
MULTIPLE SPATIALITIES: ASSEMBLED GEOGRAPHIES OF CONTENTIOUS POLITICS

Catarina Gomes de Matos (2023)

INTRODUCTION¹

The 2015 municipal elections in Spain are considered a turning point in Barcelona's urban politics. A new social movement-oriented electoral alliance called *Barcelona en comú* entered the city council with more than 25 % of the votes. Few weeks later, Ada Colau, the leading candidate of *Barcelona en comú*, was appointed mayor of Barcelona. Before this political event, economic activity had become the unquestioned ideological basis for urban development policy and the city had developed into a tourist hot spot in Europe. With *Barcelona en comú* a new actor entered the political stage who rejected this urban policy and criticised the *touristification* of Barcelona. For the first nine months of its period in office, the new authority gave itself an 'emergency plan', which included the revision of urban development projects carried out or approved by the previous government.

One of the projects listed for revision in the 'emergency plan' was the transformation of the sailboat harbour *Port Vell* since 2012. This transformation was considered the most recent event in an array of restructurings carried out at Barcelona's waterfront from the 1980s onwards to open the city towards the sea. *Port Vell*, originally a commercial port, was transformed into a sailboat harbour during the city's preparation for the 1992 Olympic Games (Wehrhahn, 2004). In early spring 2012, plans for a second transformation were announced. This time, the aim was to establish high-price tourism in the area by transforming the sailboat harbour into a marina for so-called mega yachts. Local activists and neighbours expressed vehement disagreement with this transformation plan. Activists' pamphlets² highlighted that local inhabitants need to "defend" the Port against a small group of "super-rich" tourists. The protest alliance called out to "bring your friends, families, clubs and neighbours" to the protest activities, because *Port Vell* "It's ours!". Despite ongoing protests, the activists could not prevent the transformation project.

The aim of this article is to show that a perspective that understands urban protests – such as the *Port Vell* protests in Barcelona – as a conflict between two or more interest-driven actors falls short. Many approaches developed in the social movement studies (f.e. Castells' concept of urban social movements, see Castells, 1983, and rational choice-based approaches on resource mobility or collective action, see Herkenrath 2011) adopt such a perspective and are thus unable to fully understand the heterogeneous social contexts of urban conflicts. For a more comprehensive analysis, the complex fabric of multiple power-laden discourses, processes, networks and spatial conditions in which such conflicts are embedded must be taken into consideration. Since the early 2000s, conceptual

¹ I wrote the first version of this text in 2015/16, when *Barcelona en comú* governed Barcelona for a few months. Now, at the end of 2022, they have almost completed their second term. The protests described in this text have died down after the transformation of *Port Vell* into a marina for mega yachts. Nevertheless, they are a striking example of the ways in which spatial realities play a role in the disputes in and around the city.

² All quotes in this sentence: www.ravalnet.org/agenda/sardinada-i-cadena-humana-en-defensa-del-port-vell.

debates in the social sciences have discussed ‘assemblage’ as an approach that takes up this challenge (see Miller, 2013; Chesters and Welsh, 2005; Venn, 2006).

The ontology of assemblage theory has become popular as a concept that promises to gather new insights into old research fields by painting a more complex picture of the social world. Central to this approach is the idea of describing the world as a fluid and heterogeneous assemblage, a composition of interconnected elements (Phillips, 2006). Work using assemblage concepts has been carried out in a variety of research fields, including feminist-influenced explorations of gender, race and intersectionality (e.g. Grosz, 1993; Puar, 2012; Saldanha, 2012), research on the mobility of (urban) politics (e.g. Künkel, 2015; McCann and Ward, 2011, 2012; Prince, 2010; Silomon-Pflug et al, 2013; Stein et al., 2015) and studies on protest and social movements (e.g. Chesters and Welsh, 2005; Davies, 2012; McFarlane, 2009; Miller, 2013; Woods et al., 2013). In this article, the assemblage approach is in particular helpful to understand the local conflict about *Port Vell* in Barcelona as part of a complex, relationally connected array of different power laden spatialities. The article starts with an overview of existing research about protest and space. Following this, the article presents assemblage as an approach to linking different spatialities in this field. Both sections serve as a theoretical basis for the analysis of the case study in the third section. The empirical example is used to show how different forms of inequality, strategies, structures, discourses and identities can be condensed into a geography of urban conflicts.

PROTEST SPACES: MULTIPLE SPATIALITIES OF CONTENTIOUS POLITICS

In the last decades, spatiality became an important factor to understand social protest and activism (Pile and Keith, 1997; Routledge, 1993). Different geographical concepts and theories, such as scale, network, place and territory competed in the research on protests, social movements and activism (for comprehensive overviews see Leitner et al., 2008 and Miller, 2013). In the second half of the 2010s, the debate on the most adequate approach to spatiality in contentious politics moved to a new direction. Scholars have argued that in contentious politics *more than one* spatiality is at work (e.g. Leitner et al., 2008; Nicholls et al., 2013). Jessop et al. (2008) propose a combination of *territory*, *scale*, *place* and *network* (TPSN) to analyse contentious politics. Leitner et al. (2008) further include *mobility* and *socio-spatial positionality*. They highlight that in activists’ practices different spatialities intersect and affect each other. Yet they state that political actors “not necessarily sit around discussing the merits of, say, mobilities vs. place as domain of action. Rather, they draw on their experience and knowledge, crafting and intuiting strategies that they hope will succeed, and which simultaneously engage multiple spatialities” (Leitner et al., 2008: 166). Taking into account such different spatialities, Janoschka and Sequera (2012) describe neoliberal logics of space production and identify counterhegemonic strategies of the 2011 *Indignados* protests in Spain. Focussing on *Puerta del Sol* in Madrid, they show that in recent years the *plaza* has been transformed into a neoliberal, touristified and commodified space. During the *Indignados* protests, activists reinterpreted this place as a stage for protest actions, as a symbolic place of resistance, but also as a practical redefinition of public space and a reference point for horizontal democracy in the *barrios* of Madrid. Janoschka and Sequera (2012) have thus demonstrated that in order to understand the complex geographies of contentious politics it is important to consider space mutually as an object, arena and framework of protests. Several theories have adopted the term assemblage to theorise such multiple spatialities (e.g. McFarlane, 2009; Miller, 2013).

ASSEMBLING CONTENTIOUS POLITICS

ASSEMBLAGE BETWEEN POSTSTRUCTURALISM AND THE RENEWAL OF MATERIALISM

The term *assemblage* – broadly defined as a composite of interconnected elements (Philips, 2006) – became popular in human geography and other social sciences around the end of the first decade of the 2000s. In this context, various methodological and theoretical ideas have been discussed, but without a homogeneous and consistent theoretical framework being presented (see Buchanan, 2015, for a commentary on different interpretations of Deleuze and Guattaris notion of assemblage; see Anderson et al., 2012, for a distinction between assemblage used as concept, ethos and descriptor; see Brenner et al., 2011, for a critical debate on empirical, methodological and ontological approaches to assemblage). There are currently two fundamental debates in the social sciences that have influenced the conceptualisation of assemblage approaches. Firstly, a poststructuralist critique that has questioned essentialist ways of thinking about subjects and culture, as in discourse analysis or practice theory. Secondly, a debate of the re-materialization in human geography that engages with socio-material relations (Mattissek and Wiertz, 2014; Müller, 2015, for an overview over the debate on re-materialisation see). Science and Technology Studies as well as Actor-Network-Theory have strongly influenced some works on assemblage by pointing to the importance of artefacts – e.g. a franking machine (Davies, 2012) – in order to consider human *and* non-human agency (McFarlane, 2011). Feminist informed scholars have contributed to theorise the role of bodies as elements in assemblage analyses (Currier, 2003). In the tradition of both critical debates, assemblage theories have emerged as an approach to implement the understanding of a socially constructed world in empirical social research (Marcus and Saka, 2006).

Assemblage approaches focus on heterogeneity of elements in assemblage composites and the relations between them. Elements include for example discourses, practices, different entities and actors. In contrast to hierarchical or organic forms, elements in assemblage formations are not subsumed (or subsumable) under a single, generalizable logic (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 16) nor are they complementary parts of an organic whole. Consequently, arrangements of elements and the connections between them rely on distinct logics. In the poststructuralist tradition, assemblage constellations are not seen as pre-given structures, but as a fabric, that is always ‘in the process of becoming’. By changing one of the elements of an assemblage, a new assemblage is being produced (Anderson et al., 2012; Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 18). Therefore, assemblages are under constant transformation – they are ‘fluid’. Rejecting a somehow fatalist ‘everything goes’ perspective that might result from the idea of constant change, assemblage theorists focus on the moments between the ‘fluid’ and temporarily fixed constellations (Davies, 2011: 277). The interface between these two aspects is of particular importance for assemblage analysis. Specifically, researchers are interested in the ways in which the different elements of an assemblage are put together, how relationships are stabilised or interrupted, and what specific logics underlie these processes. In doing so, they focus on the act of assembling and reassembling (McFarlane, 2009) formation and reformation (Ong and Collier, 2005) or processes of connection and disconnection (Davies, 2012).

This perspective has led to new and lively research questions, but it also has its limitations. Silomon-Pflug et al. (2013) point out that assemblage approaches are destined for analysing ongoing processes but are less useful for researching into past and/or historical developments. Stein et al. (2015: 4) further state that the approach fails in including the non-existence of assemblages and the non-emergence. This critique leads us to important questions about the implementation of the assemblage

concept as a perspective in empirical research. Drawing the example of BIDs³, Pütz et al. (2013: 97) argue, that “failings” empirically only appear as “flaring up”. The authors highlight the importance of being aware of this limit of assemblage approaches. Going beyond this claim, it could be argued that from an assemblage perspective it is exactly the work of researchers to consider such “flaring ups” and their wider context in order to describe and analyse the processes of production and reproduction, the fixity and transformation of assemblages including its ruptures and divergent logics.

ASSEMBLAGE AND SPATIAL LOGICS

Debates among human geographers about assemblage approaches are part of a critical engagement with an oversimplified representation of spatial social processes⁴. In this context, critical voices have called for overcoming simplistic concepts of space and developing a more “synthetic” perspective on human geography (Purcell, 2003: 328). Approaches such as the TPSN framework (see above) were developed as a response to this critique (Leitner et al., 2008). These approaches avoid giving preference to *one* spatial theory, but understand theories such as *scale*, *place*, *territory* and *network* “as mutually constitutive and relationally intertwined dimensions of socio-spatial relations” (Jessop et al., 2008: 389).

The assemblage approach stands in the tradition of this debate, but differs from the above approaches in its conceptual foundation. Instead of combining pre-given spatial theories, assemblage approaches open up the possibility to going beyond such familiar spatial patterns, principles and forms. Additionally, they encourage researchers to develop interpretations of power-laden relations and constellations from the empirical data. This perspective allows scholars both to draw on spatial concepts that are “already in circulation in socio-spatial theory” (Leitner et al., 2008: 159), but also to develop spatial concepts that go beyond them. Situationally, researchers will then draw on elaborated concepts in some cases and pursue spatial logics specific to the empirical example in others. Having a notion of space as a “more open spatiality that is produced in the moment” (Davies, 2011: 282f) is the radical consequence of both taking contingency seriously and considering spatialities solely on the ground to analyse the underlying power relations (I will come to this second point later).

Beside openness for unexpected forms of spatiality, an assemblage perspective highlights that the arrangement of different spatialities is no fixed structures, but can change over time. “Assemblage thinking (...) does not point to any particular spatial imaginary. It rather demands an empirical focus on how these spatial forms and processes are themselves assembled, are held in place, and work in different ways to open up or close down possibilities” (Anderson et al., 2012: 172). In this context, Miller (2013: 2) has argued that “not every spatiality is always equally important, but rather that different spatialities may be of greater or lesser significance in the articulation of specific processes”. I propose to use the term *spatial logics* to name these specific forms of temporary construction of space. On the one hand, this term refers to the singularity of every spatial logic respective to the particular way of thinking about the world, the social and space in which a spatiality is constructed. On the other hand, the term points to the idea of a world in which these spatialities despite its heterogeneity are elements of a temporary whole. Over time, spatial logics can gain or lose importance and they can be

³ Business Improvement Districts

⁴ This debate relates to broader human geography discussions about the possibilities and limitations of describing complex empirical (spatial) relationships from the perspective of a *complex science* and, in this context, the compatibility of different spatial approaches (O’Sullivan, 2004; Byrne and Callaghan, 2014; Amin, 2007; Jessop et al., 2008).

reframed or replaced by new spatial logics⁵. Social processes thus “are spatial and temporal at the same time” (Davies, 2011: 277). In consequence of such a processual view, research based on an assemblage perspective focusses rather on the act in which a specific spatiality is produced, reproduced or stabilised than the spatiality itself.

As mentioned above, from my point of view, research on spatial logics is not valuable in itself but rather an approach to analyse specific forms of power relations. In several research fields, scholars have theorised the relation between power and spatialities. In the realm of assemblage analysis, Miller (2013) has worked out different forms of socio-spatial power relations that should be considered in assemblages. Drawing on the example of a transnational slum dwellers federation, McFarlane (2009) has elaborated the various forms of power relations through which translocal assemblages are structured. Further, from a Foucauldian perspective, Mattissek and Wiertz (2014) have identified assemblage as an approach to analysing the power exercised in forest policy in Thailand by arranging human and non-human practices in space. Such different spatial logics of power are at the core of a critical assemblage analysis. Power in this context is neither centred nor evenly distributed through the assemblage. Rather “different actors appear powerful at different times” (Davies, 2011). In this context, it is important to be aware that the analysis of power laden spatial logics should not replace the analysis of spatial power relations in assemblages. Focussing in particular on assemblage approaches to policy mobility, Künkel (2015) identifies this neglect of power and inequality as the weak point of assemblage as a (critical) geographic concept. This critique suggests a perspective from which spatialities are not the starting point of the analysis of contentious politics, but in the empirical analysis, spatial logics must be considered as relevant forms of exertion of power that can become effective at some point. Consequently, it is not only necessary to be open for ‘new’ forms of powerful spatial logics, but also for the fact that within some parts of an assemblage or in a specific moment other forms of power relation than spatially mediated ones can be the important ones.

DOING ASSEMBLAGE RESEARCH

To methodically capture the complex heterogeneity of both elements and connections between them, scholars have combined ethnographic methods with an assemblage perspective (e.g. Davies, 2012). Likewise, the following analysis of the *Port Vell* conflict in Barcelona is based on ethnographic research during two periods of research in Barcelona in summer 2012 and spring/summer 2013. Participatory observations took place at protest activities and planning meetings. Qualitative interviews with politicians, members of the city and port authority as well as academics and activists opposing the regeneration project complement the observations. In addition, an extensive body of further documents, such as manifestos, notices of appeal, homepages, leaflets, newspaper articles etc. has been included in the analysis.

The data collected was analysed in three steps: The first step was to identify different elements such as discourses, actors, bodies, artefacts etc. and their relations to each other in a specific situation. The result of this first step is the mapping of specific constellations (assemblages) in different moments. The second step is to contrast these assemblage constellations to identify changes over time. The third

⁵ This argument has similarities with Foucault’s concept on problematizing, defined as “the ensemble of discursive and non-discursive practices that make something enter into the play of true and false and constitute it as an object of thought” (Foucault, 1994: 670; Collier et al., 2004).

step is, while having a closer look at these changes, describe the activities and conditions of ‘moments of bifurcation’ more explicitly, and thus examine them as processes of reassembling. This procedure requires being open to the specific empirical situation.

It is in this context that some scholars criticise that assemblage theory follows an “empiricism in which description reflects a reality of heterogeneity” (Fuller, 2013: 4). The particular focus of the approach on the empirical, it is argued, always carries the risk of conducting a search for the ‘real’ in empiric data. Brenner et al. (2011) adopt the term ‘naïve objectivism’ to describe this search. This critique must be countered with the argument that assemblage analysis as well as other forms of analysis is a – more or less structured – process of assembling, constructing and selecting in which the researcher arranges and shapes actively. In so far “every book, article or discourse, which deals with the social life, has necessarily a significant amount of subjectivity” (Borja, 2009: 11, translated by the author). Consequently, assemblage analysis – parallel to other forms of empiric research – requires reflection on the process of ‘producing’ scientific knowledge. In order to comply with this requirement, in my case, the data collection and analysis was accompanied by both a process of reflection about my own position as a researcher and a process of searching for a (political) ‘sense’ in doing (this specific) research (see Gomes de Matos 2015).

However, Brenner et al. (2011: 233) make a valid point, when they argue that assemblage approaches *alone* are unable to unfold their full potential. Linking assemblage approach to a set of different theories, concepts, methods and research agendas allows us to contextualise the case study in a wider context. In doing so, data can be framed, mediated and interpreted. However, it is a desideratum how this can be done methodologically. In the following analysis, the idea of a ‘thick description’ was used additionally to the above-mentioned methods as a hinge-concept to link the assemblage perspective to other theories. The term ‘thick description’ is used for condensed presentations of empirical data and interpretations that go beyond classifying and categorizing. Thick descriptions focus on giving sense to the analysed phenomenon by doing both interpreting and contextualizing the empirical data to bring complex micro-phenomena in contact with ‘conceptual structures’ of the society. To combine ‘thick description’ and the assemblage perspective stimulates both concepts: The term conceptual structures was originally defined in a narrow sense as a cultural system of meanings and the concept was applied with a focus on practices and rituals. An assemblage perspective opens up the term and includes further elements such as ‘materiality’ and actor networks. At the same time, ‘thick description’ provides a practical methodological suggestion to analyse complex phenomena with a specific focus on the empiric data following the premise of not identifying the ‘truth’ but producing a plausible interpretation. In the process of producing such a thick description, a repertoire of theories and concepts is woven into the condensed description of the empirical case (Geertz, 1994; Müller, 2012). While Brenner et al. (2011) in particular focus on theories in the context of global processes of current capitalism and related uneven structures, their argument could be similarly used for all forms of theories. So, while adopting an assemblage perspective on the following case study, I have selectively drawn on distinct theories and concepts in order to explain how elements are put together, stabilised and ruptured and which logics stand behind these processes and how the entire assemblage is embedded in the wider context of the society.

ASSEMBLING THE *PORT VELL* CONFLICT

For decades, Barcelona's urban development had been characterised by diverse processes of neoliberalisation and commodification (Capel, 2005; Casellas, 2006; Charnock et al., 2014). In this context, major construction projects were implemented in the eastern part of *Diagonal*-Avenue and in the waterfront area. While the former had been transformed into a business, shopping and 'innovation' area surrounding the new build architectural flagship project *Torre Agbar* (Charnock and Ribera-Fumaz, 2011), the latter had been transformed even more into a touristic area including the shopping centre *Maremagnum* and the *Hotel Vela*. The *Port Vell* restructuring project was one of the latest transformations in this district. The citizens' disagreement with this transformation project led to the founding of a protest alliance called *Plataforma defensem el Port Vell* in May 2012 and to the first protest activities. The alliance included people engaged with ecological and urbanistic issues, members of neighbourhood associations as well as activists of the *Occupy* and the *Indignados* movements. Other members defined themselves rather as critical academics than as activists. Via personal connections, the *Port Vell* protests were from the beginning integrated in a network of citywide contention. This network was strengthened through selective collaboration with other protest alliances over the months⁶. Later, there were also personal overlaps with *Barcelona en comú* and in the consequence, after 2015, activists engaged in the *Port Vell* protests were appointed to public offices in the new government. The following analysis of the *Port Vell* conflict, however, starts 1988, almost three decades before this incident.

PART I: ADMINISTRATIVE PARCELLING, RESCALING OF RESPONSIBILITY AND SPATIALLY FRAGMENTED PARTICIPATION

In 1988, the municipal management company *Port 2000* was founded and, as a subsidiary of the national port authority *Puertos del Estado*, it became responsible for the management and promotion of all public space in the port area of Barcelona. This moment was the origin of a specific spatial logic of administrative parcelling, which had a strong impact on the *Port Vell* conflict: The public waterfront area in the city of Barcelona is divided in two administrative districts, the 'port territory' and the 'city territory', both running under the authority of political institutions on different scales. *Port 2000* controls the water, the shore area and the public space close to the shore, while the municipality is responsible for the area on the city side. Further differentiations, e.g. different police responsibilities (port police vs. city police) and different legal frameworks accompany this division. The border between both territories, which runs in parts in the middle of the pedestrian area, is not visually marked. Adolfo Romagosa, manager of *Port 2000*, describes this administrative peculiarity as follows: "This territory here is property of the state (points to the waterfront-side on the map). This territory here is property of the city (points to the city-side). Here there is a line. We know where the line is, but (...) Barcelona's characteristic is that citizens do not know where the 'port' begins and where it ends. We have managed to keep a little the same elements of urban design; the system of the city has been respected in the area of the port. This makes the line spreading".

Both city and port authority cooperate in a policy of mutual adaption including a set of chaired administrative practices of *doing* this border *invisible*. This "complex of regular behaviour acts and

⁶ E.g. the protest alliance *Plataforma Aturem Eurovegas*.

practical understandings” (Reckwitz, 2003: 290, own translation) does not only ‘invisibilise’ the administrative territorialisation but at the same time also performs an undivided public space in the *Port Vell* area. An example for such practices beside the creation of a coordinated visual appearance of the streetscape is that city and port police patrols are instructed to occur in the same manner and to enforce the same (agreed) laws in both parts of this area (Interview with Adolfo Romagosa and Aloma Mar, *Port 2000*). Similar processes of “(un-)doing border” in a very different setting were described by critical researchers on border regimes drawing on praxis-theoretical conceptualisations of the border. However, in the case of the *Port Vell* conflict, this ‘invisibilisation’ was disrupted in parts. The administrative parcelling of this area was picked up and attached with greater importance. This was, on the one hand, due to specific counter discourses and protest practices of activists, as described in the next section. But it was also, on the other hand, explained by a changed discourse by city councillors and the urban administration, which aimed to disclaim responsibility for the transformations in the port area. In the interviews, several city councillors argued that the city government had no decision-making authority regarding the *Port Vell* project, except for decisions over some minor urbanistic questions, as all decisions were taken on the national scale by *Puertos del Estado*. Therefore, they concluded, the city council had no responsibility for the decisions made on the *Port Vell* case. This argument seemed to be a scalar ‘strategy of innocence’, given that the port authority managers highlighted a close collaboration between city and port authority concerning all decisions made.

Shifting strategically the relative importance of the national scale on a first glance seemed to be a loss of power for the local government. This shift to another scale, however, also changes another power relation: The administrative division of the area implies fundamental consequences for the citizens’ rights to participate in urban planning. This is due to the different juridical frameworks that both areas rely on. While in the part of the port area administered by the city, at least a part of the residents of Barcelona⁷ can participate in formal, legally anchored participation procedures at the local level, the part of the port area administered by the port authority is regulated by the national port law and is thus not subject to local participation requirements. The participation opportunities consequently depend on a spatial division – they are spatially fragmented. As reconfigured as a ‘national issue’, the *Port Vell* transformation in great parts is detracted from citizen’s right to formal participation.

To sum up, in this case study the border between city and port is continuously produced, stabilised, ‘invisibilised’, (un-)made relevant and so on. It is thus a historically grown, contested and constantly changing spatial element in the assemblage.

PART II: SPATIAL COUNTER DISCOURSES, PLACE-BASED IDENTITY AS MARITIME CITY AND REDEFINING THE CITY TERRITORY

Beside urban politicians, another group of actors aims in ‘visibilising’ the ‘invisible’ administrative parcelling: The opponents of the *Port Vell* project criticise the spatial fragmentation of participation opportunities and in their protest activities and counter discourses they make the division visible. They argue that “the *Paseo de Colón*-Avenue embodies an undemocratic trace. Seaward is the kingdom of

⁷ It is essential to note that a part of Barcelona’s residents as for example *Sans Papier* is excluded.

the port authority, an autonomous entity, and we citizens cannot comment on what is done at the port” (Speech of a member of *Asamblea Portuaria Vecinal* on the *Seminari Geocrítica*, 18.06.2013).

To confront the inequality of participation opportunities, the activists do not simply claim for more participatory politics in the port area, as could be expected. Instead, they use a different, spatially embedded argument: *Port Vell* should become ‘part of the city’. This call for including *Port Vell* in the administrative city territory is based on a two-fold discourse: First, Barcelona is considered a city with a ‘maritime character’ and the harbour is one of the few places where this character can be lived. The character is traced back to the historic development of the city as a port city that “has always been specifically related to the sea” (Interview with activist M.F.⁸) and is directly influenced by the city’s geographical waterfront position. In this historical discourse, maritime trade gains an important role as a key factor for urban development. Today, Barcelona’s relation to the sea is still embodied in and based on local practices, specific economies and cultural traditions, such as sailing as well as traditional cooking and eating seafood. Barcelona is further a space where specific maritime knowledge is produced – for example the science of navigation, which is preserved in institutions such as the *Escuela Náutica* (Nautical School). Referring to the French scientific term *maritimité* (maritimity), the members of the protest alliance in many cases use the term *maritimidad*, to subsume the different elements of a ‘maritime Barcelona’ (for a further discussion on this see Gomes de Matos 2013). The term *maritimidad* is an example of how concepts and terms become mobile in two ways: On the one hand, they travel between different spheres of the society (in this case: from science to everyday life), and on the other hand, they travel – similar as others have described mobile policies (see McCann and Ward, 2011) – from a geographical place to another (in this case: from France to Barcelona). The example shows on the local level that not only the activists’ arguments have changed with the use of the term *maritimidad*, but also the meaning of the term has changed in the context of contentious politics (see also Gomes de Matos 2013)⁹. From 2013 on, the term *maritimidad* became mobile again – this time within Barcelona: Other Organisations including *Barcelona en comú* adopted the term. In consequence, when 2015 in the context of the political change in Barcelona, Gala Pin, who former was one of the main actors in the *Port Vell* protests, became councillor of the inner-city old town districts, the term *maritimidad* and the idea behind it were also included in official statements and political debates¹⁰.

Within the discourse of *maritimidad*, Barcelona became a special ensemble in which the maritime history of the city and its location were inseparable from the citizens' sense of belonging to Barcelona. According to Tuan’s (1974) definition of place as entrenchment of time, identity and sense in space, the discourse about the maritime city Barcelona could be considered an example of place-making. In this process of place-making, the harbour plays an important role as a materialisation of maritime identity. As a historical site of maritime trade, shipping and fishing, the port is considered one of the most important places in Barcelona where activities that shaped Barcelona's maritime character took place. From a heritage perspective, the harbour is consequently a part of the “collective heritage of the maritime and fishermen identity of Barcelona” (Interview with activist M.F.). Even today, *Port Vell* is considered an important place where the *maritimidad* of the city becomes accessible to the public.

⁸ Activist’s names are anonymised.

⁹ Trans-local forms of ethnography are discussed to gather such processes of policy mobility (Peck and Theodore, 2012).

¹⁰ See e.g. the interview with Gala Pin (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nHhn12bgd6M>), the party platform of the governing party *Barcelona en comú*. (<https://barcelonaencomu.cat/es/programa/navega/detall/recuperar-el-port-vell-para-usos-publicos-y-ciudadanos>) and debates in the city’s participatory online platform *decidim.barcelona* (e.g. <https://decidim.barcelona/proposals/el-port-com-espai-urba>).

In consequence, as “it is difficult to understand Barcelona without the harbour (...) every assault on the harbour is an assault on Barcelona on the whole.” (Interview with activist P.P.). With regard to the redevelopment of *Port Vell*, one of the activists' central arguments emerges from the discourse on Barcelona as a maritime city: the establishment of a high-security zone hinders citizens' access to *Port Vell* and thus also the possibility of maintaining their identity as citizens of the maritime Barcelona.

Second, the history of *Port Vell* is told as a history of citizens reconquering the waterfront. This discourse goes back to late 1980s and 1990s, when extensive recreational activities were conducted in connection with the 1992 Olympic Games, especially in the waterfront area. Before then, almost all parts of the inner-city waterfront area were part of the fishing and commercial port as well as the industrial zone. Access to this area was restricted to those working there. Then, during the redesign of the waterfront, a large part of the port area became public space: the so-called *Moll de la Fusta* was transformed into a strolling promenade, and *Port Vell* became a sailboat harbour. The term *puerto ciudadano* (citizens' harbour) did emerge at this time to characterise this 'new', accessible *Port Vell*. This is why the term *Port Vell* is still closely associated with the idea of the waterfront being accessible to citizens. On the level of individual actors, the development in the *Port Vell* area – especially the latest transformation – produce a sense of disconnectedness, as the following quote illustrates: “We had the impression that the harbour became much more accessible, that we could go there and so. But then there were doing all these constructions, and while momentarily we were able to see the horizon, the sea, the water, much closer, in the next moment it was striding away and we had to go in search for it”¹¹ (Interview P.P.).

Both discourses, the one on the maritime city and the one on the citizens' harbour, produce a collective identity between the activists based on a shared emotional commitment to the city as well as to the harbour. This place-based identity is the basis for the activists' argument to claim for an administrative re-territorialization: The *Port Vell* area should become part of the city again. At the same time, activists also claim for rescaling the power about *Port Vell* from national to regional scale (for example with the slogan “*El Moll d'Espanya pels Catalans!*”¹²). Both argumentations aim in changing the spatial conditions in a way that gives the citizens of Barcelona a greater power to interfere in the development of the *Port Vell* area. To analyse the activist's attempts to re-appropriate power over *Port Vell* as both, politics of jumping scales and a pursuit to re-territorialisation, highlights, that activist do not restrict themselves on single spatial strategies, but use and create different spatial logics simultaneously.

Going further, *Port Vell* is not only a place of identity that produces a sense of belonging. It is also a place to voice dissent and resistance – for example, when activists and residents equipped with banners and megaphones form a 'human chain' along the pier to demonstrate against the new project. In such moments, the *Port Vell* area, which most of the time is perceived as 'touristified' area and 'lost' for the citizens' daily life activities temporarily becomes a *space of contention*.

¹¹ In the quote, the activist refers both figuratively and literally to the image of "looking for the horizon". In the literal sense, he is referring to the physical environment of the Port of Barcelona, where piers, buildings and jetties block the view of the open sea to citizens in a large part of the inner-city port area. New buildings and a fence as part of the redevelopment of Port Vell have reinforced this.

¹² See https://defensemportvell.files.wordpress.com/2012/07/portvell_cat_sl.png.

PART III: NEOLIBERAL URBAN POLITICS, SPACES OF EVERYDAY LIFE AND ALTERNATIVE SPACES OF PARTICIPATION

When in spring 2013 the city council confirmed the transformation plans for the *Port Vell* area, the *Plataforma defensem el Port Vell* seemed to have lost their campaign. Effectively, in the following month the activities of the protest alliance tailed off. Does this signify an abandoning of the activists and a failure in the struggle against the existing uneven structures in the city? Up to this point of the description, the harbour has taken a central position in the protests. However, another part of the *Port Vell* protests focused more on the city as a neoliberalised and touristified conflict space. Notwithstanding that, both logics have always coexisted, when the city council confirmed the *Port Vell* project, the significance of a harbour-centred perspective had decreased, and the urban scale has gained importance. The transformation between these two logics can be regarded as what DeLanda (1997) call *moment of bifurcation*. His argument is that in times of instability, smaller changes can trigger a greater modification of the assemblage.

The *moment of bifurcation* in this case has led to a stronger debate on the embeddedness of the *Port Vell* conflict in wider urban processes as well as in related impacts on the individual level. The change in the activists' discourse – steering away from a harbour-centred perspective and leading to a focus on urban politics – took place in permanent interaction with an internal reorganisation of the protest structures. The most apparent change in this process was the foundation of a new protest alliance called *Asamblea Portuaria Vecinal* (APV). Officially, the foundation of the new alliance was first and foremost explained by the new and explicit focus on a citywide perspective. However, during this founding process, former – in parts conflictive – cooperation was disbanded and new collaboration networks were formed. The internal reconfiguration of the protest movement should neither be regarded as a pure cause for the new spatial focus, nor a pure consequence of it – both aspects rather influenced each other mutually.

This change related to broader discourses on Barcelona's neoliberal touristification and commodification. On the one hand, in this context, neoliberalisation was seen as a citywide process comparable to processes in other cities worldwide. The notion of neoliberalisation producing equivalent *places of conflict* distributed in commodified urban space served as the basis for situating the *Port Vell* within this process of urban neoliberalisation. This idea was amongst others promoted by academics when visualizing 'burning conflicts' publicly in maps (see an example on the web site of the *Seminari Geocritica*¹³, see also the further discussion on this aspect in Gomes de Matos 2015). On the other hand, neoliberalisation was discussed in the context of *personal affectedness*. Here, people expressed a sense of loss about space at these *places of conflict*. Uitermark (2004) explains such senses with an alienation caused by a gap between international processes of commodification and lived spaces of everyday life. A sense of *being affected* by neoliberalisation was the identitarian basis for the changing protest network from 2013 on. *Port Vell* activists engaged increasingly in establishing connections with protests groups related to other *places of conflict* within Barcelona. Furthermore, individual *Port Vell* activists started to interfere even more in citywide protests platforms such as *La PAH* and *Barcelona en comú*.

In the context of this changing focus in the *Port Vell* protests, another issue gained importance: the engagement with non-transparent and even corrupt politics on the urban scale. As mentioned earlier,

¹³ See www.ciutatport.com/Seminari.html.

in all issues concerning the urban area, the citizens had formal participation options. These, however, were insufficient and highly criticized by the activists, who claimed that there is no 'real' participation. Interviews with city managers and local politicians revealed that participation was on the one hand restricted to the choice between different pre-given options and on the other hand, it was only recognized when articulated in terms of economic interest. Interventions going beyond these limited spaces of participation were not seen as dissent with current urban developments and politics but as *disturbance* (Rancière, 2002: 40f; this argument is enrolled with more depth by Gomes de Matos 2013). The critique on these post-political policies generated specific protest practices: activists participated in formal participation processes or parliamentary sessions, while at the same using them as places to express their dissent with this form of participation, for example by showing banners or leaving the room during the debates. In these practices of critically re-labelling of official 'participation' processes, the activists appropriate these spaces and transform them into *protest spaces* (see Gomes de Matos 2013).

The protest movements not only discuss alternatives to the current post-politics, but also practice them in their activities and ways of working. To give an example: One practice is publicly taking minutes during meetings on a paper pinned to the wall. In doing so, all participants can follow the process of taking notes. In this way, the process of creating written knowledge about the situation becomes transparent and inclusionary. Another example for alternative practices is the use of the homepage: The activists describe the homepage as "a fundamental part of the protest alliance, the communication to the public. (...) We did a counter position, a counterbalance to the municipality and the harbour. So, if they don't inform us, if they don't explain, if they don't give information we need, we have to do the work to create transparency they were supposed to do. Therefore, we put all information on the web site, always! – Our minutes, all information we got from the harbour" (Interview with activist C.N.). With their practices of inclusion and transparency, the protest alliance presents itself as a counter-position to current urban politics. At the same time, their *asambleas* (assemblies) become alternative spaces of genuine participation and horizontality. Some of these horizontal forms of organisation and communication have found their way in the governing practices of the *Barcelona en comú* cabinet. Examples are the internet platforms used to enable transparency and discussion and new forms of public participation developed by the Office for Community Participation used to develop a new municipal plan¹⁴.

Moreover, the idea of the *barrio* plays an important role in the construction of alternatives to neoliberal politics. Out of the feeling of being affected by the post-political politics of non-participation, a strong collective identity emerged between activists across the city. They developed the idea that together they had to defend their common everyday life in the neighbourhoods (*barrios*) against the opaque and anonymous neoliberal politics. In this context, the term *barrio* had the meaning not only of an everyday space and of a historically grown social network of neighbours, but also of an alternative model of urban life. While in the discourse neoliberal urban politics were associated with the terms *rich/luxurious/competitive*, *anonymous/foreign* and *exclusive/corrupt/intransparent*, the *barrio* symbolised *simple/small/poor*, *neighbourly/familiar/intimate*, *routine/everyday life* and *inclusive/participatory/information*. Consequently, the ideal of the *barrio* as an everyday (public) space of democracy and encounter was seen as the antipode to the city as a foreign, economised and tourist-driven space. Parallel to the debates in the *Port Vell* conflict, other protest movements as well as *Barcelona en comú* politicians discussed the *barrio* as an alternative model. From a conceptual point

¹⁴ See <https://decidim.barcelona>.

of view, the term *barrio* functions as an empty signifier for an alternative vision of the future. In contrast to the exclusionary and stereotypical representation of the neoliberal city as the "other", the term *barrio* is used to create an alternative self-definition (for a further description of place-based politics with reference to Edward Said, see Harvey, 1993).

The protests in *Port Vell* exemplify how contentious politics on urban planning issues and the question of democracy and participation were linked. The analysis shows that activists in Barcelona derived their role as citizens from the history of civil society's struggle for inclusion in urban planning decision-making processes. Building on this, they developed a self-understanding as empowered political subjects who raise their voices, participate in decision-making and use spaces of formal decision-making such as parliament as well as create alternative open and inclusive forms of urban planning. These practical lived alternative forms of urban planning and decision making are very close to what Lefebvre (1968) has called the "right to the city". It is a practical example of how people perform a "radical examination (...) with the historically grown city they live in – with the aim to break with hitherto conditions and adjust the city to current needs" (Gomes de Matos and Starodub, 2016: 25)

CONCLUSION

This analysis of the *Port Vell* conflict has revealed different logics that pervade the conflict – many of them relate to spatially mediated modes of exercising power. While unrolling these interrelated spatial logics and the connections between them, I elaborate, as Deleuze and Guattari (1987: 9) put it, 'some' of an assemblage. Having in mind what was argued earlier in this article, using this expression is meant to highlight that at the cut of this 'some' is influenced by our own subjective decisions and interpretations – there is no natural break that marks the border of a presented empirical case (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 19)¹⁵. Given a specific interest in spatially embedded processes of inclusion and exclusion inside and outside the protest movement, it is paid less or no regard to other aspects such as the use of different languages within the protest alliance or its strategies to recruit new members.

At first glance, one might think that the protest movement had failed when the new marina was built. However, the assemblage perspective on the case study sheds a different light on the *Port Vell* protests. The analysis demonstrates that the activists did not only engage with the specific transformation process in the *Port Vell* area, but critically examined Barcelona's urban development model. By proposing alternatives for *Port Vell*, the protests have taken into question the underlying logic to privilege economic growth over cultural or social issues. When the activists criticised the existing processes of participation, they argued for alternative and inclusionary forms of urban planning. This entails a critique on the existing political limits of urban planning and city politics. From a micro-perspective, moments of personal subjectification and temporary appropriation of spaces are crucial. In these moments, alternative forms of doing and saying become possible and different worldviews come to the fore. For the activists, the process of learning how to create such moments of political intervention is an important achievement of the *Port Vell* protests. From an urban perspective, these protests conveys dissatisfaction with the political status quo in the city that goes beyond this case study. The *Port Vell* transformation is one aspect amongst others – for example the *Plan Paral·lel*

¹⁵ Deleuze and Guattari (1987: 9) use the term asignifying rupture to describe the characteristic that "a rhizome may be broken, shattered at a given spot, but it will start up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines".

and the *Plan de Usos de Ciutat Vella* – that has triggered the debate about the neoliberal transformation of Barcelona and its consequences for the citizens' everyday life and spaces. Individual protests against neoliberal transformations, such as those against the restructuring of *Port Vell*, seem to have bundled and manifested themselves in the political turn of 2015. While before the turn urban politics in Barcelona have lost part of the citizens due to its economic agenda, after the turn new platforms and networks have emerged in which citizens express their will and right to shape the city and participate in urban planning. The shift towards a citywide interconnection had already become apparent in the internal reorganization of the *Port Vell* protests shortly after the government's resolution for the *Port Vell* land use plan. It was also visible in the organisation of other protest networks in Barcelona. In the end, this development seems to be one of the factors that led to the successes of *Barcelona en comú* and paved the way for a new policy aimed at opening up the process of urban development to all citizens.

This article exemplifies the interlocking multiple logics of power in the *Port Vell* protests. It uncovers a variety of spatially mediated power relations and the processes in which they were stabilised and became fluid. The construction of *places* as the *Port Vell* and the maritime Barcelona played an important role in forming the protest alliance's identity. *Rescaling processes* are crucial strategies for politicians to abdicate responsibility, and activist's demands can be interpreted simultaneously as *politics of scale* and *processes of re-territorialization*. The case study also demonstrates that supposed contradictory spatial logics are constructed simultaneously. This is the example when the same politicians contribute to 'invisibilise' and 'visibilise' the borders of the harbour area in different practices and routines. Furthermore, this article pinpoints on how spatial logics are related to other forms of power relation, which are not primarily spatially mediated, or which are not fully explainable by given theoretic concepts. These are the concept of *barrio*, and post-politics that mute radical-alternative arguments by identifying them as 'disturbance'.

As described above, through the analysis of multiple spatialities, it is possible to consider the *Port Vell* protests in their wider context. Although this article can be considered in relation to their wider context, as outlined above. This article primarily highlights the connections with processes on the urban scale – especially the political change in 2015. In addition, it would also be worthwhile in this context to discuss in more detail the links to other national or international events and processes such as the European debt crisis and the bursting of the Spanish housing bubble, national austerity policies and nationwide protests against mortgages.

REFERENCES

- Amin A (2007) Re-thinking the urban social. *City* 11(1): 100–114.
- Anderson B, Kearnes M, McFarlane C and Swanton D (2012) On assemblages and geography. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 2(2): 171–189.
- Borja J (2009) *Luces y sombras del urbanismo de Barcelona*. Barcelona: UOC.
- Brenner N, Madden D and Wachsmuth D (2011): Assemblage urbanism and the challenges of critical urban theory. *City* 15(2): 225-240.
- Buchanan I (2015) Assemblage Theory and Its Discontents. *Deleuze Studies* 9(3): 382-392.
- Byrne D and Callaghan G (2014) *Complexity Theory and the Social Sciences: The state of the art*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Capel Sáez H (2005) *El Modelo Barcelona. Un examen crítico*. Barcelona: Ediciones del Serbal.
- Casellas A (2006) Las limitaciones del «modelo Barcelona». Una lectura desde Urban Regime Analysis. *Documents d'Anàlisi Geogràfica* 48: 61-81.
- Castells M (1983) *The city and the grassroots. A cross-cultural theory of urban social movements*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Charnock G and Ribera-Fumaz R (2011) A new space for knowledge and people? Henri Lefebvre, representations of space, and the production of 22@Barcelona. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29(4): 613–632.
- Charnock G, Purcell TF and Ribera-Fumaz R (2014) City of Rents: The limits to the Barcelona model of urban competitiveness. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38(1): 198–217.
- Chesters G, Welsh I (2005) Complexity and Social Movements: Process and Emergence in Planetary Action Systems. *Theory, Culture & Society* 22(5): 187–211.
- Collier SJ, Lakoff A and Rabinow P (2004) Biosecurity: Towards an anthropology of the contemporary. *Anthropology Today* 20(5): 3-7.
- Currier D (2003) Feminist Technological Futures. Deleuze and Body/Technology Assemblages. *Feminist Theory* 4(3): 321-338.
- Davies AD (2012) Assemblage and Social Movements: Tibet Support Groups and the Spatialities of Political Organisation. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37: 273–286.
- Deleuze G and Guattari F (1987) *A thousand plateaus. Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- DeLanda M (1997) *A Thousand Years of Nonlinear History*. New York: Zone Books.
- Foucault M (1994) *Überwachen und Strafen. Die Geburt des Gefängnisses*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

- Fuller C (2013) Urban politics and the social practices of critique and justification Conceptual insights from French pragmatism. *Progress in Human Geography* 37(5): 639–657.
- Geertz C (1994) Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In: Martin M and McIntyre LC (eds) *Readings in the philosophy of social science*. Cambridge, London: MIT, 213–231.
- Gomes de Matos C (2013): Das Modell Barcelona – Partizipation, Protest und Postpolitik. *Sub/urban. Zeitschrift für kritische Stadtforschung* 1(2): 121–140.
- Gomes de Matos C (2015): Whose knowledge? Reflecting on the plurality of knowledge production in contentious politics. *DIE ERDE – Journal of the Geographical Society of Berlin* 146(2-3): 175–188.
- Gomes de Matos C and Starodub A (2016) „Es liegt auf der Straße, es hängt in Bäumen und versteckt sich unter Pflastersteinen“. Das Recht auf Stadt in Theorie und Praxis. In: *Kritische Justiz* (49)1: 18–30.
- Grosz E (1993) A Thousand Tiny Sexes: Feminism and Rhizomatics. *Topoi* 12: 167–179.
- Harvey D (1993) From space to place and back again: reflections of the condition of postmodernity. In: Bird J (ed) *Mapping the futures: local cultures, global change*. London: Routledge, 3–29.
- Herkenrath M (2011) *Die Globalisierung der sozialen Bewegungen. Transnationale Zivilgesellschaft und die Suche nach einer gerechten Weltordnung*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Janoschka M and Sequera J (2012) Zur symbolischen Rückeroberung und Politisierung des öffentlichen Raums. Eine Analyse der Raumpolitiken des movimiento 15-M. *PROKLA* 42(1): 151–162.
- Jessop B, Brenner N and Jones M (2008) Theorizing sociospatial relations. *Environment and Planning D* 26(3): 389–401.
- Künkel J (2015) Urban policy mobilities. Theoretische Grenzen und Rekonzeptualisierungen. *Sub/Urban. Zeitschrift für kritische Stadtforschung* 3(3): 75–98.
- Lefebvre, H (1968) *The right to the city*. Paris: Anthropos.
- Leitner H, Sheppard E and Sziarto KM (2008) The spatialities of contentious politics. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 33(2): 157–172.
- McCann E and Ward K (eds) (2011) *Mobile urbanism. Cities and policymaking in the global age*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- McCann E and Ward K (2012) Policy assemblages, mobilities and mutations. Toward a multi-disciplinary conversation. *Political Studies Review* 10(3): 325–332.
- McFarlane C (2009) Translocal Assemblages: Space, Power and Social Movements. *Geoforum* 40: 561–567.
- McFarlane C (2011) Assemblage and critical urbanism. *City* 15(2): 204–224.
- Mattisek A and Wiertz T (2014) Materialität und Macht im Spiegel der Assemblage-Theorie: Erkundungen am Beispiel der Waldpolitik in Thailand. *Geographica Helvetica* 69(3): 157–169.

- Miller BA (2013) Spatialities of Mobilization. In: Nicholls W, Beaumont J and Miller BA (eds) *Spaces of contention. Spatialities and social movements*. Farnham: Ashgate, 285–298.
- Müller M (2012) Mittendrin statt nur dabei: Ethnographie als Methodologie in der Humangeographie. *Geographica Helvetica* 67(4): 179–184.
- Müller M (2015) Assemblages and Actor-networks: Rethinking Socio-material Power, Politics and Space. *Geography Compass* 9(1): 27–41.
- Nicholls W, Beaumont J and Miller BA (eds) (2013) *Spaces of contention. Spatialities and social movements*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- O’Sullivan D (2004) Complexity science and human geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 29(3): 282–295.
- Ong A and Collier SJ (eds) (2005) *Global Assemblages. Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Peck J and Theodore N (2012) Follow the Policy: A Distended Case Approach. *Environment and Planning A* 44(1): 21–30.
- Purcell M (2003) Islands of practice and the Marston/Brenner debate: toward a more synthetic critical human geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 27(3): 317–332.
- Phillips J (2006) Agencement/Assemblage. *Theory, Culture & Society* 23(2-3): 108–109.
- Pile S and Keith M (1997) *Geographies of resistance*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Prince R (2010) Policy Transfer as Policy Assemblage: Making Policy for the Creative Industries in New Zealand. *Environment and Planning A* 42(1): 169–186.
- Puar JK (2012) “I would rather be a cyborg than a goddess”. Becoming intersectional in Assemblage Theory. In: McCann, CR, Kim, SK and Ergun E (eds.): *Feminist theory reader. Local and global perspectives*. New York: Routledge: 405–415.
- Pütz R, Stein C, Michel B and Glasze G (2013) Business Improvement Districts in Deutschland – Kontextualisierung einer ‚mobile policy‘. *Geographische Zeitschrift* 101(2): 82–100.
- Rancière J (2002) *Das Unvernehmen*. Stuttgart: Suhrkamp.
- Reckwitz A (2003) Grundelemente einer Theorie sozialer Praktiken. Eine sozialtheoretische Perspektive. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 32(4): 282–301.
- Routledge P (1993) *Terrains of resistance. Nonviolent social movements and the contestation of place in India*. Westport, Conn: Praeger.
- Saldanha A (2012) Assemblage, materiality, race, capital. *Dialogues in Human Geography* 2(2): 194–197.
- Silomon-Pflug F, Stein C, Heeg S and Pütz R (2013) Die unternehmerische Stadt als Gegenstand von Urban-Policy-Mobilities-Forschung: Kontextualisierung global verfügbarer Politikmodelle am Beispiel BID und PPP in Frankfurt am Main. *Geographische Zeitschrift* 101(3-4): 201–217.

Stein C, Michel B, Glasze G and Pütz R (2015) Learning from failed policy mobilities: Contradictions, resistances and unintended outcomes in the transfer of “Business Improvement Districts” to Germany. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 24(1): 35–49.

Tuan Y (1974) *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perceptions, Attitudes, and Values*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Uitermark J (2004) Looking Forward by Looking Back: May Day Protests in London and the Strategic Significance of the Urban. *Antipode* 36(4): 706–727.

Venn C (2006) A note on Assemblage. *Theory, Culture & Society* 23(2-3): 107–108.

Wehrhahn R (2004) Hafen und Stadt in Barcelona. Zur Integration der Waterfront in die Stadtentwicklungsplanung. *Kieler Arbeitspapiere zur Landeskunde und Raumordnung* 43: 15–36.

Woods M, Anderson J, Guilbert S and Watkin S (2013) Rhizomic radicalism and arborescent advocacy: a Deleuzo-Guattarian reading of rural protest. *Environment and Planning D* 31(3): 434–450.

CITE AS

Gomes de Matos, Catarina (2023): Multiple Spatialities: Assembled Geographies of Contentious Politics. Universitätsbibliothek Johann Christian Senckenberg. URN: urn:nbn:de:hebis:30:3-714116

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.