



# Kong at the Gates: guerrilla urbanism and the possibility of resistance

Gordon Douglas<sup>1</sup>

© Springer Nature Limited 2020

This special issue of *Urban Design International* brings together six diverse new studies on this phenomenon referred to as guerrilla urbanism, or insurgent public space, or urban hacking, or spatial reclaiming, or do-it-yourself, grassroots, pop-up, etc., urbanism. The pieces are each valuable contributions on their own, and push the discourse ahead. Perhaps the most important takeaway is just the incredible diversity of understandings and applications of the concept itself. From historic preservation to anti-gentrification activism and efforts at participatory design, we see guerrilla urbanisms hard at work in many contexts.

The issue also presents an excellent opportunity, however, to reflect upon this subject itself. This is especially true given that our editor is Jeffrey Hou and that it is ten years since the publication of one of the earliest and most influential collections of writing on these phenomena from the perspective of urban design, his *Insurgent Public Space: Guerrilla Urbanism and the Remaking of Contemporary Cities*. This edited volume, featuring an important introduction by Hou and contributions from the likes of James Rojas, Laura Lawson, Blaine Merker and others, in many ways set the stage for research like that collected here in *UDI*. It was certainly among the very first introductions to these ideas that I ever came across, and remains the go-to reference on the subject, especially within the architecture, design, and planning literature.

Much has changed in the ten years since *Insurgent Public Space* was released. Especially significant, as Hou rightly points out in his introduction to this issue, has been the transition of informal, transgressive, and sometimes illegal interventions into more mainstream planning and development. Not only has tactical urbanism (etc.) itself been employed as an approach by city planning and transportation departments big and small, but the tactics and aesthetics of even

scrappy, small-scale DIY efforts have found their way into the parklets, plazas, and pop-up marketplaces of new economic development schemes (see also Mould 2014, Douglas 2018, Finn and Douglas 2019). And the priorities reflected in these urban design interventions, especially among some of their more privileged practitioners, sometimes seem to be more about softening the edges of an increasingly middle class city than making needed changes or challenging the status quo. So the idea pressed in this issue of *Urban Design International*—to return our focus to the *counter-hegemonic potential* of guerrilla urbanisms—is thus almost counter-intuitive.

What do we talk about when we talk about informal urban space interventions through the particular language of insurgence and guerrilla urbanism? The association, of course, is of resistance, rebellion, and the road to revolution. Is there any possibility here of meaningful resistance or societal transformation through creative interventions in public space? This idea is set up by Hou in his introduction rather explicitly in contrast to officially sanctioned tactical urbanism. Certainly he is correct that the most prominent interventions to capture attention in the public sphere—whether community-building tactical urbanism, professionally designed creative placemaking efforts, or the hip appeal of nonetheless-still-illegal guerrilla bicycle lanes—still represent only a fraction of the informal urbanisms by which people around the world are constantly making and remaking their built environments. Those we may hear less about, those we are less inclined to immediately celebrate, those crafted without permission under cover of night by communitarian anarchists, or out of necessity in the harsh light of day by people poor in capital but rich in creativity—those may well be more insurgent in some important ways. This special issue presents many such instances that ought to be more recognized for their potential to challenge mainstream urban design, lodge protest, and improve access and daily life for those without privilege.

Still, the question always nagging in my mind is whether *any* of this rises to the level of meaningful resistance, much less transformation, in the ways that we should want or

✉ Gordon Douglas  
gordon.douglas@sjsu.edu

<sup>1</sup> Department of Urban and Regional Planning, San Jose State University, One Washington Square, WSQ 216, San Jose, CA 95192, USA



expect from our counter-hegemonic struggles. I have long felt that the DIY urban design interventions that I have studied do not rise to this level, even as I have wanted to see a way forward them as at least evident of critical consciousness and of a desire for change. To some extent, it is a question of degrees and definitions and metrics. And while many thinkers have grappled with the big questions of resistance and critique, and some have ably connected them to urban space and to particular actions thereupon, we are without a satisfying theory of what meaningful resistance should look like at the level of small-scale urban space interventions. I do not propose to craft one in a few pages here. But it is worth indulging in a bit of a theoretical diversion, with hopes of at least getting closer and being surer of ourselves in labeling any of these actions “guerrilla urbanism” in the first place, and thereby better understanding their implications for urban design theory and practice.

The premise we are given in Hou’s introduction to the present collection is a great place to start: “short-term, unsanctioned and unscripted activities can begin to intersect with sustained, organized actions of resistance that lead to substantive and transformative outcomes”. Interestingly, that sounds a lot like tactical urbanism—which Lydon and his collaborators (e.g. 2012, 2015) have defined as “short-term actions for long-term change.” However there are two key differences. First, Hou makes clear we are looking at the unsanctioned.<sup>1</sup> This matters because the unsanctioned or unauthorized suggests an element of subaltern pranking, à la Debord and Wolman’s (1956) *détournement*, de Certeau’s (1984) *perruque*, or Ferrel’s (2001) urban anarchy. It suggests perhaps some critical consciousness. Lydon would note that tactical urbanism can be either sanctioned or unsanctioned—it is a method anyone can use, not a particular design or policy process—but much of the work under this moniker has been increasingly done with approval and even by professional hands. The word “unscripted” in Hou’s definition takes this further, alluding to the collective “non-movements” described by Bayat (2013), the critical significance that de Certeau (1984) gives to a walker’s meandering “spatial turn of phrase,” or the unspoken everyday resistance of Scott’s (1985) peasants. Still, this is far from anything resembling what both Hou and Lydon might happily agree to call “long-term change,” and all the more so if the long-term change desired is not only a safer or more livable streetscape, but some sort of societal transformation.

What is our guerrilla urbanist insurgency actually in struggle against? Well Hou (via Maraftab) suggests it is hegemony, which in urban space contexts must be, at the risk of gross oversimplification, something like the “capitalist

city” (or “urban life under capitalism”) and the various facets of neoliberal planning, politics, and development that mainly define it.<sup>2</sup> Even if we set aside more meta-level Marxist theories of domination and false consciousness, we might agree that modern capitalist society is one in which people’s lives are largely defined and constrained by our political-economic system and other historical structures of power/oppression, and our culture, politics, and environment dominated by elite actors seeking wealth accumulation and profit maximization. Our urban landscape too is unquestionably shaped heavily by the market, the desires and fears of powerful elites, and a professional bureaucracy (including much urban planning and design) working in their service.<sup>3</sup>

Conceivably, informal urbanisms could stand to challenge this situation in some ways. But capitalism is also dynamic, full and accommodating of all the counter-normative expressions, playful transgressions, and desperate struggles of twenty-first century urban life, and, to borrow the words of Marcuse (1964), a “comfortable, smooth, reasonable democratic unfreedom.” Can even a radical provocation of the use or design of urban space hope to challenge, much less transform, this system? Certainly Marcuse and the Frankfurt School theorists saw little hope in the avant-garde or other acts of cultural rebelliousness.<sup>4</sup> Simply recognizing the conditions of our own oppression, as Gramsci might have put it, or producing avant-garde acts of creative disruption of the sort examined by Adorno and others, was and remains a long way off from the sort of mass critical consciousness required to challenge hegemony or foment social revolution. The closest they came—especially Benjamin (e.g. 1986 [1929]) and, late in his life, even Adorno (2001 [1969])—was to acknowledge some potential in acts of critical cultural awareness to “eventually help to turn free time into freedom proper” (Adorno 2001 [1969], p. 197). So it seems difficult to attribute any greater qualities of resistance to insurgent public spaces than to, say, Dadaism or jazz. But perhaps this is a nonetheless helpful way of understanding small acts of guerrilla urbanism as critiques of the mainstream that might at least be meaningful to their own creators and even those directly impacted by them.

This is where Lefebvre is usefully brought in. A key conceptual framing for any discussion of the counter-hegemonic potential of guerrilla urbanism must be the dialectical nature of both everyday life and urban space, for which we are

<sup>1</sup> This is a distinction I also make for DIY urbanism in my own work, e.g. Douglas (2014, 2018).

<sup>2</sup> Even this takes a leap. We know that capitalist urban space is rife with all manner of creative expression and transgression, both formal and informal.

<sup>3</sup> Countless references might be made here, from Marx himself to Lukacs (e.g. 1971), Gramsci (1971), and the Frankfurt School theorists, to the likes of Neil Smith (1996) and most recently Samuel Stein (2019).

<sup>4</sup> See Cook (2009) for a helpful overview.



indebted especially to Lefebvre. To him, everyday life is a realm of alienation, yet it is also through critical engagement with everyday life that one might reclaim it and transform it; urban space is where the hegemony of ‘far order’ structural economic and political domination is at its starkest and space is organized most explicitly for state control and the production of capital, yet the urban is where the ‘far order’ and the ‘near order’ of everyday experience come together. So we might be confident that the urban everyday is at least the right place to wage the struggle for the critical cultural awareness described above. And Lefebvre argued that the radical transformation of society could *only* be achieved through the transformation of the everyday (2008a [1947]). “The critique of everyday life,” he writes, “implies criticism of the trivial by the exceptional—but at the same time criticism of the exceptional by the trivial, of the ‘elite’ by the mass...” (Ibid, p. 251). This sounds very much like an understanding of insurgent public space—of the exceptional nature of everyday urbanism—and lends some support for the idea that even small transgressions, insignificant on their own, are nonetheless steps in the right direction.

Of particular relevance may be Lefebvre’s emphases on joy, the art of living, and what he called “exceptional moments” that disrupt the everyday and can lead to critical consciousness. Built out of the ideas of Leibniz, Hegel, and Marx,<sup>5</sup> these “moments” are painfully vague and rather poorly defined by Lefebvre, but the important components can be drawn out. Having tangled with the concept in a couple pieces of prior writing, in 1961 Lefebvre offered a “theory of moments” in which shared exceptional experiences like love, play, and festival hold within them “the attempt to achieve the total realization of a possibility” (2008b [1961], p. 348). He noted years later that some moments seek to “transform daily life through poetry” (2008c [1981], p. 172). “Just as alienation reflected an *absence*, a dead moment empty of critical content,” explains Merrifield (2006, p. 29), “the Lefebvrian moment signified a *presence*, a fullness, alive and connected.” And these moments, not only of love and play, but elsewhere crucially also of work, struggle, artistic expression, and creative production, represent the possibility of shared, imprecise-but-mutually recognizable memes of experience that serve as potentially liberating *exceptions to the everyday* that are nonetheless born of the everyday. As others have pointed out, the Lefebvrian moment can be seen as somewhat analogous to (and even

inspirational of) “the situation” of Guy Debord and the Situationists, with whom Lefebvre was in frequent discourse.<sup>6</sup>

Like Gramsci and others, Lefebvre disputed the idea that simply subverting the everyday will lead to consciousness of ‘real life’ (as the Surrealists and Situationists seemed to suggest) and he was often unsure of the chances for success even through his own philosophy of praxis. Furthermore, Lefebvre (2008a, p. 151) argued that “Consciousness must be gained over and over again through action and struggle as well as through organizations whose role is to penetrate everyday life.” The prospect of the masses participating in this critique and building an ultimate “total moment” of revolutionary transformation is, for him, a remote one. But one thing that became clear to Lefebvre was that if this moment is to happen, it is likely to happen through urban space. “‘To change life,’ ‘to change society,’” he wrote, “these phrases mean nothing if there is no production of an appropriated space” (2009, p. 186). Lefebvre ultimately added additional problematics to his critical analysis (notably the state, which he also considered heavily in spatial terms, and information and technology) but in all cases returned to the urban and the everyday. In *The Urban Revolution* (1970, p. 92), Lefebvre offered the following appraisal of the city under advanced capitalism and the need for its transformation as part of the revolutionary project, an appraisal that could serve as a rallying cry for the insurgent contesting or reclaiming of urban space:

“Space becomes increasingly rare—it is expensive, a luxury and privilege maintained and kept up through a practice (the “center”) and various strategies. The city does indeed grow richer. It attracts wealth and monopolizes culture just as it concentrates power. But it collapses under the weight of its wealth. [...] If there is a connection between social relationships and space, between places and human groups, we must, if we are to establish cohesion, radically modify the structure of space”.

In considering these perspectives from twentieth century Marxian theory, we can see connections to both the promise and the limitations of guerrilla urbanism. On the one hand, no, guerrilla urbanism cannot promise the transformative potency that we might wish for our greatest moments of radical critique and counter-hegemonic resistance. To some extent, of course it can’t—just as the entirety of, say, late 1960s counter-cultural revolts didn’t change the system either. Yet we can see the value of these small actions

<sup>5</sup> Merrifield (2006, p. 29) succinctly describes the significance of “moments” for Hegel and Marx: “All dialectical movement progressed through different moments: moments of skeptical, negative consciousness defined history for Hegel; moments of contradictory unity defined and structured capitalism for Marx. All reality for both thinkers was momentary, transient, in motion, in fluid state, whether as an idea or as material reality.”

<sup>6</sup> See for instance Trebitsch (2008 [2002]) and Merrifield (2006, 2008). However, while Lefebvre ultimately criticized Debord and the Situationists, the theory of moments was criticized by Debord himself for, among other things, its aspatiality.



nonetheless, perhaps most fundamentally as evidence of some individual or maybe community-level consciousness and critique of dominant norms and assumptions, which is powerful in itself.

More importantly, there are other ways to think about what matters most for changing the status quo beyond the frameworks of a handful of midcentury European men.

Guerrilla actions that challenge the many racial and gendered inequities, exclusions, and violences of public space, for instance, can do a great deal to confront the worst of deeply entrenched norms just by happening at all. The emerging discourse of mobility justice in scholarship and activism points to the critical significance of making streets safe, accessible, and free of race, class, and gender-based obstacles, enclosure, and violence, (e.g. Hoffmann 2016; Lee et al. 2016; Lugo et al. 2017; Carpio 2019). Theorist Mimi Sheller (2018) extends this to a crisis of movement writ large, from local mobilities to global scales of migration and displacement, but again focuses on rights to access and freedom of movement at the urban scale as being key to challenging these crises. What is more insurgent than demanding the right to be safe on public streets not only from cars, but from rape and police violence? This should be of great interest to urban design theorists and practitioners alike. And guerrilla urbanism can work toward it.

We know too that the very act of *being* in public space—when the bodies doing the being do not fit with white, masculine, affluent expectations—can challenge assumptions, stoke fears, assert rights and identities, and cause others to think. These actions may not uproot the hegemony of empire or end white supremacy, but they can be emancipatory for those—usually non-white, non-male, and under-resourced—who are in varying ways excluded from public space and thus from full citizenship (see e.g. Kotef 2015). And all of these are things that guerrilla urbanisms of various sorts have been doing, indeed they are many of the insurgent public spaces featured by Hou in 2010 and again here in this volume. This too offers a promising pathway for urban design, scholarship and practice to engage with these practices and their generative potential.

Especially relevant also are theories of lived and enacted “everyday utopianism.” Cooper (2014, pp. 2–3) describes the significance of such everyday utopias themselves, which exist not through sweeping systemic or institutional change but by “creating the change they wish to encounter, building and forging new ways of experiencing social and political life.” In so doing, they can “contribute to a transformative politics specifically through the concepts they actualize and imaginatively evoke.”<sup>7</sup> Guerrilla urbanisms that make

change through enacting it can thus be deeply meaningful for the individuals and groups involved, can challenge the status quo with their very existence, and may even suggest ways forward for urban design. More practically speaking, there is in fact tremendous value in those projects that suggest—to co-opt an urban planning term—locally preferred alternatives. Because of course this is what insurgent public spaces really are! And here, guerrilla urbanism comes back around to the roots of tactical urbanism, roots which I would argue are certainly shared. Because even if an action itself is not transformative, it can suggest ideas that can lead to change. The point would be that it need not always be “tactical” to be influential. Simply by happening, it can begin to make change.

Street vending in Los Angeles, as described in this issue by Kim and Crisman, happened in countless independent iterations to powerfully shape cultural norms in the city before grassroots organization and a confluence of political factors led to its legalization. This demonstrates the profound impact that adaptive and agile policymaking can have when working to accommodate the potential of guerrilla urbanism, but also the influence that these myriad tiny transgressions had on changing how people there understand urban space in the first place. And this recalls another Los Angeles example, from Hou’s original *Insurgent Public Space* collection: the simple, profound meaning-making-through-place-making of what James Rojas (2010) calls Latino urbanism—countless tiny acts of cultural expression and repossession in the built environment that amount to a whole cultural vernacular inscribed on the landscape of Southern California. Sure, as such things are legalized or normalized, they become that much less “insurgent,” strictly speaking. But the cultural expression of a minority group, and the sense of freedom and power that comes with expressing it, however, quietly and despite other forms of oppression or marginalization that may remain, is a real example of the “art of living” and the emancipatory value of making one’s surroundings one’s own.<sup>8</sup>

For me, perhaps the biggest hope for a guerrilla urbanism that could be truly changemaking—and that is desperately needed—is the urbanism of the unhoused. People experiencing homelessness are among the most marginalized in the world, yet they are increasingly visible, especially right now in many American cities. Connecting back not only to Hou’s

Footnote 7 (continued)

not only that the means of achieving a desired revolutionary outcome must be consistent with that outcome, but that those means are as important or even equivalent to the ends. See also Yates (2015) and Ackhurst (2019) for further relevant discussion.

<sup>8</sup> Genevieve Carpio (2019) takes this farther, arguing that culturally inflected uses of place—along with racist restrictions on that use—amount to the social construction of racial identity.



<sup>7</sup> In these ways guerrilla urbanism is also reflective of the concept of “prefiguration” in revolutionary movements, à la Boggs (1977), Rowbotham (1979), Breines (1980) and others, including the philosophical practice of actually existing anarchism, all of which emphasize



*Insurgent Public Space* but also Holston's (1998) "insurgent citizenship," I can think of no urban design or place-making more insurgent and subaltern than the efforts of the unhoused to build for themselves not only shelter, but place and community. Each act of doing so offers some shred of empowerment to its practitioners; were informal settlement to become normalized or even legalized, it could transform housing, land value, the city, the system. (At the very least, as this particular struggle becomes a rising challenge for the field of urban design, those working to address it would be wise to view the guerrilla urbanism of the unhoused not as simply a problem to solve, but perhaps also a worthy source of inspiration in how best to solve it.)

Unquestionably, the concepts of the insurgent, guerrilla, tactical, pop-up, and DIY at work in the design of public space remain incredibly fruitful analytically—and, I hope, politically and pragmatically. In her work on "utopia as method," Ruth Levitas (2013) argues that in the course of any struggle for transformation there is a need for recognition of the value of the everyday steps taken along the way. Because even if they are not clear ordinal progressive steps forward as in a mechanical production process, they still matter in a more organic sense of movement, inspiration, and hope. So if I remain inclined toward skepticism of the truly transformative counter-hegemonic potential of many unauthorized urban space interventions, it is clear that they can be of great value. First, as personally or culturally meaningful actions in and of themselves, also symbolically as challenges to the status quo that may cause others to stop and think, and perhaps even functionally as small steps in the direction of a better society, or at least better urban space.

## References

- Ackhurst, Molly. 2019. Everyday Moments of Disruption: Navigating Towards Utopia. *Studies in Arts and Humanities Journal* 5 (1): 115–128.
- Adorno, Theodor. 2001/1969. Free Time. In *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, ed. J.M. Bernsetein. Routledge Classics Edition. Trans. G. Finlayson, and N. Walker. London: Routledge.
- Bayat, Asef. 2013. *Life as Politics: How Ordinary People Change the Middle East*, 2nd ed. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Benjamin, Walter. 1986/1929. Surrealism: The Last Snapshot of the European Intelligentsia. In *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings*, ed. P. Demetz. New York: Schocken.
- Boggs, Carl. 1977. Marxism, Prefigurative Communism, and the Problem of Workers' Control. *Radical America* 11 (November).
- Breines, Wini. 1980. Community and Organization: The New Left and Michels' 'Iron Law'. *Social Problems* 27 (4): 419–429.
- Carpio, Genevieve. 2019. *Collisions at the Crossroads: How Place and Mobility Make Race*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Cook, James W. 2009. The Return of the Culture Industry. In *The Cultural Turn in U.S. History: Past, Present, and Future*, ed. J.W. Cook, L.B. Glickman, and M. O'Malley. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Cooper, Davina. 2014. *Everyday Utopias: The Conceptual Life of Promising Spaces*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- de Certeau, Michel. 1984/1980. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. S. Rendall. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Debord, Guy, and Gil J. Wolman. 1956. Mode d'emploi du détournement. *Les Lèvres Nues* 8: 3.
- Douglas, Gordon C.C. 2014. Do-It-Yourself Urban Design: The Social Practice of Informal 'Improvement' Through Unauthorized Alteration. *City & Community* 13 (1): 5–25.
- Douglas, Gordon C.C. 2018. *The Help-Yourself City: Legitimacy and Inequality in DIY Urbanism*. London and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ferrell, Jeff. 2001. *Tearing Down the Streets: Adventures in Urban Anarchy*. New York: Palgrave.
- Finn, Donovan, and Gordon Douglas. 2019. DIY Urbanism. In *A Research Agenda for New Urbanism*, ed. E. Talen. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Trans. Q. Hoare, and G. Nowell-Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- Hoffman, Melody. 2016. *Bike Lanes are White Lanes: Bicycle Advocacy and Urban Planning*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Holston, James. 1998. Spaces of Insurgent Citizenship. In *Making the Invisible Visible: A Multicultural Planning History*, ed. L. Sandercock. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hou, Jeffrey, ed. 2010. *Insurgent Public Space: Guerrilla Urbanism and the Remaking of Contemporary Cities*. New York: Routledge.
- Kotef, Hagar. 2015. *Movement and the Ordering of Freedom: On Liberal Governances of Mobility*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Lee, Do J., Helen Ho, Melyssa Banks, Mario Giampieri, Xiaodeng Chen, and Dorothy Le. 2016. Delivering (In)Justice: Food Delivery Cyclists in New York City. In *Bicycle Justice and Urban Transformation: Biking for All?* ed. A. Golub, M. Hoffmann, A. Lugo, and G. Sandoval. London: Routledge.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 2008a/1947. *Critique of Everyday Life Vol. I: Introduction*, 2nd ed. Trans. J. Moore. London and New York: Verso.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 2008b/1961. *Critique of Everyday Life Vol. II: Foundations for a Sociology of the Everyday*. Trans. J. Moore. London and New York: Verso.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 2008c/1981. *Critique of Everyday Life Vol. III: From Modernity to Modernism*. Trans. G. Elliot. London and New York: Verso.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 2009/1979. Space: Social Product and Use Value. In *State, Space, World: Selected Essays*, ed. N. Brenner, and S. Elden. Trans. J.W. Freiberg. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Levitas, Ruth. 2013. *Utopia as Method: The Imaginary Reconstitution of Society*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Lugo, Adonia, Naomi Doerner, Do Lee, Sarah McCullough, Sahra Sulaiman, and Carolyn Szczepanski. *Untokening 1.0—Principles of Mobility Justice*. <https://www.untokening.org/updates/2017/11/11/untokening-10-principles-of-mobility-justice>. Accessed 1 Nov 2019
- Lukács, Georg. 1971. *History and Class Consciousness: Studies in Marxist Dialectics*. Trans. R. Livingstone. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lydon, Mike. 2012. *Tactical Urbanism: Short-Term Action, Long-Term Change*. Vol. 2, Published Online 2 March. [https://issuu.com/streetsplanscollaborative/docs/tactical\\_urbanism\\_vol\\_2\\_final](https://issuu.com/streetsplanscollaborative/docs/tactical_urbanism_vol_2_final). Accessed 21 Oct 2019
- Lydon, Mike, and Anthony Garcia. 2015. *Tactical Urbanism: Short-Term Action for Long-Term Change*. Washington, DC: Island.



- Marcuse, Herbert. 1964. *One-Dimensional Man*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Merrifield, Andy. 2006. *Henri Lefebvre: A Critical Introduction*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Merrifield, Andy. 2008. Lefebvre and Debord: A Faustian Fusion. In *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*, ed. K. Goonewardena et al. New York and London: Routledge.
- Mould, Oli. 2014. Tactical Urbanism: The New Vernacular of the Creative City. *Geography Compass*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12146>.
- Rojas, James. 2010. Latino Urbanism in Los Angeles: A Model for Urban Improvisation and Reinvention. In *Insurgent Public Space: Guerrilla Urbanism and the Remaking of Contemporary Cities*, ed. J. Hou. New York: Routledge.
- Rowbotham, Sheila. 1979. The Women's Movement and Organizing for Socialism. In *Beyond The Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism*, ed. S. Rowbotham, L. Segal, and H. Wainwright. London: Merlin Press.
- Scott, James C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Sheller, Mimi. 2018. *Mobility Justice: The Politics of Movement in an Age of Extremes*. London and Brooklyn: Verso.
- Smith, Neil. 1996. *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. New York: Routledge.
- Stein, Samuel. 2019. *Capital City: Gentrification and the Real Estate State*. London and Brooklyn: Verso.
- Trebitsch 2008/2002. Preface: The Moment of Radical Critique. In *Critique of Everyday Life Vol. II: Foundations for a Sociology of the Everyday*, ed. H. Lefebvre. Trans. G. Elliot. London and New York: Verso.
- Yates, Luke. 2015. Rethinking Prefiguration: Alternatives, Micropolitics and Goals in Social Movements. *Social Movement Studies* 14 (1): 1–21.

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

