

## **Mobilities, futures and the city**

Towards a reflexive methodology for urban planning in the mobile risk society

Freudental-Pedersen, Malene; Kesselring, Sven

*Publication date:*  
2015

*Document Version*  
Early version, also known as pre-print

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Freudental-Pedersen, M., & Kesselring, S. (2015). *Mobilities, futures and the city: Towards a reflexive methodology for urban planning in the mobile risk society*. Roskilde Universitet.

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [rucforsk@kb.dk](mailto:rucforsk@kb.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# MOBILITIES, FUTURES & THE CITY

TOWARDS A REFLEXIVE METHODOLOGY FOR URBAN PLANNING IN THE MOBILE RISK SOCIETY

EVALUATION REPORT / PHASE 3 / MAY 2015

Sven Kesselring & Malene Freudendal-Pedersen





# CONTENT

1. Introduction .....	3
2: The dialectics of distance and emotions .....	5
3: Selction of participants .....	8
4: Building trust and focusing the work .....	10
5: Changing perspectives: Innovation and critique .....	14
6: Planning as a social process and storytelling.....	17
7: Reflexive mobilities .....	19
8. Concluding remarks: It needs 'an ifrastructure, a framework and a perspective'.....	21
7. Literature .....	23



# 1. INTRODUCTION

In December 2013 the project Mobilities Futures & the City (MFC) has been originally launched and started. In fact the discussions between the Mobile Lives Forum and the project team started much earlier, about two years before. An earlier version was discussed and been drafted into a first proposal. In this pre-version the project consisted out of a series of five workshops and a performance event based on the first four workshops.

Against this background the current project needs to be considered as a scaled down version of the first proposal, which the team delivered to the Forum in summer 2012. The Mobilities Futures & the City project as it finally has been realized thus elaborates on one element cut out of a bigger concept and it is focusing on the methodological aspects and potentials of a reflexive approach in urban planning. The MFC project was re-designed as a methodological experiment and a sort of proof case on how to provide a trustful, inspiring and productive framework for working on the future of sustainable mobilities in contemporary cities.

## THEORIES AND EMPIRICAL FRAMEWORK

MFC aims for exploring innovative ways for the transdisciplinary re-thinking of cities and their mobilities. As described in deliverable 1 MFC's theoretical and methodological approach has been conceptualized by using different disciplines and research traditions: first, the interdisciplinary 'new mobilities paradigm' (Hannam, Sheller & Urry 2006); second, the sociological theory of reflexive modernization and the mobile risk society (Beck, Hajer & Kesselring 1999; Beck 2008; Kesselring 2008); third, the argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning by Fischer & Forrester (1993) including Hajer's (2003) 'argumentative discourse analysis' and fourth, the 'future workshop method' by Jungk & Müllert (1987).

MFC takes these resources as a point of departure and forms a workshop concept that enables the participants to work – literally – in an inter- and trans-disciplinary environment. The following pages bring together the lessons learned from the different phases of the project. This document is based on the project team's internal evaluation of the workshops and the method, an evaluation questionnaire sent out right after the workshops and two evaluation dinners, one in Copenhagen in March 2015 and the other



in Munich in May 2015. The evaluation dinners have been structured by the same ordered sequence of questions and recorded on tape. The recorded time during each dinner was about 2.5 hours (interestingly enough Copenhagen was 2.35 and Munich 2.34 hours). The collected data has been transcribed and coded by following a routine developed within earlier qualitative research such as in Kesselring (2001) and Freudendal-Pedersen (2009). The data analysis applied in the evaluation goes back to Goffman's frame analysis and uses Hajer's pragmatic discourse analysis to extract major perceptions of the social reality discussed within the group situation of the evaluation dinner.

As we wrote in deliverable 2 the heart piece of the project was the two workshops in Denmark (Lungholm) and Germany (Frauenchiemsee). But before we finalized the workshop concepts the whole project team (including the PhD student Line Thorup) had an intense working phase of discussing Jungk & Müllert's approach and redesigning it for the project's specific needs and circumstances. We broadly detailed the modifications made on the Jungk & Müllert concept in deliverable 1 and 2. The timeline on p. 63 in deliverable 1 shows that we consider the 'Reflexive Methodology' as part of a tradition that began with Jungk's work in the 1950s.

The following evaluation is ordered in six chapters capturing the essential methodological aspects of the project. It ends with a concluding chapter that presents some general thought on how to set up a sustainable planning and deliberation process.

## 2. THE DIALECTICS OF DISTANCE AND EMOTIONS

The locations for the two workshops have been chosen carefully. For both places we needed to be a least an hour away from Copenhagen/Munich to create the best opportunities for intense and undisturbed work. For the Danish workshop we relied on recommendations of people who had earlier used the place. For the Munich location we also had recommendations and went for a field trip in advance to experience the island and the abbey. We also talked with the person in charge. We wanted to secure that the conditions were guaranteed that we considered as being necessary for the success of the work. In both cases the participants were more than positive on the places chosen.

But of course it is an open question if the intentions you have in advance get realized and meet the expectations and the conditions the participants bring in. The reasons why we decided for these two places have been based on earlier experiences we collected with future workshops. But in fact none of us has organized a five days workshop like this before. Therefore one of the key questions we had for the evaluation was how the participants assessed the places.

It was interesting to see that as well during the Copenhagen evaluation dinner as the Munich one our questions for how they experienced the place stimulated some almost philosophical reflections on time and space, physical and social distance and the culture of 'here and there'. The following formulation of a member of the local Munich transport provider stands for most of the comments:

'(...) I think one of the reasons why the workshops actually worked has been the setting of this environment. In this sense it was a good choice to go there. Before I thought why do they have to go there?! It's so long to get there (...). I was really skeptical but in the end it was the setting that made it possible and there wasn't much distraction.'

We made specific efforts to create environments where the participants didn't have to consider any practical issues but could just spend all their energy on being present in



the workshop. This obviously matched with the needs and perceptions of the participants:

‘It’s been about the environment. Not only the castle but about being away and at a place where everything works, together with this random combination of people or maybe not random combination of people that I would never ever have access to. People you meet normally are your friends or people in your field and this never happens, the sort of exclusiveness that was, I am going back to how amazing this is and I may think this may never happen again in my life.’

This also quickly became clear when already during the first day most participants left their cell phones in their rooms. Both places have been quite secluded and the German workshop has been organized even on an island. One of the artists from the Munich workshop started out a long reflection on what he called the ‘dialectics of distance and emotions’. He said:

‘When we were on the island, it was very funny to speak about mobility and about communication. I didn’t phone before eleven at night, it was also difficult to keep a line and, because (...) on an island you feel the normal *dialectics of distance and emotions*.’

By putting up this point he refers to Stendhal’s ‘Chartreuse de Parme’, which was a very important book for him when he was younger. Stendhal (1783-1843), describes there how

‘the emotions between the big lovers increase a lot, when he was in prison and couldn’t keep in contact with his wife. He could only see her through the windows. And this is the typical *dialectics of emotions*, because you have to be really separated from each other to really imagine the other person. When you are always in contact everything is superficial and you don’t have time to go inside yourself to grow up with this association of emotions.’

He uses these considerations to follow up with some general remarks on time and space and the sociotemporal structurations of contemporary urban lives. He said:

'I think this kind of dialectics [that Stendhal describes in his works from the late 18<sup>th</sup> century] is nearly impossible now. Or it's like..., you don't feel it, maybe not impossible but possible in a completely different way. Today, Stendhal would arrive totally different, in a totally different way.'

This passage of the evaluation in Munich initiated an intense conversation amongst the participants. Someone came up with a story from the time when she was studying abroad (in a South American country) and that at this time she was completely disconnected from her main social contacts back home. This was before the time of the Internet, or at least the Internet as we know. Skype wasn't an option while today it has become a mode of communication and virtual mobility on an everyday basis. She reported that her sister, eight years younger, came into a quite different situation a few years later. She said:

'She never really went away, although she lived also in South America for a while. She kept all her close contacts by using the Internet'.

By saying this she followed also with some deep considerations on the dialectics of mobility, emotions and distance. She said:

'Physical mobility doesn't mean – now with all the modern means of communication – as a consequence that you move emotionally. You can physically move and emotionally stay where you've been before. For a certain time. After a few years it will probably change. But it is possible to not move emotionally but to move physically.'

The interesting aspect of this quote is that the whole reflection was stimulated by a couple of questions on the quality of the place and the basic conditions of the location. It shows the specific quality of the workshops and the high reflexive level reached amongst the members of the groups. Later in the evaluation we will refer to this by mentioning the meaning of trust for the results and the quality within the working process. Supported by the two secluded places the group has been run through a process that we call 'building common ground' (see deliverable 1 and 2). By going to the places the group has been somehow tied together in a way that deep reflections like these have become part of their common interaction culture and practice – also after the workshops. We consider this as a fundamental goal that has been reached to achieve a certain amount of social sustainability of the working process.



### 3. SELCTION OF PARTICIPANTS

In the same way as the place we gave a lot of thoughts and efforts to the selection of participants. The goal of the evaluation questionnaire and the dinner was to estimate or measure the quality of the constellation of people by the participants themselves. In the same way as the place the questions stimulated a couple of reflection beyond and the opportunity has been used to consider inter-disciplinarity and cross-disciplinarity.

A designer from the Danish workshop mentioned the fact that ‘as a designer I am used to draw but not that much to talk. But in this setting with all these different people I talked a lot.’

Following up on this a Danish architect emphasized the meaning of language and the fact that the interdisciplinary constellation of people enforced in some ways that

‘I have learned a lot about language. At the first days, I am usually good at talking about architecture in a language that everybody understands. But when I was talking, you guys looked at me as if you didn’t understand. And if we are working in such trans-disciplinary environments we need to be better aware of what language we are using. Afterwards I had a couple of experiences where I was more sensitized of the language I was using and tried to be more precise and careful. This was a very good experience.’

We actually expected it to be difficult to gather these different people and we had been prepared for some interventions and additional exercises to take care of an equal communication and participation situation for all people involved in the workshop. But the following quote represents the general line of argument within the two groups in relation to the selection of participants:

‘During these days a lot of potentials became visible, and this was **because** we all have so different perspectives.’

But at the same time, by looking back, the general problem of the workshops became obvious and he said:



‘Fair enough to say the problem was not to bring us all together for the workshop and make us work together. This problem has been solved. The problem is how to keep these potentials staying and discussing together sustainably. It is difficult to bring [this experience on the island] together with our daily work and routine.’

The question, this can be summarized from the evaluation, wasn’t managing the inter-disciplinarity of the groups. The statements on this have been unambiguously positive. It has been said that the team

‘...succeeded in creating a situation that was friendly and playful and professional at the same time’ and that ‘it was amazing that we so easily and fast came to a certain amount of consensus’.

But the problem that has to be solved for the future is ‘how to keep it somehow actual what we did.’

Part of this - and this is actually the most pointed critique raised throughout the evaluation materials - is that

‘Sometimes I think and would wish we had also spend some more time on difficult issues where we didn’t go together and disagreed and where I felt at that time that we went too quickly over the things where we disagreed’.

## 4. BUILDING TRUST AND FOCUSING THE WORK

The main purpose of the MFC project was to figure out, if we can provide a setting where an interdisciplinary group of people can work together on the question of how to develop sustainable mobilities for the city for the future. One of the key assumptions grounding the work was that trustful social relations between all participants are the basis for all this. In other words, the capacity of a group to ‘think out of the box’ strongly depends from the stability and reliability of its social relations. This doesn’t mean that better results can be obtained when the group knows each other for years. The challenging task is much more to build up trust amongst strangers or even people that aren’t very close to each other.

For Giddens (2006) the major problem for modern societies in the age of reflexive modernization is the loss of traditional forms of trust and the belief in the others’ power to positively shape the future. At the same time he says that it’s not a hopeless project to re-establish new ligatures. But those and the relevant stakeholder networks need to be invented ‘beyond left and right’. They need to be empowered to become deliberative institutions where policy innovations can happen. This fits together with the new theories for the transition of modern societies towards sustainability. These approaches would probably label it as the necessity to sustain and nurture niches of innovation and discursive interaction (see Grin et al. 2010; Sheller 2012) places for new thoughts and initiative.

This capacity to open up for new ideas beyond current path dependencies and overcome concepts demands for a setting where the members of a group can work together successfully. This needs a methodology to facilitate also conflicting decisions on how to proceed with the work. But certain playfulness needs also to be guaranteed to open up for unconventional and innovative perspectives, thoughts and discussions. In other words: Detecting new projects, services, products, activities and policies hinges on the discursive and communicative quality of the groups interactions. And this again has to do with the management of power throughout the common work and if it is possible to avoid that single persons or subgroups predominate the work and reflections.



Many of the participants emphasized again and again – throughout the workshops and during the evaluation talks we had – that their biggest problem is how to integrate new issues into their daily routines. Together with this they mentioned the impossibility of concentrating on certain issues and tasks as the biggest challenge. The level of everyday distraction has been picked out as one of the most important reasons why they sometimes lose perspective and orientation and why they often forget the bigger picture that gives direction and meaning to their work.

Against this background it is easy to understand why it has been the most difficult issue of the project to bring the participants into a mood and atmosphere where they were able to step out of the ‘iron cage’ (Max Weber) of daily routines and focus on the purpose and opportunities of the workshop.

One of the indicators how we can measure the level of concentration and trust of a future workshop is the amount of embarrassment people feel when we put them into plays and interactive games. It is the high when people do not feel embarrassed and blocked from doing things they would never do together with workmates or in a traditional planning context. We asked the participants how they felt about the first one and a half days where the ‘building common ground’ phase took place with different games and interactive plays. During the preparation of the workshops we put in a lot of time and considerations in designing this phase. Its final shape is a product from our close collaboration with the external facilitator Kristoffer Thurøe (Copenhagen). His work was absolutely significant for the success of the first phase. Also the modifications we made after the workshop in Denmark (see the final workshop manual in deliverable 3) have been discussed and decided together with him. His work and person was highly appreciated and accepted by the participants and we have been very grateful about his commitment and the whole collaboration.

The feedback from the participants to the common ground activities was positive all the way through. We expected it somehow as the working and discussion culture of both groups was on a high level of consensus and purposefulness. The fact that the critique phases in both workshops worked quite well must be seen as another indicator for the success of the first phase. The wish for more dissent as it has been mentioned at the end of the chapter above is understandable. But in fact it is actually an essential element of the future workshop approach that a well functioning critique phase helps the groups to concentrate on the common visions instead of staying put in conflicts. The low level of dissent we consider as a product out of both, a common ground phase that generated a community feeling amongst the members and a powerful and in parts very negative critique phase that helped to get rid of negative emotions and blocking frustrations. It

helped the participants to energize common activities instead of discussing and deepening differences and conflicts. One of the participants in Denmark, who was very critical towards the common ground phase in advance, summarized her experiences in the following way:

‘It was the balance in that phase that made me feel that the plays had a purpose and I felt quite playful because of the atmosphere you created. And this was quite well done. And it is not easy at all to make someone like me to play.’

Another participant, who is familiar with creative methods and who uses them in his own work, stated:

‘Everything was so light and playful and you lost your distance to others. I have never experienced such methods before’.

A third participant said:

‘It was such a nice and constructive atmosphere of discussion. (...) By using these methods you managed to get the people very quick very close and with other approaches you couldn’t have this managed’.

As we can see in the data the reason why the working process following the common ground phase worked out smoothly and without bigger tensions was that the modifications of the original future workshop concept exactly met what was intended. All decisions after this phase went without bigger problems and the group was always able to make common decisions. In other workshops we needed to stick very much to the communication rules. In these workshops the other participants sometimes worked like a ‘midwife’: Whenever someone had problems in articulating intentions, critique, utopian ideas etc. the others helped out and supported finding the right words without stepping over boundaries. Once, during the German workshop, we once needed to strongly re-establish the communication rules; and in some cases we needed to protect someone from being overrun from a more eloquent and predominant participant. But apart from this we can say that we never before facilitated a workshop of such a quality in its communicative culture.



Nevertheless, there was one seriously critical moment in the Danish workshop. It was when the utopian phase didn't end up with specific projects for the realization phase (as it normally does and in all other cases we had before). We decided to take over this task of the participants and selected the topics for the next phase as the facilitators by giving pointed titles for the next working step. As this usually never happens within future workshops we were quite insecure and worried how the group would react on this. But obviously we decided for the right thing and the group welcomed this decision. We are sure the trustful relations between the participants and the team would have allowed to questioning this. In the evaluation dinner this decision wasn't an issue and we strongly relate this to the successful work within the 'common ground phase' at the beginning of the workshop.

## 5. CHANGING PERSPECTIVES: INNOVATION AND CRITIQUE

When we developed the project proposal we considered art as playing a key role in reaching a specific level of reflexivity within the working process. As described in Witzgall, Vogl, Kesselring (2013) art has the potential to investigate topics such as mobilities by following a different than the traditional scientific logic. But nevertheless it is a sometimes quite scientific rationality of understanding and conceptualizing problems and identifying solutions or ways of dealing with them (see Witzgall 2013 in particular). By using aesthetic techniques and methods of modeling and configuring realities in a different and often individualistic logic art can be radical in the original meaning of the Latin word. It can follow issues and thoughts to the *radix*, what is the Latin word for root. In this sense art has an unused potential to initiate changes of perspective and to re-trace or re-direct the line of thoughts on specific problems or facts.

An example for this from the German workshop is the art project ‘The Randomized City’ which has been developed during the days at Frauenchiemsee. The project has been described in the second deliverable and does in some ways exaggerate the idea of a comprehensively mobilized city. The project starts from the assumption that in the future not only people, goods, data, information etc. will be mobilized. It considers even the material structures, the buildings and infrastructures itself as being mobile and mobilized. Once in a year, so the idea of the artists, on a certain day the city will be completely reconfigured. People within their architectural cubes will be set into a new environment and the social structure of the city will be randomized from one day to the other. This is systematically radicalizing and thinking the postmodern culture of mobility to an end and to a point where the social and cultural (dystopian) aspects of a completely mobilized society become visible. By doing so art can give access to a level of experience that traditional forms of science (such as modeling, scientific analysis and quantitative trend analysis) cannot open up.

The very first statement at the Munich evaluation dinner expresses this ambivalence quite clearly:



‘The first thing that pops into my mind from the workshop is the Randomized City project. On the one hand it is so far away from reality, but on the other it is so obvious. It’s not a solution but it was a mind-blowing moment and a thing that opened up new lines of thought.’

Following up on this he puts his statement into perspective by saying

‘I need to say it doesn’t help me in my daily work and life. Ok, I need to ... move on.’

But then he ended up by saying

‘(...) it was really, oh, wow!, I’ve never looked at this like you guys. This was also, really.... And I think, in real life, in research and scientific discussions and hopefully in the future also in the industry, it needs more of these cross-, inter-disciplinary topics. Otherwise you are just losing the focus on who really needs solutions. Not only we as mobility specialists but in general.’

To a certain amount this statement proves the project’s main assumption: by using a reflexive approach in future research it is possible to initiate changes of perspective and the abandoning of traditional ways of thinking. Interestingly enough the Randomized City was quite difficult to handle for several of the participants. Many left the discussion when the project was presented, they couldn’t stay close to the presentation. People were walking around, got closer and stayed away again. Only the facilitators stayed to the very end of the presentation. We interpret this as a reaction to the massive dystopian energy of this project. It gives access to a level of understanding and experiencing the emotional, social and cultural dimension of the hypermobile city that can be reached by other methods and forms of investigation. This is frightening but as we could see during the evaluation meetings it also stimulates deep reflections that can be used for identifying new policies and approaches. The power of art comes through in its way of making a point, making an impression that stays strong and prompts reflections long after.

Also in Denmark the creative approach in presenting the work was significant for future reflections. Here one of the projects referred to by many of the participants was called the Circular City (also described in deliverable 2) and it was basically a model of the sustainable cities metabolism. One of the participants, a designer, part of creating this idea, said





‘Well, [the workshop] basically gave me a new perspective on my own work. I haven’t expected that at all. I expected to learn and to hear new things. But I haven’t expected this workshop to make me consider what I am doing from a new angle. And that was really interesting.’

In the follow-up discussion she reported ‘the workshop made me realize how important mobility is’ and that it is ‘important and present’ in her daily work. During the workshop she has been working on the concept of the Circular City and figured out that a lot of it has to do with the management and the structuration of mobility from logistics and infrastructures to consumption and the reuse of products. After the workshop she decided to start a PhD, because she learned how many open questions she still has on the topics she is working on.

The argument we are developing here is not that the reflexive methodology is the answer on the complex questions of the transition of cities towards sustainable mobility. It is also not to say that the two workshops could initiate lasting and deep-going social and political change. What we want to emphasize is that the data shows a significant potential to start a process that can facilitate these changes to a certain amount. We will come back to this when we reflect on ‘reflexive mobilities’ and ‘planning as a social process’.

## 6. PLANNING AS A SOCIAL PROCESS AND STORYTELLING

In an earlier project we characterized the interdisciplinary settings that stakeholders face today as ‘heteroplexity’ (Kesselring et al. 2003). Planning within fields such as mobility has to deal with the complexities of the topics (in particular when traditional definitions of mobility as transport do not help anymore) and the social and disciplinary heterogeneity of the stakeholders themselves. ‘Governing without government’ (Rhodes 1996), in particular on the local and regional scale, means that the interdisciplinarity of the actors involved in decision making processes and the diversity of related topics and interdependent fields constantly increases. In particular large-scale and long-term projects such as train stations, airports, motorways but also housing projects, new hospitals, the spread of IT infrastructures etc. reveal that the modern planning paradigm, that grounds in the rationality that transport problems need to be solved by transport experts and health problems by health experts is enforcing problems instead of solving them. Modern planning concepts are guided from the idea that it is possible to make better planning and better decisions **FOR** society when the perfect allocation of knowledge and expertise can be secured. Also by knowing that the MFC project hasn’t been choosing a broad and representative selection from society, in its diversity it applies more the idea of planning and re-thinking mobility **IN** and **WITH** society. It is guided by the idea that ‘influential movers’ and experts play an important role; but they need to be understood as citizens in responsibility and they shouldn’t be detached from society. This is the reason why we originally proposed a concept starting with the identification of problems and following up those problems to the dissemination into society. Workshops such as the two in Denmark and Germany can only be the incubators of a process that leads to social and conceptual changes within society.

By having said this and referring to the earlier parts of this evaluation report we emphasize that from the MFC project emerges a significant potential for an alternative approach towards planning the future of urban mobilities. Instead of relying on even more complex models and simulations the MFC project relies on setting up an interdisciplinary social structure where storytelling (Sandercock 2003) and the genesis of a new argumentative rationality and construction of desirable mobilities futures are possible. This is highly conditional and the following quote shows that workshops like



ours need to be contextualized. They can only succeed when the urban context is ready for the social transformations that need to go hand in hand with the conceptual changes in mobility policies. This quote is from one participant who came later to the workshop. He reflects on the fact that he and another participants had hardly any problems with accommodating in the workshop:

‘The reason why the group worked so well together and why [we] have been welcomed immediately from the others has probably to do with the local mobility culture. We have this (...) and we have a collaborative setting in mobility politics where people just work together in different fields. The way of talking was just incredible and we have these experiences that when someone (...) says something, it’s not considered to be stupid. We have this working and discussion culture (...) that helped maybe also us in the workshop.’

This quotation shows that the basis for ‘successful communication’ (Habermas) is the establishment of a trustful and – ideally – powerfree communicative setting. It is the precondition for re-thinking mobilities. Building up a trustful and reliable social process for the telling of new ‘stories’ on the future of mobility is the fundament on which comprehensive policies for the future of urban mobilities can be build upon.

## 7: REFLEXIVE MOBILITIES

What the data analysis shows is not an endpoint in a development. But it reveals how changes in planning and in political culture could be initiated and facilitated. It would be rather naïve to expect final solutions from a project of this size and duration. But once more we could learn something about how to manage the ‘heteroplexity’ of the mobile risk society. The communicative setting provided the conditions for an efficient social situation which helped opening up new directions of thinking about mobility and the city. As we mentioned before art and other artistic ways of reflecting and redesigning realities play a key role in this process. One of the participants shows how the ‘functional perplexity’ works that art can introduce into a setting where normally economic and technological rationalities predominate. It shows the structural ambivalences which are inherited in mobilities on all societal levels:

‘Arts can do crazy things. Somehow you don’t understand but you look at this and say, that’s cool! And it doesn’t have an impact right now, but then we just have to wait, we can’t change the world today. But in my daily world at [company] (...) there are so many things changing and it’s not like all is going the same road. But it’s hard and it goes small things...’

The effect that has been generated in this workshop is that the participants started to re-think their own conceptions and constructions of what mobility is and how it can be handled and re-planned. In some sense we observed a bottom-up re-definition of the new mobilities paradigm. Of course, this is an exaggeration but the following statement shows an element of it. We used it before but here it is used together with other quotations that reveals the capacity of the group to deal with the ambivalences of mobilities and urban developments. It has been formulated in a situation where the German workshop members started a common reflection on what mobility is and what the fundamental changes are in the organization and perception of mobility:

‘Physical mobility doesn’t mean (...) that you move emotionally. You can physically move and emotionally stay where you’ve been before. (...) it is possible to not move emotionally but to move physically. ‘



In this line with this someone from the Danish workshop considered the ambivalences of new mobility policies. She said:

‘Sharing mobility modes of transport limits the freedom that originally was associated with cars.’

This statement shows that within the group a certain level has been reached to approach mobility discourses and urban strategies from many different levels. The participants met each other with a high level of respect and recognition and this could be the basis for designing solutions and policies which are not primarily following an expert rationality but which are deeper rooted within societies and the urban context.

So far we can conclude by following the statement of a Danish artist:

‘It was a kind of eye opener to see how mobility transformed throughout the time that we spent together into different other fields. Even as it wasn’t upfront and always present.’

We haven’t analyzed the data on its conceptual potentials in depth. As specific analysis and interpretation of the data on its use and usability for urban policies and planning is still awaiting. It hasn’t been the main focus of the project.

## 8. CONCLUDING REMARKS: IT NEEDS 'AN INFRASTRUCTURE, A FRAMEWORK AND A PERSPECTIVE'

Unfortunately the project needs to stop at a point where the above mentioned use value of the work comes to the center of attention. So far we can conclude that the project has reached its goal by showing that it is possible to provide the conditions for a significant interdisciplinary and also cross-sectorial work on the future of urban mobilities. Based in a reflexive setting as we described in the different deliverables, it is possible to initiate a reflexive process that can generate innovative policies also down to products and services. But this needs a longer term perspective and as the participants articulate:

‘We need to keep a project like this alive (...). This means we need an infrastructure, a framework and a perspective for our projects to sustain them.’

The main problem with the results was - and beginning with the question why the participants should stay for the creative retreat - was the open question of what will happen after the workshop. Like in any other work context people want to know what is the purpose and what is the aim of the common work. This question is unavoidable when working without a certain level of continuation.

Against this background it is actually amazing that we generated some quite concrete and sustainable projects from the workshops. This is not to praise the quality of the work we did. It is much more a product out of the commitment the participants had to the topics we put into the focus. And it shows what was actually possible to generate by having a long-term perspective to offer.

One of the high potential people we had in the workshop, which is strongly tied in administrative and political routines and processes, emphasized at the end of the evaluation meeting

‘Just by going there (...) and meeting all you people there gave me more than spending three days in the office. (...) And there is something about the intense



situation. This is the biggest problem in my working life that we are doing something here and there and then we start something at a different place. Everybody says in my working life that one wants to do some works where I can concentrate and make some focus. (...) This is so ineffective and we jump from one job to another. And this is what this method does, it generates some concentration and this is so efficient and we should be trained in this. This would make a difference and some innovative products.'

Building up on this we summarize that the experiment that Mobilities Futures & the City was can proof a significant success. Against the background of the challenges cities face today the reflexive methodology shows a certain potential for developing new strategies to deal with urban problems. But this is only possible when the work has a longer perspective and when it is part of the project to build up a 'reflexive platform' as one of the participants called it. What needs to be established is a stable working context together with a certain amount of resources to realize some of the projects generated in the workshops. In other words: it needs an 'infrastructure, a framework and a perspective'. Otherwise the energy and the innovative dynamic that can be generated melts into air.

## 7. LITERATURE

- Beck, Ulrich (2008): Mobility and the Cosmopolitan Perspective. In: Weert Canzler, Vincent Kaufmann und Sven Kesselring (Hg.): Tracing mobilities. Towards a cosmopolitan perspective. Aldershot, Burlington: Ashgate, S. 25–36.
- Beck, Ulrich; Hajer, Maarten; Kesselring, Sven (Hg.) (1999): Der unscharfe Ort der Politik. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.
- Fischer, Frank; Forester, John (Hg.) (1993): The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning. London: Duke University Press.
- Freudendal-Pedersen, Malene (2009): Mobility in daily life. Between freedom and unfreedom. Burlington VT: Ashgate Pub. (Transport and society).
- Giddens, Anthony (2006): The consequences of modernity. Reprint. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Grin, John; Rotmans, Jan; Schot, Johan; Geels, Frank W (2010): Transitions to sustainable development. New directions in the study of long term transformative change. New York, NY: Routledge (Routledge studies in sustainability transitions, 1). Online verfügbar unter <http://www.gbv.de/dms/zbw/608517992.pdf>.
- Hajer, Maarten (2003): Argumentative Diskursanalyse. Auf der Suche nach Koalitionen, Praktiken und Bedeutungen. In: Reiner Keller, Andreas Hirsland, Werner Schneider und Willy Viehöver (Hg.): Handbuch sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse 2. Opladen: Leske + Budrich (Handbücher), S. 271–298.
- Hannam, Kevin; Sheller, Mimi; Urry, John (2006): Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings. Editorial. In: *Mobilities* 1 (1), S. 1–22.
- Jungk, Robert; Müllert, Norbert (1987): Future workshops. How to create desirable futures. London: Institute for Social Inventions.
- Kesselring, Sven (2001): Mobile Politik. Ein soziologischer Blick auf Verkehrspolitik in München. Univ., Diss--München, 2000. Berlin: edition sigma.
- Kesselring, Sven (2008): The mobile risk society. In: Weert Canzler, Vincent Kaufmann und Sven Kesselring (Hg.): Tracing mobilities. Towards a cosmopolitan perspective. Aldershot, Burlington: Ashgate, S. 77–102.
- Kesselring, Sven; Moritz, Eckehart F.; Petzel, Wolfram; Vogl, Gerlinde (2003): Kooperative Mobilitätspolitik. Theoretische, empirische und praktische Perspektiven am Beispiel München und Frankfurt, Rhein-Main. München: IMU; IMU-Inst.
- Rhodes, Rod A. W. (1996): The new governance. Governing without government. In: *Political Studies* 44, S. 652–667.
- Sandercock, Leonie (2003): Out of the Closet. The Importance of Stories and Storytelling in Planning Practice. In: *Planning Theory & Practice* 4 (1), S. 11–28.
- Sheller, Mimi (2012): The Emergence of New Cultures of Mobility. Stability, Openings and Prospects. In: Frank W Geels (Hg.): Automobility in transition? A socio-technical





analysis of sustainable transport. New York: Routledge (Routledge studies in sustainability transitions, 2), S. 180–202.

Witzgall, Susanne (2013): Mobility and the Image-Based Research of Art. In: Susanne

Witzgall, Gerlinde Vogl und Sven Kesselring (Hg.): New Mobilities Regimes. The analytical power of the social sciences and arts. Burlington VT: Ashgate, S. 7–16.

Witzgall, Susanne; Vogl, Gerlinde; Kesselring, Sven (Hg.) (2013): New Mobilities Regimes. The analytical power of the social sciences and arts. Burlington VT: Ashgate.