public sphere." The distinction between "public" and "private" could no longer be applied due to (1) the transfer of conflicts of private interests onto the political level and adoption of these interests by the state authorities and also due to (2) the transfer of public functions to private corporate bodies (Habermas, 1991:141–143).

What is remarkable for us is that Sennett also contributed to this discussion on spatiality and urban planning by defining "dead and alive public spaces." He criticised how instrumental urban planning and architecture create dead public spaces of capitalism which are not even open for all technically; they are places to only pass by or watch rather than places accommodating assembly and representation (Sennett, 2002: 12–14). Moreover, Sennett also mentioned how the urban patterns of Western cities and habits of the labour class on using public spaces have changed in favour of leisure rather than politics (Sennett, 2002: 17–18).

As a sociologist, Sennett offered an analysis of the general evolution of the "public man" on both individual and massive scales. In the capitalist mode of production, he claimed, the absence of belief in publicness is based on (1) the consequence of the masses being merely an audience for hundreds of years and so losing self-faith, the ability of judgement and self- representation, (2) the condition of denial as the act of trying to ensure self-protection by refusing to accept the truth; the self is bounded by restrictions. The condition of denial is taking the easy way out because "active expression requires human effort," and it will require even more than that, since "the problems become more intractable as long as they are not being confronted." In fact, the actual absence is to be shielded by silence or to stop feeling or not to show them; in brief, the conditions of individualisation, impersonality, alienation, and apathy form the actual absence (Sennett, 2002: 259–262).

In terms of the evolution of the public sphere, a significant advancement of the 20th century has been the accelerating development and increasing worldwide use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in everyday life (Huurdeman, 2003: 580–583, 604–605). Although the public sphere was assumed to be a realm that was defined at the domestic/local level, booming ICTs brought up the question of the possibility of the phenomenon of a worldwide public sphere (Habermas, 1996: 360, 514). Today, the reality of worldwide mass objections or celebrations and the effect of instant communication tools on creating public opinion cannot be ignored. Perspectives on the existence of a worldwide virtual public sphere, in general, can be framed as either part of a pessimistic or enthusiastic and optimistic approach to them.

Discussions that arose from the optimistic approaches consider ICTs as the tools for the worldwide concretization of the public sphere. These approaches argue that: (1) ICTs offer the possibility of large numbers of people participating on any issues that are under discussion, since participants are not categorized in terms of age, status, class, gender, etc.; (2) ICTs provide people with instant access to information anywhere in real-time resulting in the convenience of expanding knowledge to anyone with a smartphone or computer and an internet connection. From this optimistic point of view, the virtual public sphere also (3) is considered to be a democratic one, based on the arguments that say it is universal, anti- hierarchical, unforced, unrestricted by any agenda or any institutional structure or process and it works by the will of anyone (Buchstein, 1997; Loader & Marcea, 2011).

Conversely, pessimistic approaches emphasise that (1) today individuals have become the consumers of information and the internet became an area where people are bombarded with irrelevant or unnecessary information that causes waste of time and loss of personal effectiveness. In the long run, this consumption also results in the banalization of information and normalisation of traumatic social conditions. Another issue under discussion is based on anonymity: (2) the possibility of social media accounts being fake or automated by robots may cause the condition of disinformation or manipulation and a sort of illusion of reality, and accordingly, a feeling of insecurity, unreliability and loss of referentiality. Furthermore, (3) the pessimistic perspective emphasises that virtual interactions may substitute for face-to- face communications; the passive conditions of individuals in front of a computer, television or smartphone screen have been discussed as a threat in experiencing the real atmosphere of being included in something and by not making an effort at inclusion may also promote a kind of "denial," as Sennett underlined. Here, we think the reality of being alone and having a sort of feeling of being a part of something at the same time is inherently contradictory and it is not conceivable that they can be compatible. Last but not least, the assumption that information is now available for anybody fails because the tools for accessing that information are not widely available for free, so this "anybody" usually has to pay to be included in this virtual sphere and obviously this is not equally affordable for the entire world (Brook & Boal, 1995; Dean, 2003). Finally, we note that internet censorship and surveillance together with broadcast bans imposed and generated by governments are actually the evidence of the existence of a virtual worldwide public sphere and its contribution in creating public opinion.

Here, we arrive at two important outcomes of the historical evolution of the terms publicness and public sphere, which are described as "Procedural Approaches" by Iveson (2007). A procedural understanding of publicness (1) indicates the ability of political representation and action to exist without being reduced to a specific type of physical setting (Iveson, 2007:10). Also, (2) although this approach does not underestimate the conventional existence of public spaces, they still draw attention that the matter of being public, to be included in the public sphere and public space as an act of discursive interaction which is nothing but a struggle timelessly (Mitchell, 1995: 117).

On the other hand, as Fraser (1990) and Iveson (1998, 2007) indicate, the most important weakness of Habermasian understanding of the public sphere is embedded in the key words of "inclusion" and "struggle". Despite legalization of free speech, press and assembly for everyone, the liberal public sphere was open to everyone only in principle (Iveson, 1998:26); in reality, society is polarized by class struggles so the public is fragmented into a mass of competing interest groups (Fraser, 1990: 59). In other words, out of the potential of creating "public opinion" to mediate between society and state, different "publics" were constituted in the liberal mode of production.

Fraser's (1990:62–63) discussion of the Habermasian public sphere is based on the critique of (1) the ignorance of social differences and assumption of social equality, (2) the preference of a single and comprehensive public sphere over "multi publics." Departing from this point of view, Fraser (1990:67) reveals the terms "dominant publics" and "counter publics." In defining "counter publics" she refers to the counter-discourses expressed by the members of subordinated social groups as an opposition, a reaction to exclusions within dominant publics based on their differentiating "identities, interests and needs". From this discussion it appears that relations between multi-publics, which are actually struggles between dominant and counter publics, produce and re-produce the public sphere itself. In other words, as it is summarized in Kluge's famous words (1993:ix), "the public sphere is the site where struggles are decided by other means than war."

Actually, before Fraser, in "Public Sphere and Experience: Toward an Analysis of the Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere," which was originally published in 1972 in German and translated to English in 1993, Negt and Kluge offered the concept of the "Proletarian Public Sphere" as a form of counter-public against the "Bourgeois Public Sphere" and discussed the dialectic between them.

It is parallel to the Marxist discourse, as Marx indicates that class struggles of former periods of history were simplified in the capitalist mode of production, mainly divided into two opposing classes: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat (Tucker, Marx, Engels, 1978: 481). Defining this process as the involvement of the proletarians in the political arena, Merriman also defines this period as the politicization of the common –ordinary– man (Merriman, 2009b).

There are many aspects of the complicated structure of the notion of public sphere to be discussed, obviously. However, first it is important to understand that the public sphere itself is chaotic, dynamic, multi-dimensional and produced and reproduced by struggles among different publics. In this point, we agree that Iveson was right to complain that procedural approaches fail to reveal the spatiality of publicness; if different publics find their "proper location almost any time and anywhere" then what would public spaces possibly mean in an urban setting? (Iveson, 2007:11). We comment further that it is also contradictory that since making an appearance in this world (in the sense of being public) always requires the presence of others (Arendt, 1998:49–50), then this indicates not a bedroom with an internet connected TV but rather a gathering place that we conventionally call "public space." Because, in such a bedroom one might be a part of public but it would be in a passive voice since there are two sides of "publicness" as "to be addressed and/or to address". Hence, our concern within this discussion is with (1) the spatial dimension of this complicated structure regarding the existence and affordances of public space and (2) its reflection in spatial sciences literature. Briefly, here we pose our question as "how the domain of spatial sciences (urban planning, architecture, geography) deals with the physical reflections, requirements and affordances of this complex structure of production of the public sphere and/or how it affects the social production of space in turn?"

2. In the ordinal scale (public space)

Following this evolving discussion on the public sphere from the domain of political theory beginning from the late 1950s, increasing numbers of studies dealing with geography, urban planning and architecture have focused on the issue of spatial requirements and desirable features of ideal public spaces since the 1970s.

To have a general understanding of the period, we should remember that economic recovery and reorganization was sustained in most conturies after the end of World War II based on Keynesian economics and the development of a welfare (social) state model. However, by the end of the 1960s the system began to break down, suffering from crises of various states; it was no longer working by the mid-1970s on both an international and domestic scale. The reasons in the background of the crisis of welfare state model are the subjects of many studies that have to be discussed. For us, it is significant that by the end of the 1970s a new turn towards neoliberalism emerged, questioning the extent of state intervention to promote investment, production, and employment and controlling inflation. The result was the withdrawal of the states from many areas of social provision; it was the rise of deregulation and privatization (Harvey, 2005).

In the long run, this new socio-economic and political turn reflected itself in urbanisation, which has been driven by the spatial organisation of the brutal capitalist system, especially by means of privatization of urban space. In all these developments, changing typologies and functions of public spaces in an urban pattern and their publicness have become an unavoidable and growing discussion in the domain of spatial sciences.

Here we might mention some sort of influence of the conjuncture after the 1970s which reflects itself in proposed definitions of public space in the spatial studies that Iveson frames as topographical approaches (2007:2–3).
Public spaces are considered as:

- Composed of the presence of other people, activities, events, inspiration, and stimulation (Gehl, 1987:15),
- a common ground for people to perform functional and/or ritual activities either as a part of daily routine or periodic festivities (Carr et al., 1992:xi),
- places that belong to a community not developers/investors or police and traffic wardens (Tibbalds, 1992:14).

There are many similar definitions referring different terms such as urban open spaces, urban public space etc. Yet, there has been a consensus on the general characteristics of a given public space summarized also very recently by UN-Habitat as "all places publicly owned or of public use, accessible and enjoyable by all for free and without profit motive including streets, open spaces and public facilities" (UN-Habitat, 2016:6).

Departing from this point of view, the main components/dimensions of public spaces have been described by many studies again sharing similarities as well.

Considering "the rights in public space" within the contradictory relationship between "freedom and control of the space," Lynch presented five dimensions of "spatial rights": "presence, use and action, appropriation, modification and disposition" (Lynch, 1981). In addition, to determine the essential components of public space, these dimensions have been redefined and renamed by Carr et al., after Lynch as: "access, freedom of action, claim, change, and ownership and disposition" (Carr et al., 1992:137). Furthermore, emphasizing human needs in public spaces, Carr et al. also defined five reasons and so the indicators "comfort, relaxation, passive and active engagement, and discovery" to assess the "success of public spaces" (Carr et al., 1992:90–92).

Benn and Gaus determined "access (dividing into four subdimensions as physical access to spaces, activities and intercourse, information and resources), agency and interest" as three dimensions of "publicness and privateness" (Benn & Gaus, 1983:7–11).

Referring to a broader urban context, Jacobs and Appleyard proposed a number of goals of public spaces as: livability, identity and control, access to opportunity, imagination and joy, authenticity and meaning, open communities and public life, self-reliance, and justice to create a "good urban environment" (Jacobs & Appleyard, 1987:115–116).

Similar to this broader context, offering "a cocktail of elements to produce good places," Montgomery has discussed three main "qualities of successful urban places": "activity, image and form" (Montgomery, 1998).

Evaluating thousands of public spaces around the world, PPS (The Project for Public Spaces) has offered four key attributes "in judging any place as good or bad": "access and linkages, uses and activities, comfort and image, and sociability" (PPS, 2000; https://www.pps.org/reference/grplacefeat/).

Gehl has defined twelve key quality criteria under three main components to create a "100% place" (a place that provides human comfort and pleasure) as "protection, comfort, and enjoyment" (Gehl, 2002:11).

Following these attempts to define an ideal public space and desirable features of it, methodological studies have been conducted to measure and assess the degree of publicness of any given space, including the "Three Axes Model" (Nemeth & Schmidt, 2007–2011), the "Star Model" (Varna, 2011), and the "OMAI Model" (Van Melik and Langstraat, 2013). Each of these models serves as a tool for analyzing the degree of privatization of public space in comparison to others.

Nemeth and Schmidt (2011) evaluated publicness in terms of three dimensions: ownership, management, and uses/users, and questioned whether a space is "more public" or "more private" based on these dimensions.

Varna (2011) also described five meta themes of publicness as "ownership," "physical configuration," "animation," "control" and "civility". In this model, each of the five dimensions ranges from 1 (the least public) to 5 (the most public) along an ordinal scale, except the control dimension; less controlled human activity is more public.

Following these studies, Van Melik and Langstraat (2013) proposed four dimensions of publicness: ownership, management, accessibility and inclusiveness (OMAI). Each of the dimensions is measured on a four-point ordinal scale that ranges from 1 (fully private) to 4 (fully public).

Briefly, in the answers to the questions of "what makes a place successful?", "how to measure the quality of space?" or "how to define a great place?" there has been a search for an ideal public space and the definitions of desirable features of it. The main reason why there has been a growing search to define what is "more / less / least / most / fully public and etc." is the argument that public space is under threat from the modern urban life that is characterized by the capitalist mode of production, consumerism, privatization, restrictive regulations on public space, controlling and militarizing public space through security measures, police force and/or high tech security camera systems, social exclusion from public space and related politics.

Sorkin (1992: xiii-xv) indicates that in modern cities and their public spaces these threats are (1) similarization and generic applications on space, (2) technologcial and physcial surveillance for the purpose of security and (3) thematisation of space to create a sort of simulation of any desired and commercially tradable images by means of architecture and urban design.

Shopping malls and theme parks have been especially discussed as the new generation and privatized examples of public spaces that differ from traditional ones in regards both to their ownership and their operation. Since these privatized settings have been tailored for the benefit of private interests rather than the overall public, they have been considered and designed not for all but for a specific targeted user profile.

As Loukaitou-Sideris says (1988:201–203; 1993) "these new privatized spaces are not that equally open and accessible to everyone" and "they are exclusive and segregative spaces".

Today, says Mitchell, production of public space centers on the appetite for "security rather than interaction" and for "entertainment rather than politics" more than ever (Mitchell, 1995:119). On the other hand, considering the future of public spaces, Banerjee (2001:19–20) admits that "increasingly public life is flourishing in private places," and his emphasis here on the argument that there are also small businesses within these private places alongside chain stores, malls, theme parks etc. such as "coffee shops, bookstores and other such third places" which should be supported to improve both the local economy and public life together. In other words, he prioritise the possibility of social interaction over the issue of ownership.

From a larger perspective Madanipour (2003, 2005:11–14) also discuss the change of public spaces, relating it to the general transformation of post-industrial cities. He also argued that there is more than one challenge to the traditional importance of public spaces; "their political role limited to the periods of crisis and their social role to providing leisure". However, "the most significant challenge to public space is, rather, economic," since "private investment in public space tends to limit the access to control the space to lower the use and maintenance costs" which results as "social-segregation, functional fragmentation and loss of meaningful usage," in turn.

Briefly, from the perspective of spatial sciences, there has been a general consensus on the admission of what Sennett called "dead public spaces," as many public spaces still seem to be "intentionally designed to be looked at but not touched today; they are neat, clean and empty, as if to say, no people, no problem!" (Madden, 2001:20). In other words, as Iveson (2007:3) notes, there has been a growing concern that contemporary "public spaces are becoming more exclusionary and hence less accessible to those who make a connection between public- making and public space and seek to put public space to work in circulating ideas and claims to others." The combination of discussions that have arisen out of the domain of political theory and spatial reflections on neoliberal urbanisation conditions after the 1970s formed a very just and common concern in all the different areas of the still expanding spatial sciences literature to search for "how or to what degree public spaces contribute spatially to the production (and re-production) of the public sphere and to which extent they are public?"

Here we might rephrase our research question (in Section 1) as: what are the weaknesses of the attempts from the domain of spatial sciences in dealing with the complex structure of production of the public sphere? On this point, we will expand two shared major problematics of topographical approaches in conceptualizing public space offered by Iveson (2007:5–8) regarding the discussion on public sphere revealed (in Section 1).

Iveson characterises the first problematic aspect of topographical approaches as "arguments for a better public space are articulated through narratives of loss and reclamation" and the condition of loss and reclamation is a relative one that differs from side to side; in his words, "the villains and the heroes change depending on who is telling the story" (Iveson, 2007:5). What Iveson emphasises here is that one of the weaknesses of these approaches is that they are designed to define and classify publicness with a limited focus on physical and operational features only. Defining publicness is more than assigning a label to a space as public or private, or checking if a space meets some criteria (Kohn, 2004:10). Indeed, publicness, although we have been told that we lost it in neoliberal urbanism, has always been a matter of struggles and so public spaces have always been exclusionary places for some publics in history.

Having this concern, Madanipour (2010:237) also puts that the claims of different publics over space contest the others, and the struggle between them causes a simultaneous process of inclusion and exclusion, and this is why he asks "Whose public space?" Standing on this very spot, Robbins (1993:viii) also poses a fair question: "for whom was the city once more public than now; for workers, women, lesbians and gay men, in other words, for the differences, minorities and the poor?"

The result of this narrative loss has been "a degree of false romanticization of historic public spaces" (Madanipour, 2010:7) which becomes "a phantom[1], never actually realized in history but haunting our frameworks for understanding the present" (Iveson, 2007:6).

A second major problem of topographical approaches is the simplification of the relationship between publicness and physical space; in other words, it is the reduction of production of the public sphere to just physical visibility in spaces that conventionally considered as public like streets, squares etc. However, "appearance (in the sense that Arendt uses it) is not reducible to visibility" as it has been considered in these approaches (Iveson, 2007:11). This critique emphasises that there are also other forms of making-publics and besides one could be a part of multi-publics in a place that is called "private" through varying communication tools, and this also brings us to the discussion on the "ownership" as another

[1] Kurt Iveson (2007) used the term "Phantom" after Walter Lippmann (1925) and Bruce Robbins (1993).

key feature adopted in these approaches. That is to say, just because one appears in public does not always mean they are “a part of public”, high degree of physical accessibility of any place also does not necessarily make it “public”.

Briefly, topographical approaches fail to see that (1) public spaces have never been open to everyone at all in the sense of providing a welcoming atmosphere democratically for all different publics and so (2) although it is crucial and has been seen as the key feature of a public space, physical accessibility of a place alone does not make it “public” for all.

Although these two main problematics are profoundly valuable to see how complicated and difficult it is to do justice to the comparison of the notions “public sphere” and “public space”; we should not overlook the preference of anyone to be in public space in any sense, because as we see in history “making-public” is not a matter of moment in time, it is rather a cumulative process. In fact, our passive acts in our daily routine like just encounters with passers-by might contribute our awareness of the outside world and hence making publics, just as our active acts contribute to being a part of the public like joining a public rally or a discussion, etc.

Consequently, two important outcomes of this discussion on topographical approaches to public spaces are that (1) they fail to catch the complex and dynamic structure of publicness, they rather simplify it to some measurable criteria or lines on a map, and (2) they do not face the reality of the timeless struggle between publics and so the exclusionary nature of “public” spaces historically, they rather assume fictitious societies composed of equals in a fully democratic world.

Conclusion

Above, we have investigated the terms “public sphere” and “public space” from the insights of both social and spatial sciences. Out of this investigation, it appears that procedural approaches reveal a “public sphere” which is not reduced to a type of physical setting; they rather draw attention on the condition of being included into collective action and debate on common issues and interests.

In such an understanding there is no distinction between public and private spaces in the conventional sense; as it is a matter of to see/be seen and to hear/be heard. Any place considered as “private” that contains some kind of communication tools like a computer, a mobile phone, etc. or any place which enables a group of people to be engaged in exchanging ideas may operate as “public”.

This collocation (1) enables the complex and dynamic structure of “publicness” and also the concepts of literary and/or virtual public spheres to be operated; (2) it legitimizes the discussions on quasi-public, fully public etc. However, procedural approaches fail to discuss the spatialisation of publicness (1) by making the significance of conventional public space in an urban pattern questionable, (2) by risking the active voice of being a part of public and (3) ignoring the spatial dimension of the conflicts between dominant and counter publics.

Although the claim that the world in which we exist is common to all of us might be justified from many perspectives (e.g., global warming affects all of us), in this specific context, it is a naive approach to the reality of the present day in which the private property described by the law and especially the reality that private capital occupies the physical space which belongs to everyone a little more each day.

As Iveson (2007) also points out, the idea of accepting any place in an urban setting as having the potential to make publics requires the assumption that any place, whether they are squares or screens, is equally available any time for anyone for those who wish to be seen and heard politically (Iveson, 2007:12–13).

As the assumption of social equality repeats itself in the discussions of “public space,” it appears as a common failure of both procedural and topographical approaches. Indeed, from ancient times to today, it is practically impossible to identify examples of an unrestricted, unobstructed or uncensored publicness; spatially, literarily and even virtually.

In conditions of social inequality, involvement in the public sphere and so the public space has always been a matter of struggle. That is to say, in the existence of produced biological, sociological, economic etc. identities and ideological differences –multi-publics– a fully democratic world in which all the differences make their own representation in equal conditions has never been realized.

The powerful and/or the privileged publics that dominate the public sphere both in individual and mass scales spatialise their representation – just like animals marking their territories by emitting odors – as an instinctual or learned act assuming that “whatever belongs to everyone belongs to no one.”

This is exactly where the topographical approaches fail to address the complex and dynamic and inherently political structure of “publicness” and its spatialisation. Sudjic (2011:12–14) points out that as professionals and users, we tend to interpret architecture and planning in terms of its technical and structural qualities, considering the space as the material product of a construction process; in other words, we are more concerned with how the space existed rather than why in fact. In reality, the execution of actual production of space has always been under the initiative of representatives of the powerful rather than professionals. Every political and governmental system has produced its own representational space to mark a symbolic point by means of architecture and planning regardless of time and geography. The ambition of unsatisfied egos to leave a trace in the material world and to glorify their power becomes an addiction to build larger and higher which is called "The Edifice Complex." Since this addiction requires the "appearance" then it should be "public" and here the primitive formula is; the more spacious and the higher you build the more visible it becomes. This is the reality that occupies "public space" of every age both physically and psychologically and it neither invites nor welcomes "everyone" indeed.

For what is behind this exclusion, it is extremely important to note and be aware of, is that (whatever constitute the dominant; here church and palace or bourgeoisie and aristocracy, there a dictator or capital) there has been a sort of love and hatred relation between dominant publics and public spaces. In other words, power loved to show itself physically on and at conventional public spaces; however, public spaces full of critical publics arouse hatred in turn, because, as history has witnessed, mass objections might threaten the powerful revolutionarily.

Yet, it is remarkable here to see that no matter what the physical conditions and affordances of public spaces are, the public sphere continues to evolve and publics are still to be created especially by means of literary and virtual communication tools. As an example, the consideration of the aforementioned Baroque concept of spatial organisation in the 18^{th} century together with the political upheavals of the period that they staged reflects the way that any given "public space" might be more complicated than it has been intended to do so.

This is because neither publics nor their spaces have been immune to change over time; dominant publics of one kind or another are born out of the struggles among multi-publics and create other counter publics, but what remains is that they oppress, mark and shape the "public" space to enable their physical appearances (visibility), determining the requirements and affordances of that space. This is mainly the process of the social and actual (re)production of both public sphere and public space.

As topographical approaches reduce "appearance" to "visibility" through their emphasis on the features of "accessibility" and "ownership," they fail to overlap with the discussions that arise out of social sciences (1) by simplifying complex structure of "publicness" to lines, colours and numbers, (2) ignoring that "appearance" requires the presence (access) of other publics but it does not necessarily makes a place "public" and in this sense (3) by assuming a fully democratic world composed of equals.

As professionals in the spatial sciences we are more comfortable in defining public spaces by just claiming that they are open, accessible and enjoyable by all for free. From our privileged position it may seem that way, but the truth is, they are not. Although the attempts to define the spatial requirements and desirable features of public spaces are valuable to the extent that they open different parameters to discussion, and the methods to measure the degree of publicness are also valuable in indicating that public spaces are not that public after all, we are still left with the question of how to achieve a public space that is democratically available to all.

Is this question a self-destructive one or is it possible that a truly democratic public space can be realized? To answer this question first we should admit that "democracy itself is never a condition but a struggle" (Lefebvre, 2009:135). In the end, Madanipour (2010:242) also answers his question of "Whose Public Space?" on the basis of the importance of social production of public spaces that "embody the principles of equality through democratic and inclusive processes".

From this perspective, we are reminded of Kluge's words (1993:ix): "the public sphere is the site where struggles are decided by other means than war." We offer three absolute conditions at their most basic level that are necessary to achieve "public spaces" as we have discussed and idealised in papers and lectures: (1) internalisation of "the principle of non-violence" both physically and psychologically, which is difficult to be measured in a ordinal scale and coloured on a map, (2) being aware that (as professionals and users) we are also a part of this continuous struggle among multi-publics, and (3) challenge ourselves constantly to better decode, design and defend public spaces more effectively.

Acknowledgement

This study was developed as a part of Meriç Demir Kahraman's Ph.D. thesis in Istanbul Technical Univesity.

REFERENCES

Arendt, H. (1998) [1958]. The Human Condition. London: The University of Chicago Press.

Banerjee, T. (2001). The Future of Public Space: Beyond Invented Streets and Reinvented Places. Journal of the American Planning Association, 67 (1),9–24.

Benn, S., Gaus, G. (1983). Public and Private in Social Life. London: Croom Helm.

Brook, J., Boal, A. J. (1995). Resisting the Virtual Life: The Culture and Politics of Information. San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Brown, W. (2015). Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution. New York: Zone Books.

Buchstein, H. (1997). Bytes that Bite: The Internet and Deliberative Democracy. Constellations, 4(2), 248-263.

Carr, S., Francis, M., Rivlin, L. G., Stone, A. M. (1992). Public Space. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. Social Text, 25/26, 56-80.

Gehl, J. (1987). Life between Buildings: Using Public Spaces. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Gehl, J., Søholt, H. (2002). Public Spaces and Public Life: City of Adelaide. Adelaide, (S. Aust): Planning SA.

Habermas, J. (1974) [1964]. The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article (1964). New German Critique, 3, 49-55.

Habermas, J. (1991) [1962]. The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society. Cambridge and Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1996). Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). A Brief History of Neoliberalism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hiberseimer, L. (1955). The Nature of Cities. Chicago: Paul Theobold.

Hobsbwan, E. (1992). The Age of Revloution: Europe 1789-1848, London: Abacus Book.

Huurdeman, A. A. (2003). The Worldwide History of Telecommunications. New Jersey: Wiley Interscience.

Iveson, K. (1998). Putting the public back into public space. Urban Policy and Research, 16 (1), 21-33.

Iveson, K. (2007). Publics and the City. Wiley: Kindle Edition.

Jacobs, J., Appleyard, D. (1987). Towards an urban design manifesto: A 1987 prologue. Journal of the American Planning Association, 53(1), 112-120.

Kohn, M. (2004). Brave New Neighbourhoods: The Privatization of Public Spaces. London: Routledge.

Lefebvre, H. (1991) [1974]. The Production of Space. D. Nicholson-Smith (Trans). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Lefebvre, H. (2009) Comments on a New State Form (1966). in State, Space, World: Selected Essays. Neil Brenner and Stuart Elden (Eds.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lippmann, W. (1925). The Phantom Public: A Sequel to "Public opinion". New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Loader, B. D., Mercea, D. (2011). Networking democracy? Social Media Innovations in Participatory Politics. Information, Communication and Society, 14(6), 757-769.

Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (1988). Private Production of Public Open Space: The Downtown Los Angeles Experience. PhD Diss., University of Southern California.

Loukaitou-Sideris, A. (1993). Privatisation of Public Open Space: The Los Angeles Experience. Town Planning Review, 64 (2), 139–167.

Lynch, K. (1981). A Theory of Good City Form. Cambridge: MIT Press. Madanipour, A. (2003). Public and Private Spaces of the City. London: Routledge.

Madanipour, A. (2005). Public Spaces of European Cities. Nordic Journal of Architectural Research, 18 (1), 7-16.

Madanipour, A. (2010). Whose public space?: International Case Studies in Urban Design and Development. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, Taylor and Francis.

Madden, K. (2001). How to Turn a Place Around: A Handbook for Creating Successful Public Spaces. A. Schwartez (Ed.). New York: Project for Public Spaces Inc.

Martin, R. (2013). Public and Common(s). Places Journal, Retrieved from https://placesjournal.org/article/public-and-commons/

Mason, D. S. A. (2015). Concise History of Modern Europe: Liberty, Equality, Solidarity. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers: Kindle Edition.

Merriman, J. (2009a). European Civilization (1648-1945) Lectures: The Enlightenment and the Public Sphere. Retrieved from http://oyc.yale.edu/history/hist-202/lecture-5

Merriman, J. (2009b). European Civilization (1648-1945) Lectures: Why No Revolution in 1848 in Britain. Retrieved from http://oyc.yale.edu/history/hist-202/lecture-11

Mitchell, D. (1995). The End of Public Space? People's Park, Definitions of the Public, and Democracy. Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 85(1), 108–133.

Mitchell, D. (2003). The Right to the City: Social Justice and the Fight for Public Space. New York: The Guilford Press.

Montgomery, J. (1998). Making a City: Urbanity, Vitality and Urban Design. Journal of Urban Design, 3(1), 93-116.

Mumford, L. (1961). The City in History. New York: Harcourt Brace & World Inc.

Nemeth, J., Schmidt, S. (2007). Toward a Methodology for Measuring the Security of Publicly Accessible Spaces. Journal of the American Planning Association, 73 (3), 283-297.

Negt, O., Kluge, A. (1993). Public Sphere and Experience: Toward an Analysis of the Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Nemeth, J., Schmidt, S. (2011). The Privatization of Public Space: Modelling and Measuring Publicness. Environment and Planning B-Planning & Design. 38(1), 5-23.

Project for Public Spaces. (2000). How to Turn a Place Around: A Handbook for Creating Successful Public Spaces. New York: Project for Public Spaces Inc.

Raaflaub, K. A., Ober, J., Wallace, R. W. (2007). Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Robbins, B. (1993). The Phantom Public Sphere. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sennett, R. (1970). The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity and City Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Sennett, R. (2002) [1977]. The Fall of Public Man. London: Penguin.

Sorkin, M. (1992). Variations on a Theme Park: The New American City and the End of Public Space. M. Sorkin (Ed.). New York: Hill and Wang.

Sudjic, D. (2011). The Edifice Complex: The Architecture of Power. Penguin Books: Kindle Edition.

Thompson, A. H. (1954). The Agora at Athens and the Greek Market Place. Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, 13(4), 9-14.

Tibbalds, F. (1992). Making People-Friendly Towns: Improving the Public Environment in Towns and Environment. London: Longman Publishing.

Tucker, R. C., Marx, K., Engels, F. (1978). The Marx-Engels Reader. New York: Norton and Company Inc,

UN-Habitat. (2016). Global Public Space Toolkit: From Global Principles to Local Policies and Practice. Kenya: UN-Habitat.

Van, M. R., Langstraat, F. (2013). Challenging the End of Public Space: A Comparative Analysis of Publicness in British and Dutch Urban Spaces. Journal of Urban Design, 18(3), 429-448.

Varna, G. M. (2011). Assessing the Publicness of Public Places: Towards a New Model. PhD Diss. University of Glasgow.

Varna, G., Tiesdell, S. (2010). Assessing the Publicness of Public Space: The Star Model of Publicness. Journal of Urban Design, 15(4), 575-598.