TERRITORIAL PRODUCTION AND THE TEMPORAL USE OF PUBLIC SPACE

MATTIAS KÄRRHOLM [1]

My aim with this text is to present territoriality as a way of discussing spatio-temporal aspects of everyday urban life, with a special focus on urban and material design. I will start by introducing a conceptual framework that enables an analysis of the territorial structure of public space at a micro level. I then go on to present an empirical study of the urban square Stortorget in Malmö, Sweden, discussing how architectural and urban design play different roles in the production and territorialisation of time-space. Finally, I discuss how (and why) a time-space territorology, can be used to investigate and describe the role of urban design in the shifting and transformative power relations of an ongoing everyday life.*

The concept of territoriality is well known in research, and has been used in a wide range of different disciplines. For some reason it has never been very popular in architectural research, where other spatial concepts such as place, space, site and zone, often have been preferred. The concept of territory has a long history and a wide variety of uses. It has its origin in the Latin word *territorium* which was used to mean the area surrounding a roman city, but also used to mean those foreign states that had connections with the Roman Empire. The word is sometimes thought to come from *terra*, meaning earth (and territorium meaning, that which belongs to earth). Sometimes it is said that it might come from terrere (which means to frighten) or tererre (to step on). Looking through the literature on territoriality one can see that it has two primary uses, one within the behavioural sciences and one within the social sciences. The concept began to be more widely used in the behavioural sciences during the 1960's and was then used to indicate the claiming and defending of space (in Swedish often distinguished as *revir*, and in German as *Revier*). The concept was first influenced from zoology and ethology, where it had been used at least since the 1920s in order to denote animals marking their territory (for example, the territorial singing of birds). In studies of human territoriality, however, research soon became more interested in spatial claims that were not actively defended, but even so perceived as owned in some sense. In the social sciences the use of the concept goes back to its Roman origin, and is used (for example, in political geography) to denote spatial strategies of power, for example the delimiting of land into nations, municipalities, regions, etc.

[1] Professor in Architectural Theory, University of Lund, Sweden

So why is territoriality of interest to architects and planners? Simply because architecture and urban design play important roles in the production of territories and territorial effects. If we want to use territoriality as a way of analysing or discussing architecture one might, however, need to change the perspective on territoriality slightly. Traditionally, both within the social and behavioural sciences, territoriality has been studied from the perspective of a privileged actor, whether that actor is an individual, a group, a community or some kind of institution. Focus has been on the 'master' of the territory: who is establishing it and why? Another perspective would be to start from place, in an effort of describing the territories that are effective at that place. What territorial power relations can we find, and how do the territorial effects come about? Looking at it from this perspective one can often note that the attribution of a territory to just one actor, or one 'master of place' is not always easy, or at times even possible. Instead there are a lot of people, things and designs that together produce the effect of a certain territory. Territorial power is in short the result of complex relations between humans and non-humans. The built environment is often co-producing the territorial productions of the urban landscape – walls, lines, markers and doors are important parts in shaping and stabilising territorial power.

Territories are produced everywhere. They can be stable or unstable, they can be long lasting or just temporary. In order to more fully describe different territorial productions it could be useful to distinguish between different modes of production. First there is the intended production of a territory, where you deliberately delimit a certain space as a means to some end. This intentional production could be done either by territorial strategies or territorial tactics. Territorial strategies represent impersonal, planned and to some extent mediated control, and often involve the delegation of control to things, rules, etc. Territorial strategies are always planned at a distance in time and/or space from the territory produced. All planned spaces involve some territorial strategy, from playgrounds to parking lots. Territorial strategies also have a temporal side to them, that could be made more or less salient. Strategically produced time-spaces could, for example, include the opening hours of shops, parking garages, or the operating hours of factories. Territorial tactics refers to a more personal relationship between the territory and the person or group that mark it as theirs. This includes situational and more spontaneously produced territories, i.e. more unofficial or informal tactics, such as the temporary marking of a chair at a café with ones jacket or scarf. This might also include micro-situations such as the emission of certain phatic utterances, intended to stall for time and keep one's audience quiet and attentive while attempting to finish a thought, or somewhat more stable procedures, such as setting up one's tent for the night, personally claiming a certain time-space in a public park.

Besides intentional strategies and tactics, territories can also be produced in a more indirect manner, through associations and appropriations. Territorial associations and appropriations represent productions that are not planned or intentionally established, but are consequences of established and regular practices. These practices may be the effects of rational and planned decision; but not with the explicit intention of producing a territory. Territorial appropriation produces territories through the repetitive and consistent use of an area by a certain person or

group who to some extent perceive this area as their own. The object of territorial appropriation could, for example, be one's home, one's street or one's regular table at a restaurant. Appropriation thus often includes a territorialisation "through time", but can also ensue during a very short period of use. Taking a seat for a lecture, for example, often implies an appropriation of a time-space. This would become noticeable if the place in question were contested: if the seat were taken by someone else during a short coffee break, one would probably be left with the feeling that one's seat had been taken ('but, that seat was mine, at least until the end of the lecture!'). The object of territorial association represents an identifiable area, characterised by a certain usage and those specific conventions and regularities that underpin this usage. These areas do not necessarily have to be considered by any person or groups as 'their own', but are nevertheless associated by others as pertaining to a certain function or category of users, and could for examples include 'bathing places' or 'climbing trees'. A lot of places in the city are associated with a certain behavioural regularity that involves both time and space: activities such smoking a cigarette, walking a dog or going to the toilet are often connected to a certain spatial and temporal extension. If you stand in front of an ATM, you are expected to use that space during the time it takes you to withdraw money. If you use it too long or incorrectly – for example, as a place to eat your lunch – protest would probably ensue. If one starts to look around for territorial productions one soon notices that one space is often layered with several different territorial productions, so there is not just one territory for each space. A lot of spaces in the city are thus associated both with a specific use and an approximate or 'proper' duration of that use, whether it is the pedestrian crossing or the table of an outdoor café. The spatio-temporal 'borders' or limits of associated or appropriated time-spaces might not be clearly expressed or settled (as in tactics and strategies), nor might they be agreed upon, but they are there, and at some point they might be contested, or it might simply become clear that a particular time-space situation has come to an end or been transformed into something else: 'It is ok to take the seat, I was finished anyway'.

**

The four different forms of territorial time-space production discussed above, will now serve as a basic way of describing the territorial landscape of Stortorget in Malmö and its changes from 1978 to 2013. The square, Stortorget, was inaugurated in 1530s, and it was then largest square in Northern Europe measuring c:a 140 * 140 meter. The square has a long history and is an important and emblematic space for the city of Malmö (a city situated in the south of Sweden of approximately 300.000 inhabitants). In 1978, Korosec-Serfaty (1982) did a thorough study of the square observing its everyday activities. Malmö was in the late 1970s an industrial city in crisis with a declining population. Perla Korosec-Serfaty study of Stortorget in Malmö, *The Main Square, Functions and Daily Uses of Stortorget, Malmö* (1982), summarizes a large empirical work made by "Study group on public squares" in 1978. This was around the time that the pedestrianisation of Malmö inner city started. Malmö was in the late 1970s an industrial city in crisis with a declining and ageing population. Today Malmö is a growing city and it is, together with Copenhagen, part of a large and growing European urban region. Comparing

Korosec-Serfaty's results with how the square is used today (2013), 35 years later, shows some interesting differences when it comes to territorial production.

First, it should be noted that the square of today looks remarkably similar to the square of 1978. The benches have a new design but are still there, a kiosk has been substituted for another one. In terms of more permanent territorial strategies (the roads, a statue, a fountain, a large parking lot, a pedestrianised area) things remains similar. One difference is, however, the introduction of temporary outdoor restaurants which today takes more than 600 sqm of the square. Another is the proliferation of temporary planned large-scale events. In 1977, most of the (167) newspaper articles reporting from the square mentions political gatherings and activities on the square (26 %). In 2012, the articles (119 all in all) tend to focus on collective celebrations (23 %). The new collective celebrations tend to be quite large scale week-long events such as *Malmöfestivalen* (the city festival) and *Musikhjälpen* (a fund-raising event), with concerts and cultural performances. A study made by the municipality of Malmö in 2008 shows that this eventalisation of the square also seems to be welcomed by the inhabitants (Malmö Stad 2008). In line with the process of eventalisation, a lot of the stores that were there on Stortorget during the 1970s (selling everyday things) have disappeared or given places to cafés and restaurants. Although the pedestrian precinct with hundred of shops starts here, the square itself has today just five shops (but fourteen in 1978). Perhaps this can be seen as signifier of how the square now is being turned into a specialized space for events – territorial strategies of a temporal nature, often dominating the square as a whole. In short then, the temporary territorial strategies have been added to the square together with a territorial association of the square as a place of events. What about territorial appropriations and tactics? One way of looking at this is to see changes in how people cluster on the square of people. From the comparison of an observation study made in 1978 (of 901 clusters) and that of a study made in 2013 (of 2079 clusters), one could see that the ratio of women walking alone has increased from 18 to 29 percent, although the square is still somewhat dominated by male presence. In terms of clustering one interesting change is that the number of adult couples has decreased with c:a 30 % and so has the number of people in groups of 3 or more adults. People primarily tend to appropriate the square on their own.

Comparing photographic studies of 1978 and 2013 (listing 4341 and 13798 users respectively), one can see that there is a smaller percentage of people sitting on the square today as the ratio of sitting people has gone from 45% to 21%. A higher percentage is walking and also a somewhat higher percentage is taking shorter breaks on the square. In all it seems as if people spending shorter time on the square on a regular day, people take shorter breaks (most of the talking on the phone, texting or taking photos), and tend to sit less and walk more. Although people certainly spend a lot of time on the square during the large and planned events, one could argue that it has become increasingly rare for larger groups to temporarily appropriate the square for non-official uses.

The territorial association of the square as a place of official activities would appear to have given way to the square as a place of events. The dominating role of the rhythms of the industrial city – including the role of the male-dominated workplaces

the retired people on their benches, the busy weekday rush hours and the calmer weekends – have, to a certain extent, been replaced by rhythms more strongly associated with consumer society. Stortorget thus seems to have found its role as a specialised place within the pedestrian precinct of Malmö. With a decreasing number of permanent activities, a faster pace and shorter pauses from temporary activities on the one hand, and an increasing frequency of prearranged temporary events on the other, Stortorget has come to play a double role. The square facilitates movement to, from and through the pedestrian precinct. Sometimes, during large events, it works as a strong and highly accessible if temporary magnet, but otherwise it acts as a facilitator of movement to other places than the square itself. The duration and ratio of temporary appropriations and tactics seem to have decreased since the 1978 study; instead, a larger ratio uses the square purely for thoroughfare movement. Furthermore, the temporary stays that do take place tend to be made more by individuals and less by groups, less by residents of the city centre and more by tourists, visiting shoppers and those eating lunch. The general pace has changed as well; and the activity during the working week tends to be more intense, its timeframe undergoing expansion with a colonisation of evenings and weekends. All these territorial changes are traceable at different temporal scales. The number of small artefacts and objects moved about and used on Stortorget has also increased, and these seem to affect the temporary use as well as how visitors temporarily claim space by way of tactics and appropriation on the square; for example, pausing while standing rather than sitting down. On a larger temporal scale, the role of territorial strategies in the form of advertisement campaigns, outdoor restaurants and large-scale events, lasting from a week to a whole season have increased.

Even if the material design and outline of Stortorget is fundamentally the same today as in 1978, the role of the material figures on the square has undergone transformations as human behaviour has changed, and new artefacts have come into play. For example, the podium of the statue of the riding king, located at the centre of the square, has become more important for eating, the Town hall benches for resting with bags, and the fountain has become more important for pausing with cell phones and cameras. The built environment of Malmö's Main Square might thus look the same today as in 1978, but the timespaces produced here do not. Counting territorial productions, it is perhaps impossible to discern a greater variety today, i.e. when it comes to the range of different time-space territorialisations. However, territorial complexity has decreased due to the increasing dominance and stabilisation of certain types of territorial productions (people walking by, scheduled events, etc.) and also due to an increase in verticality, where certain territorial strategies (such as major events) are made to manage a series of others.

***

One of the main points of the study above is to try to see public space as a complex, sensitive and transformative ecological system of territorial productions. Theories of urban design have often shown a tendency to address public life as a homogenous and general phenomena (e.g. Hillier 1996, Gehl 2010) where connections between isolated categories are made into universal truths, like: "doubling the amount of bench seating meant doubling the number of people seated" (Gehl and Svarre 2013:111), or that "spatial configuration correlates powerfully with observed

movement by both pedestrians and drivers" (Penn 2003:31). In one way or another, this approach has been dominant in public life studies from Jane Jacobs to Jan Gehl. Although full of good intentions, the effects of methods such as Gehl's and Hillier's seem to be an urban designs promoting homogenisation and universalisation. The present study seems instead to suggest that one must take more generic recipes for public space design with a grain of salt. The material figures of Malmö's Main Square are largely unaltered, but their actor roles change as they get new associations. A thorough development of a time-space territorology might be one way of studying public space use as a complex system, acknowledging that the territorial production of time-spaces are never static or independent, but always relational, interdependent and entangled in transformative processes. In studies of material culture, discrete objects such as clothes has been showed to play a fundamental part in how we use public spaces and the city (see for example Banerjee et. al. study of the Indian sari, 2003, or Sixtensson's study of women in veil in Malmö, 2009). The division of labor between researchers of urban design and morphology (focusing on buildings, streets, etc.) and researchers of material culture (focusing on artifacts), has unfortunately often resulted in that materialities are handled in different discourses depending on size rather than their role in a certain situation. One aim of a time-space territoriology is to map actors and objects based on their relevance for the territorializing situation, and this will necessarily includes actors, practices, materialities etc. of different sizes and relating to different scales. Material factors are indeed vital for the understanding all forms of co-existence. For example, our time is always shared with objects, things that perish – batteries that run out, coffee that gets cold, food that gets eaten, etc. Activities like texting, smoking and reading takes, time and demand the territorial appropriation or tactics of a time-space. Things – and this goes for all objects: a square, a bike, a cell phone, etc. – have their own autonomy, and thus also bring difference to situations in public space. However, the relation between materiality and use is never a simple one, it cannot be isolated as a direct relation between means and ends, or objects and subjects, instead it must be studied as part of an 'ecological' and multi-scalar landscape.

REFERENCES

Amin, A.2012. Land of Strangers, Cambridge, Polity.

Banerjee, M., Miller, D., Dixie, & Das, O. 2003. *The Sari*. Oxford: Berg.

Brighenti A.M. 2010. On Territorology. Toward a general science of territory, *Theory, Culture & Society* January 2010, 27, 1, 52-72

Certeau, M. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gehl, J., & Svarre, B. 2013. *How to study public life*. Washington: Island Press.

Hillier B 1996, *Space is the Machine*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kärrholm, Mattias 2012, *Retailising Space, Architecture, Retail and the Territorialisation of Public Space*, Farnham, Ashgate.

Korosec-Serfaty, Perla, 1982: *The Main Square, Functions and daily uses of Stortorget, Malmö,* Aris, Nova Series 1, Lund.

Malmberg, T. 1980. *Human Territoriality: Survey of behavioural territories in man with preliminary analysis and discussion of meaning*. The Hague: Mouton.

Penn, Alan. 2003. "Space syntax and spatial cognition or why the axial line?" *Environment and Behavior* 35.1: 30-65.

Sack, R.D. 1986. *Human Territoriality, It's Theory and History,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Sixtensson J. 2009. *Hemma och främmande i staden, kvinnor med slöja berättar,* Malmö University, Malmö.