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Abstract
The Situationist City could not be built. Both its conception and construction required the participation of a post-revolution anarchist population (Sadler, 1999). Yet the Situationists believed that the materiality of such a city could actually foment revolution. Paradox: Utopia. Defying Situationist orthodoxy, the architect Constant modeled New Babylon, an anti-capitalist city prefiguring a playful and participatory unitary urbanism. Suspended above ‘nature’, however, New Babylon was no Ecotopia: It offered no hope of (re)integration. In the wake of the disbanding of the Situationist International and the passing of the revolutionary moment of 1968, a loose collective of ‘othered’ people occupied a former barracks site: In the midst of Copenhagen, ‘Freetown’ Christiania was born. Locked in perpetual struggle with the Danish state, Christiania’s existence has been under constant threat ever since. The community has developed a particular place-based anarchism infused with tensions: non-violent and ‘spiky’, quiescent and revolutionary, ecologically-minded and resource poor. In this paper, I assert that the notion of sustainable urbanism has been recuperated by the society of the spectacle (Debord, 1983). To resurrect the sustainable city (Whitehead, 2011), I propose a turn to situationism and that city’s détournement, looking to Christiania particularly for the threat of a good example.
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Introduction
If a turn to questions of utopian urbanism is to be critical rather than compensatory, and to avoid simply providing consoling figures to revive spirits wearied by contemporary political cynicism, then its disruptive and transgressive qualities need to be emphasized. Such a spirit can return us to the provocative power of the field (Pinder, 2002, p. 239).

To be truly transgressive, rather than lapsing into reactionary fantasy, ecotopias need to emphasise heuristic spaces and processes rather than laying down blueprints, and must be rooted in existing social and economic relations rather than being merely a form of abstraction unrelated to the processes and situations operating in today’s ‘real’ world’ (Pepper, 2005, p. 18).
The Sustainable City is dead. Its obituary has been written (Whitehead, 2011). The Sustainable City leaves behind a utopian paradigm, Sustainable Development, unable to survive without its urban heart. With the passing of sustainable urbanism too, passes a geographic conception of justice with the potential to transcends borders in time, space and materiality (Bullen and Whitehead, 2005). Surely, the Sustainable City should not go gentle into that good night, we must rage against the dying of the light? (Thomas, 1937) So, how to bring the Sustainable City back from the dead? How to make it a space for a participative politics of the common good (Sandel, 2010), a space of justice and of environmental sustainability (Agyeman et al., 2003); but also a space of freedom, difference, dissensus, of irony and fun? (see respectively, for instance, Chatterton, 2006, Mouffe, 2005, Szerszynski, 2007, Merrifield, 2011). Whether to try to resurrect the sustainable city at all – maybe a wholly new ‘paradigm of urban eco-development’ is needed? (contra Whitehead, 2011). Maybe the sustainable city was a notion always already too entangled in power relations of domination, exploitation and subjection? Even as a form of resistance to authority and corporate erosion of its core principles, the sustainable city might be past its sell-by date, theoretically over-ripe?

Capten Cyboli traced a map of his drift through Christiania (see Figure 1) in the beer slops on the table he occupied in Woodstock, the bar that was the feral sociable heart of the Freetown. Legend has it that when Bob Dylan played Den Grå Hal he ordered a fancy cocktail here and was told there was beer. But why was Capten Cyboli here in this enclave of Christiania, surrounded by antipathetic ‘Hopenhagen’, beleaguered by a hostile Danish state? Was this a fitting place for a combatant lately serving in the Clandestine Insurgent Rebel Clown Army against the coercive forces of the same state deployed in the

---

1 As with the Situationist drift or dérive, Cyboli’s studies are focused by an activist political intent, i.e. to radicalize the paradigm of sustainable urbanism. As the main method of Situationist psychogeography, dérive facilitates ‘the study of urban environments in terms of their effects on emotions and behavior’ Pinder, D. (2009) Situationism/Situationist Geography. In Kitchen, R. & Thrift, N. (Eds.) ‘International Encyclopedia of human Geography’. Oxford: Elsevier. p. 147

2 Den Grå Hal (The Grey Hall) is Christiania’s largest music venue; a former military horse-riding arena, it can accommodate some 1,500 concert goers and celebrates Christmas by Christiania serving free food to the poorest people of Copenhagen.

3 It should be explained that this visit of Cyboli to Christiania corresponded with the UN’s COP15 summit meeting taking place in Copenhagen in November 2009. For COP 15 the Siemens and Coca-Cola corporations branded the host city ‘Hopenhagen’ with no hint of irony. ‘In the centre of Copenhagen Siemens set up their faux city, brightly lit in a mendacious green. There they extolled the virtues of a range of unsustainable technologies from super-fast electric sports cars to bio-fuels. Coke posters proclaim the mega-corp’s sugar and exploitation suffused product as ‘Hope in a Bottle!’’ Mason, K. (2010) ‘Finding Hope in No-Hopenhagen’. Peace News, London: January.

4 CIRCA http://www.clownarmy.org/
service of capital\(^5\)? Why was he harbouring in a shadowed corner of this bar nursing his own beer and musing on the death and potential resurrection of the Sustainable City?

Figure 1: Map of Christiania (picture: K. Mason)

You are looking for traces of ecotopia, The Gadfly\(^6\) reminded him, landing on the table and sucking at the beer slops. Apparently, so you tell me in your rare lucid moments, your premise is that utopia, viewed as a radical imagining, must transcend the anthropocentric and be Ecotopia, it must be a vision to work towards for not just humankind but also for a wider nature. Moreover, you assert ‘the city’ is key to not only the habitation of humanity now and in the future but also in being the hub from which a politics that includes care for a wider nature emanates. Thus, the most significant places in Ecotopia will not be eco-villages or rural communes but Ecopolis, the Green city of the future. Ecopolis will be unlike current imaginings of the Sustainable City, though, because that vision is constrained by the logics of capitalism, governance, bureaucracy and scientism: The ecological modernisation thinking employed in official conceptions of the Sustainable City strips it of social justice (see for instance Buttel, 2000, Huber, 1985, Murphy, 2000, Mol and Spaargaren, 2000, Mol et al., 2010, Fisher and Freudenburgh, 2001); it can be neither Green in a meaningful environmental sense nor equitable. To challenge this

---

\(^5\) Capten Cyboli is the author’s secret activist identity, only, being a Clown, the secret is of course public knowledge. Translated into English the name means Captain Talks-Nonsense, an interesting parallel with Thomas More’s narrator in Utopia, Raphael Hythloday, whose name in Greek ‘implies ‘expert in nonsense’


\(^6\) The Gadfly is Cyboli’s evocation of the spirit of Socrates, part of a methodology of self examination and reflection. The Socratic method is dialectical and involves individuals interrogating each other’s arguments to clarify ideas and stimulate critical thought; often exponents will try to trap each other into contradiction.
corruption, I believe ‘recuperation’ is your chosen term (see Debord, 1983), Ecopolis should draw on the impossible logics of the Situationists to confront head-on the oppressive rationality that dominates spatial planning, architecture, and even the choice of building materials. So, you will draw on the situationists’ unitary urbanism and the New Babylon of Constant Nieuwenhuys’s, the Dutch artist turned Situationist architect, to reimagine the sustainable city through its materiality. But, remind me, how exactly does justice figure?

The gap in conceptualisations of the Sustainable City is a space that justice must occupy, Cyboli proposed. By taking a Situationist perspective on Ecopolis I seek to highlight this space and, most importantly, propose how it might be constructed - not in some variety of utopian imaging that is disconnected from reality, but rather constructed in all the here-and-nows of our cities from the everyday practices of citizens who claim the right to be activists and artists, builders and practical jokers; who can construct material question marks in the very fabric of so-called sustainable cities, demanding: ‘Where’s the justice?’ And beginning to answer their own question, beginning to build justice both socially and materially into the fabric of the city. Example? Well, I propose we construct straw-bale housing for the homeless on the doorsteps of city halls; that we build to Passivhaus standards, make it zero carbon and zero waste. Then, let us dare the authorities of the Sustainable City to tear it down, to make people homeless again, to destroy an architecture which contributes to meeting the millenarian challenge of climate change. In search of visions of Ecotopia, I will look to both literary and real world examples of Ecopolis. That’s why I’m drifting through Christiania, feeling it; That’s why I’ll consider urban Camps for Climate Action in the UK, and Brian Haw’s protest outside the Houses of Parliament in London. Space permitting, I would go further: social centres, squats, tent cities, graffiti, subvertising, and actions such as Reclaim the Streets… And, of course, there was the Occupy movement and the Arab Spring, especially Tahrir Square as the focal point of the Egyptian uprising in 2011. I make no spatial distinction between political actions and habitation, citing the coercion of the state as the obstacle preventing their coextension. As Stuart Hodkinson proposes of the struggle for housing alterity:

---

7 The Passivhaus Standard drastically reduces space heating and cooling requirements while maintaining comfortable indoor conditions. See http://www.passivhaus.org.uk
8 As a precedent for such action, a roundhouse (an eco-home of wood frame, cobwood and recycled window walls, straw-insulated turf roof; with solar power and wind turbine for electricity, compost toilet and reed beds for grey water) built without planning permission in Pembrokeshire, Wales, ultimately survived the authorities attempts to remove it through a combination of normative pressure (The Welsh Government is constitutionally committed to Sustainable Development) and supporters putting their bodies on the line when police and bailiffs arrived (http://thatroundhouse.info/)
The long-term aim of such a strategy would be to create a critical mass of diverse strategic and tactical interventions, from blocking privatisation and gentrification, stopping the closure of community facilities, and occupying land to winning seats on the local council. These tactics would force periodic concessions from the state and capital, and help re-energise the housing campaign and keep it going until such point as it reached an as-yet undefined future guided only by principles of the commons’ (Hodkinson, 2010, p. 254).

**Drifting into methodology**

Let us be clear, The Gadfly interrupted, ‘your hypothesis is that the concept and practices of sustainability, most particularly the Sustainable City, are depoliticised by the logics of ecological modernisation, including more recent notions of resilience and adaptive capacity (see for instance Gallopin, 2006). The radical spirit of sustainability, read as a more equitable way of living in the here-and-now, and indeed the there-and-then, has been misappropriated by neo-liberal capitalism: The Sustainable City as a project is being stripped of freedom; it becomes a place without justice or real community, devoid of public space for politics – as well as for play. And you think Situationism can resurrect the Sustainable City via a passionate participation which goes far beyond even Agyeman and Evans’ advocacy of the subsidiarity principle, whereby decisions must be taken as closely as possible to the citizen (Agyeman and Evans, 2004): You believe decision must be taken by the citizen. But hold on, aren’t situationism and sustainability antithetic? Doesn’t unitary urbanism run counter to sustainable urbanism? Could New Babylon really be a sustainable city, your Ecopolis?

Current literature views the Sustainable City principally as a realm of governance, Cyboli said, its spatial planning and architecture is conceived within existing or moderately reformed political and administrative structures (see for instance Evans et al., 2005). If it is to meet the challenge of transforming urban space socially, economically and environmentally, however, I argue that the paradigm of sustainable urbanism must be re-radicalised. Full democratic participation – a normative politics of the common good - is critical to the conception and construction of a just Ecopolis. To analyse the meeting of situationism and sustainability in the city I turn to Lefebvre’s theory of the production of space (Lefebvre, 1991). Lefebvre proceeds from ‘three dialectically interconnected processes of production’ (Schmid, 2008, p. 42):
i. Representations of space (*le conçu*) – rational and scientific abstractions; the space of capital, *conceived* by the likes of planners, architects, geographers and property speculators, ‘finding ‘objective expression’ in monuments, towers, factories, office blocks, and the ‘bureaucratic and political authoritarianism immanent to a repressive space’ (Merrifield, 2002, p. 174).

ii. Representational space or spaces of representation (*le vécu*) – lived spaces, brimming with passion; intuitive, fragmented and dynamic, the everyday spaces of experience and of situations, of imagination, fantasy and transgressive possibility; contingent and creative spaces ‘kept alive and accessible by the arts and literature’ (Shields, 2009, p. 210).

iii. Spatial practices (*le perçu*) - perceived space, accessible to the physical senses, material - ‘spatial practices structure everyday reality and broader social and urban reality, and include routes and networks and patterns of interaction that link places set aside for work, play and leisure’ (Merrifield, 2002, p. 175).

According to Christian Schmid, Cyboli continued after a much needed swig of beer, ‘Lefebvre integrates the categories of city and *space* in a single, comprehensive social theory, enabling the understanding and analysis of spatial processes at different levels’ (Schmid, 2008, p. 27, emphasis in the original). For Lefebvre, space is not passive, not a surface upon which activities are reproduced. Rather, space is itself produced, and as such it is a player in reproducing social life, or indeed producing it differently: The production of space *is* constant, fluid and alive. Participation in the production of space holds emancipatory potential, the chance to disrupt the reproduction of the spectacle of capitalism. Representational spaces are where progressive new ideas about society and the future can be produced, spaces from where, as Andy Merrifield suggests, we might ‘reclaim, for its citizens, the space of our cities’ (Merrifield, 2002, p.181). So, I am particularly interested in the mediation of representational space and representations of space by social practices, explicitly *the potential for practices of citizen architecture and protest to disrupt ‘the plan’ and produce spaces of enhanced possibility*.

**From Utopia to Ecotopia: A critical passage**
Loitering around a burning brazier in the chill evening on Pusher Street⁹, Cyboli scribbled in his notebook (recycled paper with a cover made from old car tyres): Where sustainability meets the situationists in the city the common ground is utopianism. There has been an upsurge of interest in the notion of utopia, particularly urban and transgressive material utopias of the here and now (Miles, 2005, Spannos, 2008, Carlsson, 2008, Coverley, 2010, Carlsson and Manning, 2010). In *Defence of Utopian Urbanism*, David Pinder claims that ‘a loss of utopian perspectives in their entirety has disturbing political and cultural consequences, not the least of which is a narrowing of critical thought and a moving away from the *anticipatory moment of critique*’ (Pinder, 2002, p. 230). He connects this loss with a crippling paralysis in intellectual debate (Jacoby, 1999) and argues against abandoning urban utopian perspectives, advocating instead rethinking their critical potential. Pinder views the utopian impulse as an irrepressible part of the human spirit, linking contemporary suppression of this impulse with the failure of socialism and also the decline of modernist urbanism (following Sandercock, 1998). He draws on the works of David Harvey in particular to assert the potential for creative urban thinking to progressively transform cities and processes of urbanisation, rather than accepting these as dystopian, spaces to be ignored in conceptions of the desirable future, studied only in terms of elitist practice of escape from and within the city in the here and now. Creative urban thinking, Pinder suggests, means asking John Gold’s vital question: ‘What sort of city for what sort of society?’¹⁰

Pinder takes a historical view of utopian urbanisms that have opened up visions of how the city might be otherwise. He cites Kevin Robbins’ view that the crisis of the city and urbanity is associated with both the scale of physical and social problems, ‘including the ways in which inequality, segmentation and alienation have been inscribed in contemporary urban landscapes’ (Pinder, 2002, p. 232). Pinder reviews utopianism in history and in literature, pointing out the authoritarianism with which it can be invested and, therefore, its dystopian manifestations. He claims that a *critical utopian urbanism* can counteract prevailing political pessimism and cynicism via its potentially disruptive and transgressive qualities: utopian urbanism need be neither compensatory nor authoritarian. Pinder suggests the potential of developing ‘modes of critical and transformative urbanism that are open, dynamic and that, far from being compensatory, aim to estrange the taken for granted, to interrupt space and time, and to open

---

⁹ A Christiania thoroughfare “infamous” for the sale of cannabis in many forms – grass, hash, cookies, ready made joints… The pushers enforce a prohibition on photography in Pusher Street while Christiania’s three simple ‘ground rules’ include no hard drugs (alongside no violence, no weapons and no gang colours).

up perspectives on what might be’ (Pinder, 2002, p. 229). Viewing utopian urbanism not as a unifying vision or a singular emancipatory project, Pinder suggests seeking out the possible in the conditions of the present as means of making multiple interventions in space and time.

David Pepper argues that utopianism permeates contemporary environmental discourses both radical and reformist where these terms relate respectively to the supplanting and mitigating capitalism (Pepper, 2005). Pepper considers the ‘transgressiveness’ of the notion of utopia, i.e. its potential in helping towards an ‘ecological society’. Following Callenbach (Callenbach, 1975) he dubs environmental utopianism ‘ecotopianism’, and notes that: ‘There is a remarkable consensus amongst ideologically diverse ecotopian perspectives about what should be in ecotopia, leaving relatively little as provisional and reflexive’ (Pepper, 2005, p. 18). Drawing on A Blueprint for Survival (Goldsmith, 1973), Pepper claims the underlying principles of this consensus are: minimal disruption of ecological processes; maximum conservation of energy and materials; population recruitment (that) must equal and not exceed loss; a social system in which people will accept the first three principles (Pepper, 2005, p. 8).

Following Sargisson (Sargisson, 2000a, Sargisson, 2000b), Pepper argues that constructive utopianism must sharpen our critique of existing society, creating ‘free spaces’ that catalyse social change. Transgressive ecotopianism is defined as a space for questioning the status quo and thinking differently; it outlines no universal blueprint for Utopia. Pepper differentiates between abstract and concrete utopias, the latter transcending the realms of fantasy because it is derived from critical social theory. He considers situationism to be a radical movement with a utopian aspect. Having proposed the underlying principles of ecotopia, Pepper’s critique of written ecotopias highlights a number of potential reactionary traits, including: a lack of scope for coexistence with different beliefs and practices¹¹; a ‘Luddite’ tendency towards ‘future primitivism’, i.e. a retreat to the premodern; a deep-ecology ecocentrism which tends to construct ecotopia as synonymous with a human dystopia wherein humankind perishes while (the rest of) nature thrives; a post-materialism which fails to create space for the contemporary dispossessed and oppressed. For Pepper these traits ‘suggest that ecotopianism lacks a grounding in actual material socio-ecological conditions, and that this limitation detracts from its transgressive potential’ (Pepper, 2005, p. 11). Pepper’s critique of ecological modernisation argues that it is ecotopian in the abstract, non-transgressive sense: ‘the social democratic utopian ideal of

¹¹ I note here ‘Soul City’ the voluntary segregation of the black population in Callenbach’s Ecotopia (1975)
diffusing wealth and power via regulated market economies contradicts capitalism’s dynamic of concentrating wealth and power’ (Pepper, 2005, p. 17). Citing the significant failure of Kyoto in particular, Pepper asserts that the social democratic ideal of global regulation of the environment is not enforceable under capitalism\(^{12}\). For Pepper, ‘social-democratic and ‘third-way’ attempts to realise an environmentally sound, humane, inclusive and egalitarian capitalism are ultimately headed for failure’ (Pepper, 2005, p. 18). Following David Harvey’s notion that socialism needs an ‘optimism of the intellect’ (Harvey, 2000), Pepper proposes that radical environmentalism has a parallel deficit. He acknowledges ‘much common ground’ between some socialist utopianism and radical ecotopianism, distinguishing radical ecotopianism as resonating with postmodern scepticism in its more circumspect approach to science and ‘social perfectibility’. Pepper concludes that idealism and unrealistic assessments of existing socio-economic dynamics limits the transgressive potential of ecotopianism.

**The Sustainable City and sustainable urbanism**

Cyboli left Woodstock having spent an hour with a random Christianite\(^{13}\) regaling him on the merits of the Freetown’s sewage system, apparently dug by early ‘settlements’ in the 1970s and 80s, now utilising reed-bed treatment, and the should-be envy of Copenhagen: Who needed the authorities and their master-plans? Cyboli wondered about the relevance to Christiania of the sustainable urbanism paradigm, and vice versa. Emerging from the 1960s and 1970s, sustainable urbanism could be viewed as a response to both the ecological damage caused by rapid industrialisation and a widespread deterioration in the quality of urban life and environments caused by similarly rapid urbanisation (Whitehead, 2011). Virtually synonymous with the planning paradigms of ‘new urbanism’ and ‘smart growth’, sustainable urbanism is characterised by working *with* existing urban systems and strongly associated with community empowerment (see for instance Giradet, 1999, Giradet, 2004, Whitehead, 2007). Apart from inclusion, some common elements of sustainable urbanism are: spatial planning based on walking rather than automobiles; architecture and building more in harmony with nature (Blassingame, 1998, see also Guy and Moore, 2007, Wines, 2000); a moral commitment to justice, the intra- and intergenerational equity flagged up by the Brundtland Commission (WCED, 1987). Graham Houghton posits five equity principles central to sustainable development and hence sustainable urbanism: ‘intergenerational and intragenerational equity, transfrontier responsibility (so environmental

---

\(^{12}\) A point surely underlined by the cruel farce of COP15 in 2009.

\(^{13}\) Residents of Christiania variously refer to themselves in English as Christianites, Christianians or Christians, ignoring the religious connotation of the latter.
costs are not transferred across boundaries), interspecies equity and procedural equity’ (in Satterthwaite, 1999, p. 10).

Sustainable urbanism views cities not as the root of all ecological and social evils, but necessarily as the key to sustainable development: ‘the form and quality of urban social, economic, and environmental relations will increasingly define the form and quality of human life itself’ (Whitehead, 2009, p. 109). Seeking a win-win-win accommodation between economic development, social justice and environmental protection, sustainable urbanism displays markedly utopian features. Taking responsibility for its economic, social and environmental impacts in space and time, moreover, marks the sustainable city as relational, a part of Ecotopia rather than being an isolated, elitist and so self-contradictory Ecopolis\textsuperscript{14}. Densification and intensification are increasingly viewed as urban virtues with some commentators turning to ‘slums’ such as Dharavi in Mumbai for models of community, localised industry and recycling (Pearce, 2006, McCloud, 2010). Sustainable urbanism is also recognising that cities differ and there are no one-size-fits-all technological solutions (see for instance Whitehead, 2009). For most proponents, though, ‘good governance’ is always at the heart of formulations of sustainable urbanism. Evans et al highlight ‘governing’ as the key concept, however, defining it as the interaction between government and governance as respectively the provinces of local authorities and civil society (Evans et al., 2005).

Writing an obituary for the sustainable city as a provocation, Mark Whitehead argues that the rhetorical commitment of many cities to sustainable development stands in stark contrast to practices geared to economic growth which always outweigh environmental and social considerations (Whitehead, 2011). He cites, Erik Swyngedouw who goes so far as to suggest that sustainable urbanism is exacerbating the ills of unfettered neo-liberal urban development and mitigates radical approaches (Swyngedouw, 2010). To draw on situationist concepts, sustainable urbanism has been subject to recuperation, the sustainable city commodified (Debord, 1983). Considering the pros and cons of moving beyond the paradigm of sustainable urbanism, then, Whitehead proposes that the threat emanates from three doctrines: hyper-liberalism, neo-localism and municipal pragmatism. He studies Mesa in Arizona in terms of hyper-liberalism, finding that ‘the way out of urban recession is one that places economic

\textsuperscript{14} I note here the real and imagined projects of Masdar in the UAE and Dongtan in China respectively (http://www.masdarcity.ae/en/ and http://www.arup.com/ assets/ download/8CFDEE1A-CC3E-EA1A-25FD80B2315B50FD.pdf)
expansion ahead of potential environmental consequences' (Whitehead, 2011). Totnes in Devon is used as an example of neo-localisation with Whitehead concluding that the urbanism of such Transition Town initiatives intrinsically falls short of the utopian ambition of sustainable urbanism: Resilience replaces sustainable development as the master trope of a millenarian movement preparing for the worst, i.e. peak oil and climate change (see also Mason and Whitehead, 2012b). The Meridian Gap in the West Midlands is Whitehead’s example of municipal pragmatism, which manifests in trade-offs between the economic, social and environmental goals of sustainable development, tacitly acknowledging the utopian impossibility of win-win-win.

**Unitary urbanism and New Babylon**

Cyboli headed for the café-bar Månefiskeren to drink coffee and watch the symbolic logging of one of the frequent foot-patrols of posses of police imposed by Danish authorities. Each patrol was heralded with blaring pro-cannabis reggae music, tracks such as Peter Tosh’s *Legalise It*, and chalked up on the exterior scoreboard by diligent staff: ‘We won’t let the bastards grind us down,’ Cyboli was told. If urbanism signals the urban as spatially distinct, then critical urbanism has at its heart a concern with the distinctive ill-effects associated with urbanisation under the logics of capitalist modernity. Environmentalist urbanisms could, then, be expected to focus on the exploitation of not only human urban dwellers but a wider nature within - and for the provisioning of - urban areas. Modernist urbanism substitutes the possibility of transformative ecological space with pseudo nature: measured, managed and manicured tokens of green(ery). Constant Nieuwenhuys, the Dutch artist turned Situationist architect, rejected this modernist idea of the ‘green city’ as elitist, advocating the *conquest* of nature rather than a *faux* unity restricted to designated places such as parks.\(^\text{15}\)

Constant states that ‘The city has produced the masses, only the masses can give shape to the city’ (p. 115): ‘a poetry made by all\(^\text{16}\)’ (Sadler, 1999, p.134). Yet, the lives of the masses were dominated by capitalism so that they were inhibited from giving shape to the city, beyond prosaically reproducing it. If the situationists’ unitary urbanism was to move beyond the abstract into practice, therefore, it had to embrace a paradox, which is seemingly what Constant attempted with his New Babylon project. The initial practice of unitary urbanism had to give shape to a city that would, on one hand, be a creative

---

\(^{15}\) I note that (a) the conquest of nature, as well as being associated with the enlightenment thinking and Francis Bacon, is in terms of material realisation spatially very European. Moreover, Constant’s conception is surely infused with irony as critique.

\(^{16}\) Sadler states this key Situationist refrain was inherited from the 19\(^\text{th}\) Century French writer Isidore Ducasse.
place to live for the masses, and at the same time serve to produce those same masses as newly creative beings; the architecture of New Babylon had to inspire transgression via the conscious shaping of situations. Constant conceived his city as predominantly social space with moveable walls to be rearranged by the inhabitants as they wished. Sadler claims the Situationists were agreed that: ‘the creation of the situationist city would pass from its avant-garde city fathers to its citizens’ (Sadler, 1999, p.120): ‘Constant never failed to reiterate that ultimately New Babylon could only be a collective social project, and that his work should be understood as nothing more than the projected framework for the construction of situations’ (Sadler, 1999, p.222). Seeking to deflect any charge of vanguardism, Constant presents New Babylon as:

‘(A)n imaginary project; it anticipates history, it is a futuristic project; it is based on a desirable course of history and it is therefore also in a sense a utopian project. Nonetheless, I prefer to call it a realistic project because it distances itself from the present condition that has lost touch with reality, and because it is founded on what is technically feasible, on what is desirable from a human viewpoint, on what is inevitable from a social viewpoint’ (McDouough, 2009, p. 116).

Simon Sadler highlights unitary urbanism’s debt to the ‘unitary architecture’ of ‘utopian sociologist’ Charles Fourier: ‘Like Fourier’s unitary architecture, situationist unitary urbanism was a vision of the unification of space and architecture with the social body, and with the individual body as well’ (Sadler, 1999, p.118). Unitary urbanism is a rejection of the modernist view, exemplified for the situationists by Le Corbusier, of life as ‘well-oiled participation in the production process’ (McDouough, 2009, p. 114). For Constant, at the heart of unitary urbanism lay ‘the all-embracing function of life: creativity, the urge to manifest oneself, to turn life into a unique event, to realise life as such. Urbanism is not industrial design, the city is not a functional object, aesthetically “sound” or otherwise; the city is an artificial landscape built by human beings in which the adventure of our life unfolds’ (McDouough, 2009, p.114).

The situationist view of nature, at least as represented by Constant in New Babylon, may be difficult to comprehend from a contemporary environmentalist perspective. A little historical geography is enlightening: Writing in 1960, Constant conceived unitary urbanism in a society that largely perceived itself as possessed of infinite natural resources. The future would, consequently, be one of unlimited
travel, particularly by car and aeroplane. Thus, Constant presents an extreme modernist view of nature as ‘played out; simply raw material, controlled by human beings and used in accordance with their needs’ (McDouough, 2009, p.117). Nature is transformed into culture and replaced by technology. Population growth and urbanisation, Constant believed, would mean that ‘the city might eventually expand to cover the entire surface of the earth’, but also that this surface will have to be far more intensively used (McDouough, 2009, p.117): ‘for motorized transport and agriculture, wild nature and historical monuments’ (Sadler, 1999, p.129). New Babylon would be based ‘on a strict separation of traffic and industrial space on one hand and residential and social space on the other’ (McDouough, 2009, p. 120). The city would be raised, supported on pilotis\(^{17}\); factories would be built underground\(^{18}\); traffic would flow freely on the surface of the earth. In the main, this uber-city would be artificially lit and ventilated. Constant embraced the latest structural technology and his architecture was, in the utopian tradition, fantastic, floating, suspended, inspirational rather than prescriptive; it required high-tech, lightweight materials with superior engineering properties. Fascinatingly, Constant constructed his \textit{maquettes}, his preliminary models, from industrial waste, for instance recycling the windshields of a bubble car\(^{19}\) for his Concert Hall for Electronic Music.

Constant identifies modernist urbanism as highly influential on culture but in a negative sense, concerning itself mainly with superficial technologies of managing traffic and housing, fetishising particularly geographies of the private car, with the central tenet of efficient production. Judging it a failure, Constant posits modernist urbanism as a threat to the very existence of culture, a threat specifically to social spaces in which a new culture could arise’. He proposes that there are connected but distinct aspects to unitary urbanism: (i) a transformation of our habits, our way of life or lifestyle, and (ii) a profound change in how our material environment is produced. Unitary urbanism is founded on fostering creative lives and Constant further defines it as:

‘a deliberate intervention in the praxis of daily life and in the daily environment; an intervention aimed at bringing our lives into lasting harmony with our real needs and with new possibilities that will arise and that will in turn transform these needs.... it is the

\(^{17}\) A series of supporting columns.

\(^{18}\) Note the resonance with Fritz Lang’s Metropolis.

\(^{19}\) A generic term for small, economic, usually three-wheeled cars of the 1960s, notably by BMW and Messerschmitt.
objectification of the creative urge, the collectivisation of the artwork, the materialisation of a dynamic lifestyle’ (McDouough, 2009, p.115).

The materiality of literary and literal utopias and ecotopias

Hard facts from fiction
Making his way back to Den Blå Karamel, the wooden house where he was staying with friends, Cyboli took the unlit woodland path along the water’s edge, through the area created as a defence against Swedish invasion in the late seventeenth century. Serendipitously, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries also produced a number of utopian texts whose influence survives the test of time, not least due to continued contestation of their ‘true’ meanings. Herein, we are interested in what survives the test of space, specifically the materiality of place. Thomas More’s Utopia (More, 2008/1516) was a precursor to Tommaso Campanella’s The City of the Sun (Campanella, 1981/1623), Francis Bacon’s New Atlantis (Bacon, 2008/1627) and Henry Neville’s The Isle of Pines (Neville, 2008/1668). The materiality of More’s Utopia prefigures an almost uncanny modernist aspiration of the built environment, or else reflects an uncanny stasis in mainstream building materials technology. Disparaging ‘homely cottages’ made with rude timber, mud walls and straw thatch as ‘poor’, ‘low’ and belonging to the past, More describes the materiality of Amaurote, Utopia’s capital city, thus:

‘The streets be appointed and set forth very commodious and handsome, both for carriage and also against the winds. The houses be of fair and gorgeous building, and on the street side they stand joined together in a long row through the whole street without any partition or separation. The streets be twenty foot broad. On the back side of the houses, through the whole length of the street, lie large gardens…. the houses be curiously builded after a gorgeous and gallant sort, with three storeys one over another. The outsides of the walls be made either of hard flint or of plaster, or else of brick, and the inner sides be well strengthened with timber work. The roofs be plain and flat, covered with a certain kind of plaster that is of no cost, and yet tempered that no fire can hurt or perish it, and withstand the violence of the weather better than any lead. They keep the wind out of their windows with glass, for it is here much used, and somewhere also with fine linen cloth dipped in oil or
amber, and that for two commodities, for by this means more light cometh in, and the wind is better kept out’ (More, 2008/1516, p. 54-55).

Similarly, residents of Bacon’s *New Atlantis* live in brick-built houses with glass windows. Both authors equate the ingress of light into dwellings with progress. While More imagines a plaster that performs something like Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC)\(^{20}\), though fundamentally different in being ‘no-cost’, Bacon’s ‘Chambers of Health’ could be read as prefiguring concerns with indoor air quality (IAQ), particularly as contemporary sustainable architecture looks to increasingly draught-proof designs such as *Passivhaus*. By contrast, the patriarch protagonist of *The Isle of Pines* quickly knocks together a cabin of unhewn timber poles clad with boards recovered from his shipwreck and roofed with stretched sail-cloth, before getting down to the serious business of creating what Susan Bruce dubs ‘pornotopia’ - a place ‘where mossy banks and trees provide all the shelter that one needs’ (Bruce, 2008, p. xxxix).

*Figure 2: The back of Bananhuset.*
*(Picture: K. Mason)*

Passing by *Bananhuset*\(^{21}\) (Figure 2), Cyboli smiled at its playful architecture, its cut-out cowboy standing guard. Tommaso Campanella, a Dominican, was serving a 27 year prison sentence, implicated in a conspiracy against the rule of Naples by the Spanish, when he wrote *The City of the Sun (Civitas Solis)*. Malcolm Miles writes of the relationship between the architecture of *Civitas Solis* and the knowledge of its society:

\(^{20}\) Some commentators believe More’s conception was inspired more by ceramic technology.

\(^{21}\) Bananhuset, the Banana House, was built by ‘naverne’, serving as the Northern Europe clubhouse for these journeymen builders. As with most houses built by the community in Christiania, as opposed to those that have been refurbished, Bananhuset is constructed mainly from materials that have been reclaimed at relatively little or even no cost. Wood is the principal material used in Bananhuset.
‘The city Campanella describes is radial, divided into seven rings.... Each circuit of walls carries on both its inner and outer faces a sub-set of an already-complete knowledge: first, mathematical figures and the Earth; second, minerals and geographies; third, flora and fish; fourth, birds and crawling beasts; fifth, animals on both sides; sixth, mechanical arts and their instruments.... The solar city again differs, then, from a transposition onto a geometric space of a monastic order, in that knowledge is made public, not enclosed in a scholarly community which guards its Latin texts and hence safeguards its interpretation; each generation of the city’s population is taken around the circuit of the murals in their education’ (Miles, 2005, p. 17).

A society’s knowledge being constitutive of public space and always open to public interpretation surely has transgressive epistemological appeal. Cyboli wondered about the walls themselves as carriers of knowledge: How significant was their materiality, could it convey as much about the knowledge of a society as the texts written upon them? What could be interpreted from such walls made of, say, steel reinforced concrete compared to walls of straw-bales rendered with hemp-lime plaster? Such questions have particular significance for Ecotopia: If a wall of *Civitas Solis* was dedicated to knowledge of environmental sustainability, what it was made from (and indeed how it was made, how equitably labour was employed) would matter profoundly.

First published in 1975, the most notable late-modern account of an Ecotopia is Ernest Callenbach’s eponymous novel (Callenbach, 1975). Ecotopia is an ecologically transformed California which has gained an uneasy independence from an environmentally disastrous United States (Callenbach, 2004). In *Ecotopia*, though Callenbach flirts with the notion of mass housing constructed with extruded tubing made of a plastic derived from cotton, the dominant building material is wood, with which Ecotopians have a spiritual relationship, almost tantamount to tree worship:

‘The other day I stopped to watch some carpenters working on a building. They marked and sawed the wood lovingly (using their own muscle power, not our saws). Their nail patterns, I noticed, were beautifully placed, and their rhythm of hammering seemed patient, almost placid. When they raised wood pieces into place, they held them carefully, fitted them (they
make many joints by notching as well as nailing). They seemed almost to be collaborating with the wood rather than forcing it into the shape of a building’ (Callenbach, 1975, p. 47).

Callenbach later ‘reports’ that this empathetic relationship with wood is fostered by people being obliged to work in forestry before they can buy the lumber to build a house, helping manage the forest lands sustainably, replanting to replace the wood they will use. It is policy in Ecotopia that all buildings must be of renewable and biodegradable materials’ (Callenbach, 1975, p. 97). Callenbach’s Ecotopians have also inherited the built environment and materials of capitalism, but they make choices as to their utility, choices that astound Callenbach’s journalist narrator, William Weston: ‘the great downtown skyscrapers, once the headquarters of far-flung corporations, have been turned into apartments!.... Thousands of cheaply built houses in newer districts (scornfully labeled “ticky-tacky boxes” by my informants) have been sacked of their wiring, glass and hardware, and bulldozed away’ (Callenbach, 1975, p. 13-14). One dominant feature of Ecotopia is of a built environment moving beyond the automobile. In ‘Soul City’, Ecotopia’s voluntarily segregated black area, ‘architects bred in the ghettos, have been leading proponents of rebuilding Ecotopian cities on people-centered rather than car-centered principles’ (Callenbach, 1975, p.99).

Christiania: Freetown (Fristad), Free Haven (Frihavn)

‘Behind clouds of smoke, suspicious gazes, and fleeting caresses, The Free Haven, Christiania is still taking form... alternative organisations without leadership, the unique sense of community, and the acceptance of humanity in all its forms (Lauritsen, 2002, p.8)

It is nicely ironic that Christiania’s ‘Free Haven’ title is derived from a literal translation of its geography in the frihavn (free harbour) area of Copenhagen – a designation that was originally commercial, denoting no customs duties. In the same ironic vein, given Christiania’s proud claim to ‘architecture without architects’, a near neighbour is the Royal Danish School of Architecture. Harbouring around one-thousand people, mainly émigrés and refugees from the Danish state, Christiania welcomes visitors with the sign: ‘You are now leaving the EU’. Including the area of fortifications – ramparts – built to repel Swedish invasion, Christiania enfolds more than 85 acres of what would otherwise surely be prime
Copenhagen real estate (Figure 3). The heart – or balls\(^ {22} \) – of the site (Figure 1) was formerly a military barracks and arsenal. Diverse groups invaded and began to squat the abandoned complex in the early 1970s, notably a movement of both homeless people and ‘greens’ or hippies looking for a place to put their imagined ecotopia into practice. Among its many and continuing political struggles, Christiania has come to an accommodation with the Danish state over some services, notably the provision of electricity\(^ {23} \), and the Free Haven lays claim to being an autonomous community. It is self-governing with the discussions and debates of everyday private and public spaces mediated in a network of meetings: House Meetings for inhabitants of shared dwellings; Area Meetings for the fifteen designated geographic areas of Christiania to deal with local matters; Specialist Treasurer’s, Economy, Business, and Building meetings; and The Common Meeting, the ultimate forum, constituted on participatory principles, which arbitrates on contested issues, informs ‘negotiations’ with the Danish government, and serves as form of judiciary. Houses cannot be owned, inherited or otherwise passed on and tenure is decided by Area Meetings in the first instance.

Christiana runs its own economy, collects rents\(^ {24} \) and administers a ‘common purse’ (treasury). Car-free, producing its own famous designs of bicycle, fabricating wood-burning stoves, using natural sewage treatment technology, composting and recycling, Christiana brands itself as ‘the green lungs of Copenhagen’.

\( \text{Figure 3: Christiania housing by the waterside} \)

Cyboli perceives Christiana as a place that makes him tingle – with pleasure, expectation, mellowness, and a touch of fear... Being here makes him feel very alive.

\(^{22}\) Some residents liken the map of Christiania to a phallus with the most densely inhabited area being the scrotum.

\(^{23}\) An accommodation bemoaned by one of my informants for having retarded the development of Christiania’s own renewable energy systems.

\(^{24}\) How to enforce payment from those who refuse to pay is a major bone of contention and at times the budget deficit threatens to undermine services such as building maintenance and gardening.
Christiania's paths wind and criss-cross, directions are unsure, there are no signs. At night, away from the blazing, flashing, always-partying, nomadic throbbing heart of the place, there is silence, darkness – no street lighting, stars; frequent getting lost, discovering. From the hash-smoke smell of the bars, through the fresh breeze blowing off the water, to the wood-smoke aroma of the houses... Buildings ranged from the grim brickwork of the old barracks, often though cheered and empowered by the vibrant graffiti of resistance, through the various wooden constructions erected by Christianites over the decades, shacks and ship-like forms, and housing built from scrap materials, beautiful and sometimes seeming structurally impossible, dwellings built in the water or hidden in the woods, to the playful but technologically sophisticated *Bananhuset*. Despite decades of development, aspects of everyday life in Christiania remain rough and ready for many. Economic poverty in 'the losers’ paradise' is the norm and 'dumpster-diving' for food is as much a necessity as it is ideological freeganism. Most houses are cold and draughty by modern standards, often heated only with a single woodstove. Some places in the forest share an outdoor toilet, an inconvenient trek in all weathers. But, for Cyboli, the less pleasant sensations also underscored his own vitality – they were part of life - and would also compel him to action, at least chopping firewood or making sure the compost toilet was clean and stocked with sawdust. For longer term residents the choice was theirs of whether to put their energies into draft-proofing or indoor sanitation (or to make music and revel in a little primitivism instead). And the compensations were delightful, for instance a visit to the steam-filled public bathhouse in a chill November more than made up for the lack of a domestic shower: A beer and gossip outside *Inkøbcentralen*, the community shop, afterwards... There were frequent political actions by various groups too, taking Christiania out into a wider Denmark, into a wider world: critiquing, engaging. There was a tradition begun by the famous forays of activist theatre group *Solvogner*, for instance being Santas at Christmas and giving away department store goods, or riding into corporate celebrations of American Independence Day as native Americans on horseback.

**Discussion (once bitten twice shy of The Gadfly)**

Let us begin with your *paean* to Christiania, The Gadfly said, buzzing irritatingly around Cyboli’s head as he sat in *Den Blå Karamel* trying to write. You present the space of the so-called Freetown as dynamic, seemingly shifting from Lefebvre’s representations of space towards representational space, at least redressing a balance between the dialectically connected spaces that, I assume, you view as skewed otherwise in the majority of the world beyond Christiania’s – ‘borders’?
Cyboli replied: I do find Christiana brimming with political passion, enflamed rather than quenched by the aggressive attentions of the state. A principal tactic of the state’s campaign against the Freetown is to first force people to register as residents of properties and then to ‘encourage’ private ownership, trying to stimulate the acquisitiveness of some residents who have put considerable effort into improving their homes. It seems as if the state wholly comprehends Lefebvre’s theory, fears it, and actively employs it to negate the threat of a good example. Christiania is full of fantastic imaginings and the community has always known about creating situations, in Lefebvre’s terms: ‘moments of presence’ within everyday life whose authenticity is disalienating amid the diversions and commodified relations of modernity, and whose passing can reveal a range of possibilities’ (Pinder, 2005b, p. 166).

Such community knowledge is mediated by spatial practices, including the materiality of the place, which disrupt the capitalist representations of space the state continually seeks to impose, and this disruption does reveal a range of possibilities: political potential. The same is true of other citizen architectures who are consciously political: The tents of the Camp for Climate Action near Heathrow airport in 2007 and in the London’s financial district during the G20 meeting in 2009; tents which are conspicuously vulnerable but which also conceal25; The symbolism of Brian Haw’s almost decade long camp outside the ‘Palace of Westminster’, an action against the UK’s wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, a spatial incursion – a situation – so intolerable to the ruling elite that they went so far as to change the law to end it26. The passing of Haw’s protest revealed even more political possibility than the act itself, however. If space permitted, I could continue with examples such as the Reclaim the Streets movement27, which shares with both sustainable and unitary urbanism a focus on the car as a core technology of the society of the spectacle. Or I might look to the Occupy movement’s creation of situations, sustained moments of presence...

Obviously such actions are utopian and essentially urban, The Gadfly said. They evidently transcend their symbolism and marginality: realistic, authentic, critical rather than compensatory, empowering. The masses will be bound to learn from such avant-garde actions, whether on the scale of Christiania or

25 Similarly, the Occupy movement’s camps in more than 900 cities from later 2011.
26 The Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 introduced restrictions explicitly on protests in the area around the Palace of Westminster, also creating the Serious Organised Crime Squad and giving the Police increased powers of arrest. Brian Haw’s protest was recreated by artist Mark Wallinger who was thence nominated for the Turner Prize.
27 Reclaim the Streets: ‘A direct action network for global and local social-ecological revolution(s) to transcend hierarchical and authoritarian society, (capitalism included), and still be home in time for tea’ http://rts.gn.apc.org/sortit.htm
Brian Haw’s individual artwork of banners, flags and barricades. These are so clearly not abstractions from everyday life. Whitehead claims that, ‘Adopting more radical interpretations of sustainable urban development could help to shape a more progressive urban planning culture’ (Whitehead, 2011). Well, your sustainable unitary urbanism is certainly more radical: Disrupting the spaces of the city is bound to instantly inspire people to recycle and cycle to work: New Babylon is Ecopolis! A city spatially produced by pranksters and losers is plainly going to be somewhere to be proud of: Justice is well served by creating situations...

**Conclusion: sustainable unitary urbanism?**

*Having been assailed by Socratic irony for what seemed an eternity, his arguments continually reduced to the absurd, Captain Cyboli nevertheless survived to file this field report:*

Driving my research was the question of how the materiality of the built urban environment might both reflect and produce sustainable development, a question inspired by Campanella’s *City of the Sun*. With this in mind, I focussed on Mark Whitehead’s obituary for the sustainable city, taking it as the intended provocation. In the context of their shared utopianism, I have compared the sustainable city and sustainable urbanism with New Babylon and unitary urbanism. Though its view of nature is sorely dated and its relation to sustainability highly problematic, it is New Babylon’s creation of situations which continues to inspire. Empirically, I drifted through literary utopias and examples of what may be concrete ones, concentrating on Christiania as a manifestation of the latter. I have not researched the dystopian elements of Christiania, for instance the malevolent presence of the drug gangs in the community – and neither have I examined the relation between such dystopian elements and the inevitable incompleteness of utopian Christiania due to continual intervention from the Danish state. Christiania is not presented as a wholly transferrable model of the new sustainable city, moreover. It is anticipated that one key feature of the sustainable city reclaimed from capitalism will be difference, diversity and local uniqueness.

I drew upon Lefebvre’s theory of the production of space to analyse the mediation of representational space and representations of space by social practices: My interest here is in the transgressive potential of practices of citizen architecture/protest to disrupt the conception of the society of the spectacle and serve to produce spaces of enhanced political possibility. I argue that resurrecting sustainable urbanism
will mean it taking a radical turn from governing or governance to citizen participation. In the immediate term, it will mean citizens taking creative and collective action to counter the negating doctrines identified by Whitehead, namely hyper-liberalism, neo-localism and municipal pragmatism. Such action should aim at creating situations through the détournement of the objective expression of representations of space to highlight the victims of the recuperated sustainable city, i.e. both social justice and stewardship of the natural environment. While this détournement must be radical, I turn to Stuart Hodkinson to invoke also a strategic pragmatism: I see no reason for example why a Rebel Clown should not run for Mayor; seriously! And no reason why Occupy type initiatives should not seek out soft spatial targets which might become sustained peoples’ spaces of habitation, education and nurture. As one existing example, Grow Heathrow was born from the combined logics of Camps for Climate Action and the Transition Towns movement (Mason and Whitehead, 2012a). Squatting an abandoned market garden in Sipson near London and growing food, Grow Heathrow’s productive character means it has local community support and has also achieved wider popular approval. So, if the authorities obtain an eviction order, it will be a very unpopular decision which will be resisted.

The future, as Hodkinson notes, is undefined and must be guided by the principles of the commons. There can be no set relation between resistant tactics and a utopian strategy because first resistance must inspire a critical mass of people who will conceive that strategy collectively. Seeking out the possible means many small tactical interventions can attain such a critical mass, redefining how our material environment is produced. Ultimately, the goals is, as I have stated, to make the city a space of participative politics of the common good, a space of justice and of environmental sustainability but also a space of freedom, difference, dissensus, of irony and fun. The research agenda for academics seeking to resurrect the sustainable city, then, should be action research with the community to first subvert its recuperation.

---

28 I cannot imagine a more radical example to recommend to the reader than the excerpt from Marcel Mariën’s The Commander’s Gait presented by Tom McDonough in The Situationists and the City (2009).
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