

ID 1691 | PLANNING AS A RHIZOMIC PROCESS OF EXPERIMENTATION.

NOTES FROM BRAZILIAN PLANNING EXPERIENCE

Nilton Torres¹
¹University of São Paulo
nrtorres@usp.br

ABSTRACT: This paper presents a cartographic view of planning by taking the contemporary Brazilian planning experience as reference. It understands planning not as formal activity of public administrations, but as a multiple, relational and mixed social process for dealing with the contingencies of a dynamic and complex world. In this view, planning is not limited to the institutionalized activity of formal planners, but it also includes the action of informal networks of agents seeking to promote their own social life. Based on the philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari it understands planning as a 'rhizomatic network' of horizontal connections that evolves in several directions through the action of multiple and different actors working along (lines of flight) in order to deconstruct (deterritorialize) old social premises and re-territorialize them as a more democratic, inclusive and just society. This (rhizomic) kind of planning proceeds through a haphazard process with no hierarchical structure, central command or control. The paper suggests that in the Brazilian case, emerging experiments with planning as a creative, interactive and fluid process may prove essential for keeping both the process of social transformation and the ways planning is actualized and turned into a democratic, participatory and collaborative assemblage. The paper takes as empirical case several informal/formal planning experiences carried out by many and different agents, acting either inside or outside institutional boundaries.

KEYWORDS: Rhizome Planning, Becoming, Deleuze-Guattari

1 INTRODUCTION

In an often complex and conflicting world, social institutions are under constant pressure to adapt its decisions and working procedures to new social imperatives. The objective of this paper is to identify the main elements in this process of adaptation and institutional transformation.

In order to discuss the contemporary processes of social and political transformation this paper takes the propositions advanced by Deleuze and Guattari (1977, 1986, 1980), which advocates for a permanently changing and moving world. Their ontology suggests a number of interrelated concepts in order to demonstrate the pervasiveness of the difference/heterogeneity in relation to the idea of unity and homogeneity. For them the world is but a succession of moving scenarios composed by ever increasing diverse entities. This paper explores that approach in the first part of the text by analyzing the main concepts that comprise their ontology. The second part evaluates the implication of this view for planning practice. It analyzes several experiments of planning as a free, collaborative and rhizomatic process extracted from Brazilian experience. The aim is to set the basis for understanding planning not as an idealized and closed activity of plan making, but as a democratic and relational process for dealing with a complex and fast changing world.

This paper follows Deleuze and Guattari ontology of difference, which is concerned with the processes by which the world changes and transforms the social environment, and focuses on the ways such transformations are created. It takes planning as a social process, and argues that it should not be guided by models, ideal visions or prescriptions, but by processes of experimentation, which requires investigating problems¹, exploring relations between elements "and being open to what might happen if; what differences might emerge" (Hillier 2007, 2013).

¹ The concept of problem in Deleuze's ontology emerges from his thinking about objectivity. For him the idea of problem is linked to three assumptions: (1) the difference in nature between the problem and its solution, (2) the immanence of the solution and, (3) the transcendence with respect to any possible solution.

2 ON DELEUZE AND GUATTARI ONTOLOGY

One of the main concepts of Deleuze-Guattari ontology relates to connectivity. Connectivity involves a mode of reasoning that understands the world (urban space) as system of meaning, affinity, multiplicity and performativity. Such way of thinking presupposes an inherent process of change and transformation in which difference and diversity is the rule. In this understanding, the world is in continual process of change and adjustment while fixed and stable structures are only exceptions. They propose a “theory of change” that focuses on movement, flux, and transformation rather than in stability, order or permanence. In this theory, change and movement are the objects of investigation. Movement is the general rule and it relates to emergences, flux and contingencies. Structures, patterns, fixities or orders are incidental events in the flux of change and movement (Deleuze and Guattari, 1980).

Another fundamental concept of Deleuze - Guattari (1987) work relates to the idea of immanence. By immanence, they mean an ever-moving material and immanent space and society. This paper takes this concept and argues that in order to understand the world’s ongoing change, planners should pursue the immanent dimension of reality, a dimension concerned with the unrealized, possible realities that unfolds behind the transcendent/organized world (of structures and orders). Deleuze and Guattari (1977) argues that this immanent dimension is like a latent surface of possible realities that are in process of “becoming”, although not yet fully realized or turned real. This text argues that planning frequently confronts with latent/immanent virtual realities, and in order to go through that it should learn to deal with the unfolding of improbable likelihoods. The aim of planning in this formulation is not to play a schizophrenic role of seeking governability in an unforeseeable and ungovernable context of immanent becoming, but to understand and work with the dynamic and complex contingencies of a transforming realities and act to facilitate the unfolding of changes through multiple and participative processes .

According to Deleuze-Guattari (1980, 1991) ontology, concepts should do something very specific and the objective of theorizing is not explain what something is, but to elucidate what it does. More fundamentally, it should inform what and how it might affect what others things do. With regard to planning, we should ask what a concept does for or affect planning practice. This approach has been understood as non-essentialist (De Landa 2002) or as a post-structuralist ontology of difference (Hillier 2008). This ontology is concerned with the new, with change and transformation. It points to continual creation a recreation of reality. Nevertheless, it recognizes the importance of structures, systems and orders, in defining the agency power, the power relations between agents, and agents’ networks. (De Landa, 2006)

Deleuze/Guattari work presents a new empiricist constructivist conception to the relation between theory and practice. Their contribution emphasizes the importance of praxis in the transformations of the structures and the role of “bodies” in that process. According to them, reality has three different dimensions: The Actual, the Process of Actualization and the Virtual. The actual is the world around us and it is comprised of many participants (humans and non-human): people, houses, trees, animals, forests. That dimension of reality displays the actual/observed entities in a continuous and frenetic process of interaction to each other in a complex and diverse ways. However, reality is not limited to what can be seen or observed in the outside world. According to Deleuze-Guattari (1977), an observation is only part of reality: that which displays “images” that our senses can grasp. That (actual) “reality” does not offer an understanding of how “things” come into being, how they affect, how they might be affected by other entities and how these affects affect what other entities can do.

In order to understand how the world unfolds or emerge, Deleuze/Guattari (1980) proposes another dimension of reality - the virtual. The real-virtual is defined as the reality that precedes the real-actual, and therefore is not visible. The real-virtual can be understood as a field of many possible/parallel realities that can be actualized (turned visible). The real- actual is one among many virtual realities which is actualized along with the process actualization. In fact, many concurrent worlds (virtual realities) may result in different realities, and often we cannot anticipate the unexpected along the process. For Deleuze (1980) we can only perceive a small part of the real-virtual (which comprises those entities in the process of becoming actual), which in general, surrounds the real-actual entities, and which we identify as important. The virtual is therefore, that part of part of the actual that cannot be seen. It is beyond the visible actual. This dimension is formed of becomings, which are entities that have not yet started their movement toward the actual. They are formless, latent realities to become, with no apparent sign of what they might become and how they might become. Clusters of becomings (virtual diagrams) and lines of potentials (planes of immanence) form this real-virtual world.

According to Jean Hillier (2006), planning should approach the world from the ontology of becoming, rather than from that of being. While in the latter¹ the world is made up of objects with transcendental and fixed essences, the former² approaches the world from the ontology of becoming. That ontology contends that real objects are in a perpetual process of becoming something else and that the real world is a continual unfolding of events that do not necessarily move toward a specific end or final destiny. Planning working with 'the world of becoming' does not search for stability, certainty or fixed patterns, but seeks to cope with and manage unpredictable futures and moves by improvisation and creativeness, seeking to identify trends or scenarios from "disparate flows, energies, events, entities and spaces in more or less temporary alignments" (Hillier 2007). Planning according to Hillier (2007) "have had a pervasive commitment to an ontology of being which privileges end-states and outcomes, rather than an ontology of becoming which emphasizes movement, process and emergence." Planning that privileges processes and movements deals with a continually emerging world in a fluid course of becoming.

In this perspective planning deals with the world as it actually is, instead of working with idealist prescriptions on what it should be. This approach is neither prescriptive nor normative, but intends to devise most effective practices that enable planning to help bring about the future and facilitate the process of

change³. Planning as practice direct to setting off the future does not prescribe a particular (or desirable) future because it is just that which is the object and target of planning as a practice of seeking new futures. In fact that practice emerges from the conflict of ideas and political views, through the movements along the lines of flight, through the process of deterritorialization and the courses of fleeing to new lands (Banville and Torres 2016). It is working with and through these movements, that planning as process of bringing about the future can help to produce the (desired) new world. This "desired" new world will probably be product of some rhizomatic process of many competing desires, and perhaps, it might never epitomize the truly desired outcome of any particular vision.

According to Deleuze and Guattari (1980), this approach implies a political agenda. There is a clear compromise with the process, with change and transformation of whatever political, social or economic structure. This planning does not advocate for preservation of any institutional order, practice or rule, it has no compromise with old conventions or traditional habits, but instead it seeks the new, the different, and the diverse in order to create multiple ways of producing a free and more just mode of doing and living together in the world.

2.1 LINES OF FLIGHT, BECOMING AND BORDERS

"Lines of flight" are one of the most important concepts of Deleuze and Guattari's ontology (Deleuze & Guattari, 1986; 1987). The notion of flight brings about the idea of escape from the apparatus of capture. Instead of using the notion of "point", Deleuze-Guattari employs the concept of "line" in order to indicate motion through the points. While points are fixed in the space lines are associated to the notion of movement and the idea of becoming⁴.

Apparatuses of capture work to imprison the bodies to a fixed point. Escaping from the apparatus means start moving along a line: a line of flight. This movement away from the fixed rules gives rise to a process of becoming different, becoming something else and new. Similarly, the concept of deterritorialization is also used to imply a process of escaping from the apparatuses of capture. To deterritorialize means to start a movement of liberation, detached from the rules of the territory (Deleuze & Guattari, 1986). Although deterritorialization and flight are hopeful movements, they may turn however extremely risky. In

¹ This approach is taken from Plato and Kant ontology.

² Rooted in Aristotle, developed by Nietzsche, and embraced by Deleuze and Guattari,

³ This position is, associated to Michel Foucault. Foucault argues that the role of the intellectual is not to propose any fully formed political agenda, but to analyze the political terrain and to participate of political struggle, as member of any popular or social movement. (Foucault, 2012).

⁴ Instead of adopting the concept of contradiction as a methodological axis, the authors work with the idea of Lines of flight. Lines of flight seek to explain the constituent movements of each society beyond the legal and institutional regimes aimed at normalize and control of social life.

fact, the common outcome of deterritorialized bodies pursuing a line of flight is to be recaptured and reterritorialized according to the rules of an apparatus¹ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1977).

The process of fleeing and recapture is a cyclical one. However, this is not an endless mechanical process since each movement of escape lead to some “piece of the system to get lost in the shuffle.” Along the historical process, the repeated flights and recaptures will affect and marginally change the apparatus. This continuous process, they hope, scars the system and deteriorates the apparatuses of capture (Deleuze & Guattari, 1986).

Deleuze & Guattari find a way out of this limiting cycle of flight and recapture, by turning to concept of “revolutionary connections” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 473). When a deterritorialized body that succeeds to escape from an apparatus of capture and begins to move through its line of flight, it does not have to do so alone. It can link up with other deterritorialized bodies combine with other lines of flight, and form flows, aggregates, collective multiplicities moving together in a shared project to elude recapture. According to Deleuze and Guattari (1987), these associative behaviors are in the nature of desiring production: to produce connections. One of the most important characteristics of desiring bodies is to connect with other bodies and together produce larger assemblages (Guattari, 2002). Desiring-production relentlessly unsettles the apparatuses of capture, it sets elements in motion along lines of flight, and at the same time, it induces those lines of flight to seek connection with other lines (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). They argue that bodies in movement of flight connecting with other fleeing bodies will be able to construct a larger and stead and continuously growing network of escape. The process of “connection indicates the way in which decoded and deterritorialized flows boost one another, accelerate their shared escape, and augment or stoke their quanta” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). According to our earlier example, the Land less Movement in Brazil encompasses many cells of land less movement linked to a bigger movement. The larger the network grows, the more it is empowered psychologically and materially, and the easier it is to ward off recapture by the apparatuses of the state or the capitalist economy.

2.2 RHIZOME

The network of fleeing bodies/entities is not an organized and striated process, but instead it grows and evolves in a rhizomatic manner². The Rhizome is a disjoined, a centered, non-hierarchical network of entities communicating horizontally with any other entities. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) Deleuze and Guattari contrast the rhizome to an arboreal structure in which all flows must pass through a single connection, in which all relations are hierarchical. In an arboreal structure, all communication must pass first through a single coordinating “trunk” before it flows out to the limbs and branches. Rhizomes, by contrast, are a centered; they have no trunk, no general command, and no central committee that coordinates the whole. Rather, organization and coordination emerge naturally, on its own, without any intentional or purposeful action. The network organizes itself. It is only through rhizome, Deleuze and Guattari argue, desire can operate, that it can follow its inclinations, that it can move and produce in the way that is proper to it (1987, p. 14)

Deleuze and Guattari insist that rhizomes must operate this way. In order to form properly revolutionary connections, the lines of flight must associate with each other in rhizomes without leaders, where coordination emerges spontaneously. Deleuze and Guattari suggest that rhizomes will never come to rest, but will relentlessly grow and spread by sending out new stems, any one of which can connect with any other in the rhizome, or with deterritorialized elements that are not yet part of the rhizome (1987). That is

¹ This can parallel the events of land occupation promoted by social movements in Brazil. A particular plot of the urban land is occupied by low-income (land less) population, producing a temporary outcome, but eventually the police arrive to and enforce the private property rights of the owner.

² Rhizome is an epistemological model in the philosophical theory of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari. The concept of rhizome was borrowed from botany and indicates the structure of some plants whose shoots can branch out at any point, as well as thicken and turn into a bulb or tuber. It can function as root, stem or branch, regardless of their location in the figure of the plant. For Deleuze and Guattari the rhizome exemplifies an epistemological system where there are no roots - i.e. propositions that are more fundamental than others are - which ramify under strict dichotomies. Deleuze and Guattari contend that according to the Anglo-Saxon tradition of philosophy of science, the structure of knowledge does not evolve by logical means through fundamental principles, but it is drawn up simultaneously from all points under the influence of different observations and conceptualizations. This does not imply that a rhizome is necessarily a flexible or unstable structure, but requires that any order model can be modified. There are in the rhizome, solid lines and organization determined by groups or sets of related concepts. These sets define a relatively stable 'territories' within the rhizome.

why Deleuze and Guattari ask us to “make rhizome everywhere”, to free up escapes that “dismantle the strata in their wake, break through the walls of significance, pour out of the holes of subjectivity, fell trees in favor of veritable rhizomes, and steer the flows down lines of positive deterritorialization or creative flight” (1987). The more successfully we can do this, the more likely we are to create a runaway effect in which deterritorialized flows of desire “become parts and cogs of one another in the flow that feeds one and the same desiring-machine, so many local fires patiently kindled for a generalized explosion” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987).

2.3 NEW LAND

Deleuze and Guattari use the image of lines of flight connected to each other in a rhizomatic way, to explain that the purpose of these lines is to help de-territorialized bodies to remain in flight, and keep flowing, away from the apparatuses of capture by continuing to move. If these lines can manage to flow together, progressively forming a large enough mass, they begin to trace out a plane, a fluid and yet substantially consistent two-dimensional space. They form what Deleuze and Guattari eventually call “a new land”, a generalized condition for humanity in which becoming, flow, and desire pervade the community and choke or occlude being, fixity, and capture – a coherent but always growing and spreading rhizomatic multiplicity (Deleuze & Guattari, 1977).

This process of flight-and-connection may become revolutionary, since it is pushed “to a point where the process cannot extricate itself, continue on, and reach fulfillment, except insofar as it is capable of creating – a new land” (Deleuze and Guattari, 1977). The line of flight as a schizophrenic escape has the potential to become revolutionary and this involves a process by which a body withdraws from the apparatuses of capture and start to live on the fringe.

The new land brought about by this transformation implies the collapse of the system and of apparatuses of capture. In the resulting disorder, some regularity can emerge and some form of coordination among the elements will come to exist. However, that coordination, as in a rhizome, must always be immanent or emergent. Regularity and coordination must arise spontaneously out of the collective will and of the activity of the rhizomic network. This network is not a planned framework or managed by a leadership, nor does it emerge from a central or more important node in the rhizome. However, liberated desires will not simply live free and undisturbed in the new land. According to Deleuze and Guattari (1977) it is likely, that in the new land new institutions will emerge and new centralized apparatuses of management take control. Hence, as Deleuze and Guattari warn, desire must continuously flee. It must remain in motion, always on the line flight, permanently escaping and resisting the new apparatuses (Purcell, 2013).

That is why the new land is something like a contradiction, since it is in fact, made up of flights. The movement of escaping desire traces its topography. The fleeing elements can never come to rest because the apparatuses are never eradicated once and for all. Capture will continually reaffirm itself in forms like state agencies, private property, party organizations, corporations, planning departments. Fleeing agents of desire will always continue the process of fighting off these apparatuses, preventing the formation of institutions that will try to regulate desiring-production, organize it into organs, and assemble it into machines directed to perform restricted functions. Like desires, planning in this new land will be in an endless in movement, acting along the flux desires to promote change and transform the world into a new, and possibly a better land (Porter, 2011).

2.4 SELF-GOVERNMENT. NO CENTRALITY

The debate about whether humans are capable of self-organization has a long history in political thought, one that I certainly cannot resolve definitively here (Purcell, 2013). Advocates of self-organization often point to natural examples: the anthill, the beehive, the bird flock. Michael Hardt (2004) and Antonio Negri (1999) like the metaphor of swarm intelligence, where decisions emerge from the whole instead of being issued by a central power. Deleuze and Guattari, talk of rhizomes, trees, and wolf packs. Perhaps the prime example is that of a flock of starlings. They rise together into the air, a black mass of perhaps 50,000 birds, to hunt insects. The flocks are cohesive, but they are constantly changing shape, undulating purposefully as the birds move about in pursuit of prey. Everybody knows the flock is an assemblage of individual birds, but it seems we are watching a single coherent thing, a pulsing life form with an obvious

intelligence, efficiently carrying out the task of finding, catching, and ingesting food. Scientists explain that there is no leader, that the flock makes decisions without any centralized system of command (Hayes, 2011). The flocks do not take flight, turn, or change shape gradually. Despite the great quantity of birds, they can change direction suddenly. The flocks operate as a collective mind and are able to change that mind promptly. Throughout their movements, the collective of 50,000 birds, can suddenly disappear, before you can process what you see. They seem to rematerialize as fast as they fade.

2.5 (DE) TERRITORIALITY AND THE BORDERING

Deleuze and Guattari understand the concept of flight (flee) and the process of fleeing to the border as an event of becoming. As dispersed events of flight, the process of fleeing virtually generates and opposes all institutionalized structures and established rules of organization. The process of flight encompasses a large number of affective and transformative accomplishments through which social and spatial orders are continuously reconstructed.

For Deleuze-Guattari fleeing to the border means, an escape from institutionalization (1980). This is accomplished by producing affects that operate outside of the influence of existing organized assemblages. Such lines of escape produce new frames, which in turn produce new affects. The process of fleeing to the border involves evading the limits of established structures and /or disabling archaic moorings. By this is a rhizomatic course, entities fleeing through a process of heterogenesis¹, assert their uniqueness and heterogeneity in opposition to a transcendent, universalizing homogenization. Heterogeneity manifests desire; it expresses a process of becoming that is always in the course of changing, adapting, transforming and modifying.

To deterritorialize a body means to transform it into a body without organs. That is a process of recovering its various affective capacities rather than breaking it up into functions and categories. The body becomes a multiplicity supporting new connections, affects, assemblages, etc., with other bodies, a process of infinite possibilities. It is worth note that for Deleuze-Guattari the deterritorialized body does not mean reducing its actual territorial complexity, but rather the deterritorialization and heterogenesis it experiences, creates socio-spatial complexity which, in fact was kept concealed by the functional and definite compartments of the establishment. (Guattari, 1994)

Lines of flight and deterritorialization are developments that help in the escape from the instituted body (Marks, 1998, p. 31). Nevertheless, Deleuze and Guattari warn that there are always forces of stratification seeking to capture deterritorialized bodies in order to re-organize and reabsorb (reterritorialize) them into transcendental orders of homogenized bodies. Deterritorialized bodies are always at risk of being caught by the magnetism of the organization and fall back into the territory of institutions. These are like mechanisms of repression and capture that works to attract the external into a system of interiority. That system is made of identities, which are abstracted from actually existing bodies and transposed onto another dimension: the world of transcendental structures.

The concepts of territory and flight (to the border) advanced in this paper does not convey the idea of a stable, permanent, definite or inexorable spaces and events, but rather. 'At the limit, all that counts is the constantly shifting borderline' (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 367). The movement toward the borderline that marks the process becoming diverse and heterogeneous is perhaps a movement toward the borderlands of established states, which are territories marked by profound nonconformity and creativity. The smooth spaces generated by resistance assemblages like "shelter or land movements" (in São Paulo) that resist both the striating forces of the state and the reterritorialization of capital are themselves constituted through the bordering activity of becoming.

Assemblages such as Land and home movements take their lines of flight from what they are struggling against striations, organizations, institutions that want to close the escape points and fold these fleeing aberrations back into the order of things. The group's strategy seems to speak to the solution proposed by Deleuze and Guattari: 'it is by leaving the plan(e) of capital, and never ceasing to leave it, that a mass becomes increasingly revolutionary and destroys the dominant equilibrium of the denumerable sets' (1987, p. 472). If capital has indeed erased international borders, leaving the plan (e) of capital requires

¹ An active, immanent process of singularization of subjectivity.

something that Massumi (1992) has encouraged from the outset: that you carry your bordering with you. The erasure of national borders (which is itself always an imperfect concept and an incomplete project: would not mean the end of borders.

Following Deleuze-Guattari (1994), we can problematize the concept of border as a fixed place, and understand it as distributed across diverse spaces, and not simply constituted by capital or state striations, but emerging from the assemblages of bodies becoming-other upon it. The urban movements for home, land, health, education are movements of fleeing to the border a process that embraces the perpetual end point proposed by Massumi (1992): 'To achieve the goal that has no end means ceasing to seem to be what you are ['legal'] in order to become what you cannot be: supermolecular forever.'

The goal is a limit approached, never reached'. The practice of reappropriation of space by the multitude, the minor (Katz, 1996), manifests becomings-other by assembling in and with space, by bordering against the surrounding smooth spaces of capital. But even the term 'reappropriation' may be problematic: becomings can never really re-appropriate, they cannot return ownership, capture, or repossess a space. Rather, these moments of becoming merely revival of what was always there: the ever-existing capacity for mutual transformativity and inter-affectivity. It is through the assemblage concept that Deleuze starts to build his conception of difference and change.

2.6 ASSEMBLAGE

Deleuze develops its theory of assemblage (agencement) from Hume. Accordingly, Hume solved the problem of subjectivity by developing the concepts of association, belief and exteriority of relations. Association is a natural principle that works by producing relations between things. Belief is a human reflexive sense based on habit, which allows the individual to transcend a given reality. It allows the subject to be creative and to go beyond the given by means of connecting habits. The relations of exteriority mean that each component is more or less autonomous, that is it does depend of the whole to exist. In this type of relation (external), the relation may change without changing the component.

An Assemblage is any number of heterogeneous components (parts, or things) gathered into a single context. In the assemblage, components keep certain autonomy from the whole from which it is part. A component in an assemblage has the ability to establish relations with other components and to form as many assemblages at the same time. This ability to connect in various directions, allows the component to affect and to be affected by other components, and this double affect (interaction) determines which interactions are possible.¹

Each assemblage is made of components of immediate lower scale. What is Macro (Molar) in one scale is that which plays the role of the whole (the assemblage), in turn, what is Micro (Molecular) is that which plays the role of component (part). The Molar is a statistical result of a Molecular population at any given scale and not a causal product. There is no causal relation between molecular and molar, because there is no linear relation between them. Since the relation between them are not coherently (but contingently) produced, there is no unity in assemblage theory.²

An assemblage can be regarded as an unintended and not totally determined product. Therefore, an assemblage at a higher level is not self-determined but a result of lower level connections. However, a larger scale assemblage acts as a source of resources and limitations for lower level components. An assemblage molar lines enable as well constrain the parts in specific ways. In this context, both parts and the whole are historically produced. This means that the parts of an assemblage retain a kind of autonomy from the whole.

¹ Assemblage in Deleuze and Guattari sense is a mode of thinking the social reality: a relational process of composition and a methodology directed to practice. Assemblage intends to mean the processes of bringing heterogeneous elements together.

² Assemblages are made of two vectors: the actual and the virtual. The first is oriented toward the plane of transcendence or molar or strata. This vector produces a relative de/re-territorialization. The second vector is oriented toward the plane of immanence and produces absolute movements of de/re-territorialization. Movements on a plane of immanence are seen as virtual. The absolute and thus virtual movement of de-territorialization is called as a Line of Flight.

An important aspect of an assemblage is that it does not lose its identity when it is connected to a larger assemblage. The assemblage ontology is open to any connections and these connections have relations of exteriority with those that are already included. According to Deleuze-Guattari (1987), there are three ways of approaching the concept of assemblage. The first takes assemblage as a mode of thinking. Assemblage thinking is mode of thought whereby reasoning goes through a 'rhizomatic or nomadic process' forging 'linkages or connections between different systems of knowledge'. This growing connection with different modes of thinking, rearticulate the way we see, understand and thus live the world. This paper is an exhibition of that by setting out the problem and moving towards an expression of it.

The second way of approaching the concept of assemblage is by focusing on how entities are connected and organized (humans, for example). They are then understood through the variety of capabilities they develop to make connections and the capacities they have 'to form assemblages with other individuals, organic or inorganic' (DeLanda 2002, 63). For Deleuze and Guattari (1987), the main characteristic of the assemblage is its tetravalency¹. This means that an assemblage has four (tetra) means of combining elements: machinic content, collective expression, territoriality and deterritorialization.

The concept of truth applies to problems (in general). It does not apply to actualizations because it is only a temporary solution to the problem (in the process of difference and repetition). Problems maintain certain autonomy from their particular solution. The capacity to affect is the potential to form connections with diverse elements in an assemblage.

The third way of thinking on assemblage operates at the level of matter itself in its molecular and temporal dimensions and is directly related to the concept of plastic habits. The defining distinction of the Deleuze-Guattari assemblage is that its aim is not a totalization, a definitive tracing of limits, or a final theory of everything. Rather, assemblage is an expansion of possibilities, an invention of new methods and new perspectives, an active 'entertainment' of things, feelings, ideas, and propositions that were previously unavailable to us.

2.7 VIRTUAL – ACTUAL

An assemblage refers both to a virtual space (of pure potential on the plane of immanence) and to actual space, (an actualized form on the actual/transcendental plane). Thus, a Real assemblage has both a virtual an actual dimension. Abstract machines belong to the virtual (immanent) space, and they are actualized as assemblages. The virtual is accessed through a diagram which maps (1) the unactualized tendencies (singularities) and (2) the unactualized capacities to affect and to be affected².

Everything that exists in the actual is a response to a problem. Each actual thing is a solution to a problem that is posed. Each solution however, is not the only solution to that problem. A liberal state or an autocratic state is different responses (solutions) to the problem of how to organize society. The 'real' consists of two planes, one correspond to the ACTUAL (form) and the other to VIRTUAL (formless). They are both two different parts of the REAL.

2.8 CHANGE

Since the assemblage is made of heterogeneous parts it does not dissolve into the next larger scale, but evolves through a creative process and thus remains open and active for new and different connections and therefore for (immanent) change. The identity of an assemblage is always unstable, uncertain because other processes act to destabilize or decode it. The identity of an assemblage is that of a unique singular individual. Its properties are not given; they are merely potential if not exercised.

De-territorialization may be understood as a movement that produces change. It expresses the creative potential of an assemblage to become to connect differently and to grow in a disorganized way. To de-territorialize means to loosen, release, disconnect from fixed connections of an assemblage, while

¹ Taken from chemistry and biology, valency here means the combining power of an element or molecule.

² Singularities are seen as attractors that allow many actualizations to a problem. Actualization is a temporary solution to a problem and is derived from processes of individuation. Real problems are defined by singularities.

reconnecting into new organizations is understood as re-territorialization. De-territorialization is not the opposite of re-territorialization. De-territorialization is the territory intrinsic/natural process of transformation; it is linked to the process of change, which is immanent to a territory. Thus in order to know how an event emerges and advances, it is not enough to trace its developments from actual events, but instead, to map it, which implies (1) to embrace the space of potential, and (2) to counter-actualize the becoming of the setting.

The focus of this work is in the becoming of entities rather than in their beings. Instead of examining points or fixed properties of an assemblage, this work focuses on the different kind of lines that frame it which are related to the two vectors that make up the process of transformation. This work regards an assemblage as composed by actual molar and molecular lines in the plane of transcendence /molar/strata, and by virtual lines of flight on the plane of immanence. Molar lines portray a hierarchical system that displays centers of significance and subjectification (command and decision). The molecular lines are fluid in its principles of organization. (Guattari, 1977, 1995)

3 EXPERIMENTS: A RHIZOMIC PROCESS OF PLANNING THE UNFORESEEN

This sub-section discusses some experiments with planning in which participatory practices are carried out by a diversified range of informal participants, advocate groups and local movements. These experiments evaluate the rhizomic working of these groups in dealing with specific and concrete situations. The focus of research is to evaluate the range of small and intertwined real problems the community faces every day and how it solves them by adopting a sequence of creative and unexpected solutions. The distinctive aspect of these experiments is the collaborative and networked effort accomplished by the participants. The recurrent feature of these networks is the absence of any kind of formal (institutionalized) apparatus, be it public or private (Nyseth, 2011),

The history of local planning in Brazil has been mostly conservative. For the most part planning institutions only served the private interest of some groups (elites). In fact, these groups always dominated the local institutions, and as such, most of the administrative procedures only produced outcomes to promote those interests, mainly in detriment of the majority of the population. Only recently, changes introduced in administrative practices—mainly under the impact of democratic governments—endorsed popular involvement in public planning activities. The first innovations starting in Lages and Boa Esperança during the seventies, pointed out to the emergence of local and popular groups such as neighbor associations, rural organizations, housing and land-tenure defense movements, etc. These early associative experiences and their participative practices open the way for new experiments and that requires new institutional arrangements for the management of urban realm. That entails the construction of a new political culture, which may involve the assemblage of new relations between formal institutions and the public.

Nevertheless, what are the direction these experiences points out? Are they innovative? What kind of political project or utopia they carry on? Innovations by themselves do not tell us anything about the direction of change. It is important to be aware that democratic processes of deliberation may conceal their meanings. Anyway, these societal movements, according to Deleuze and Guattari, can be seen as lines of flight seeking to construct new spaces and new modes doing and dealing with the real world problems and distresses. However, as Deleuze-Guattari warns us these flights may be recaptured by the institutional apparatus and indeed dominant interests may seize them, and use them to deceive, co-opt, and control the political power. In fact, lines of flight recouped may be used as an instrument of manipulation of people's dreams and expectations and work to disarticulate any possibility for genuine popular action.

The experiences described in the following lines are part of experiments under way in Brazil, and they are connected to many aspects of the urban or rural life. These experiments take place in many spheres of informal governance system and counts with the involvement of different kind of individuals, informal groups and associations, participating and articulating the construction of Deleuze-Guattari "new lands". These experiments are mostly present outside the formal institutions and in many cases may even be carried out independently of any formal government participation.

The next section describes some experiences we call rhizomatic collaborative planning. These experiences differs in scope, objectives and results, and are taken from an array of informal, low profile,

practical experiences of local communities, seeking to solve their real problems. The main features of these experiences are the informal, non-hierarchical, a centered and collaborative work the participants perform along and within the process. Actors interact freely and collaboratively with no central control and actions are taken with no need for bureaucratic intermediation or formal regulation. Decisions are not a formal top-down process, instead they are based on open dialogue among participants and solutions are not definitive—an ultimate and fixed point—but emerge as flow of possibilities, that is built along the way from the diverse of views, opinions and interests.

3.1 HULHA NEGRA TOWNSHIP EXPERIMENT

Hulha Negra is a small community of the Rio Grande do Sul State, where a remarkable experience of collaborative and rhizomic work has taken place. The interaction of two local councils dealing with different issues (economic development and scholar meals) introduced a new perspective for local rural producers and improved the quality of local student's meals, by changing the logic food supply of local schools.

Several small producers (local farmers) participated in the council of school meals since their children belonged the local education system, but they were also members of the economic development council seeking alternatives to improve the local economy (and local producers revenues). Initially, they thought that they needed to increase demand for their local commodities in order get increases in income, lately they discovered that the local administration used local resources to buy food for the school meals outside the town – from foreign dealers and/or producers. They also discovered that the quality of the meal was poor and inappropriate. The collaborative work of the councils, the farmers and of the local administration resulted in changes in the school meals policy: the local farmers organized a cooperative and began to provide the meals to the local public schools. This allowed public resources to remain within the local economy and the children meals improved considerably.

The disjoined multi-connected (rhizomic) relations between agents opened up many ways for participants to solve their concrete, real problems through an evolving assemblage of horizontal (non-hierarchical) network of community collaboration.

3.2 MONSENHOR TABOSA EXPERIMENT

Monsenhor Tabosa is a small town in Ceara State, in the northeast of Brazil, a poor and depressed region in the country. In Monsenhor Tabosa initiate the Programa Arco Iris (Rainbow Program) a very interesting collaborative work among the local government, a local NGO (Conselho de Segurança do Bairro de Fátima) and Abrinq Foundation (a Nationwide NGO sponsored by the Toys Industry Federation). The main target of the program was the students of primary education. After many discussions among the parts representatives and the local community, it was decided that the program should start by improving the capacity of the local teacher in order to enhance the quality of the teaching, and by that to improve the child school performance. Pedagogical workshops on a variety of subjects (ethics, art, history, citizenship, bio-dance, etc) were implemented with the objective of persuading the professor on the need to revise and change their old educational practices. Abrinq Foundation covered the main costs of the program, and the local government paid for travel expenses and meals of professors. Some years later, the municipality of Monsenhor Tabosa shows a dramatic change in their education patterns with a noticeable improvement of the entire school system performance as indicated by the figures showing a drop on student's academic failure or school abandonment. In fact, this collaborative work shows important and interesting aspects. First, it started in a small town far from any significant urban or information center. Second, it also started outside formal government, through the informal action of a local NGO and the community. Third, these local groups were able to seize important connections not only with local public institutions but also with institutions at the national level. No decree or hierarchical decision-making mediated the collaborative process, but on the contrary, people were able to sew of an informal assemblage of horizontal cooperative work.

3.3 WOMEN IN ACTION PROGRAM

This program starts in Leme, a medium size town of Sao Paulo State. It is directed to the low-income families and unemployed people. The main objective of the program is to increase the professional capacity of the women by means of educative courses, events, workshops, and meetings and active social work. The local chapter of Lyons Club and the Solidarity Social Fund (private NGOs) handled the program in cooperation some branches of local government.

With the partial contribution of each of these partners, Leme city was able to create a very powerful social program directed to, on the one hand, help woman emancipation and, on the other, to face problems of poverty and unemployment. What really matters in this case is the informal alliances and non-hierarchical work between the participants – government, private groups, population. The program achievements soon became clear. It has contributed to, on the one hand, reduce poverty and unemployment, and, on the other, to generate income and self-confidence for poor families. Some of the women who participated in the courses of dressmaker and cloth painting are now working by themselves, at home and trading their products. Other women created a cooperative and are now producing bed-sheets and uniforms for the Public Health and Education departments of the local administration.

3.4 COMMUNITY GARDEN PROGRAM

In 1995 slum dwellers in Sao Bernardo do Campo– a median size town of 400.000 inhabitants situated at Sao Paulo metropolitan area – starts a program called Community Garden, directed to increase the quality of the food consumed by the low-income population. The program had several partners/sponsors: slum residents, local government, the Methodist University Alumni Association, local firms, and other interested citizens. In addition to assure the food supply for poor people, the program also sought to increase family income. Each participant worked in collaboration with the other. There was no central coordination, or rules for participating. The local administration¹ and the private firms provided the land for cultivation, the low-income people worked on the land with the technical supervision of university professors (agronomy engineers), and the Alumni Association offered technical and legal support and undertake the project management.

In this experiment, all the members participate and deliberate together on how to distribute the land, how to prepare the land for plantation and who does the infrastructure work. Once the land is cultivated, new meetings are held to decide on how to share the production and to whom the new plots for cultivation will be assigned. After the harvest and distribution of the yields, the surplus is commercialized. During the whole process, the alumni association in connection with the local university carries out an education program.

The vegetable garden experiment achieved an enormous success all over the country, and soon other municipalities started a similar program. The program success is mainly due to its ability to assemble the target population, solve the food problem of low-income families, and create an alternative for increasing the earnings of people with no formal employment.

This is a relatively cheap collaborative program. The local administration gain by alleviating poverty, the private firms gain by improving their image in the city, the university and the alumni association gain by providing an opportunity for students and alumni to apply their knowledge, and the low-income families gain twice as they have their food quality and family income improved. At this moment, many municipalities over country have adopted programs like this mainly as a real alternative policy against unemployment.

4 CONCLUSION

The history of social struggles in Brazil is a history of struggle for citizenship and social justice, which can be summarized as the pursuit for democratization of the public sphere. In the case of planning, such democratization involves access to arenas of collective deliberation. For this reason, movements and associations of civil society carries previously incorporated into their practices, a strong ability of working

¹ São Bernardo do Campo local government was at that time fleeing political project from the mainstream political system.

together, of sharing and collaboration: a history of network organization, solidarity and mutual strengthening. (Freire, 1994) These movements are carriers of a new social ethics: the ethics of respect, brotherhood, justice and freedom—an ethics that seeks equality of opportunities in a world of diversity and differences.

These participatory social action experiences do not appear anywhere. They are the product of specific circumstances, of real political actors and of tangible action social groups. Often, experiences emerge of informal, isolated actions; other times, they are part of larger movements of transformation of civil society institutions. In most cases the current decline of political forces and the decay of conservative governance institutions nowadays, result from their inability to build a political pact that paves the way for new discourses to manifest and new political actors to emerge. In contexts of change and transformation, new social agents materialize as political actors constituting movements and practices that will seed new forms of political and social regulation.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Banville M-S and Torres J (2016) On embracing an immanent ethics in urban planning: Pursuing our Body-without-Organs. *Planning Theory*. Epub ahead of print 17 February. DOI: 10.1177/1473095215625707
- De Landa M (2006) *A new philosophy of society: Assemblage theory and social complexity*. New York: Continuum.
- De Landa M (2002) *Intensive science and virtual philosophy*. London: Continuum.
- Deleuze and Guattari, F (1977) [1972]. *Anti-oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Translated by R. Hurley, M. Seem, and H. Lane. New York: Penguin.
- Deleuze G and Guattari F (1986) [1975]. *Kafka: Toward a minor literature*. Translated by D. Polan and R. Bensaïa. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze G and Guattari F (1987) [1980]. *A thousand plateaus*. Translated by B. Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze G and Guattari F (1995) [1980]. *Mil Platôs. Capitalismo e Esquizofrenia*. Trad Ana Lúcia de Oliveira. São Paulo: Ed. 34.
- Deleuze G and Guattari F (1994) [1991]. *What is philosophy?* Translated by H. Tomlinson and G. Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Freire P (1994) *Pedagogia do Oprimido*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Guattari F (1989) *Cartographies schizoanalytiques*. Paris: Editions Galilée.
- Guattari F (2002) *Revolução molecular: pulsações políticas do desejo*. (3ª ed.), São Paulo: Brasiliense.
- Hardt M (2004) Today's Bandung? In: T. Mertes, Ed. *A movement of movements: Is another world possible?* New York: Verso, 230–236.
- Hayes B (2011) Flights of fancy. *American Scientist*, 99 (January-February):10–14.
- Hillier J (2008) Plan (e) Speaking: A Multiplanar Theory of Planning. *Planning Theory* v7 (1): 24-50.
- Hillier J (2006) Straddling the post-structuralist abyss: Between transcendence and immanence? *Planning Theory*, 4(3):271–299.
- Hillier J (2007) *Stretching beyond the horizon*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Hillier J (2013) *Deleuze and Guattari*. AESOP, Young Academics Network.
- Katz C (1996) Towards minor theory. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 14(4):487–499.
- Marks J (1998) *Gilles Deleuze: Vitalism and Multiplicity*, Sterling, VA.: Pluto.
- Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the Virtual*. Duke University Press.
- Negri A (1999) [1992]. *Insurgencies: Constituent power and the modern state*. Translated by M. Boscagli. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Nyseth T (2011). The Tromsø Experiment: Opening up for the unknown, *Town Planning Review*, 82 (5): 573-593.
- Porter L (2011) The point is to change it. *Planning Theory & Practice* 12(4): 477–480.

Purcell M (2013) A new Land: Deleuze and Guattari and planning. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 14(1):20-38.

Purcell M (2013) For democracy: Planning and publics without the state. *Planning Theory*. Epub ahead of print

ID 1694 | CITY-MARKETING POLICY AS GENERATOR OF URBAN DISCONTENT

Mohsen Mohammadzadeh¹

¹University of Auckland

mohsen.mohammadzadeh@auckland.ac.nz

1 INTRODUCTION

“Neoliberalism is a hypermarketized style of governance (i.e. government through and by the market)” (Weber, 2002, p. 520). Under the hegemony of neoliberal-globalism, the entrepreneurial state has largely deployed market-oriented policies including city-marketing to attract flows of people and investment from the global market (Brenner, 2004; MacLeod, 2011; Madureira, 2014; Peck, Theodore, & Brenner, 2009). According to Deleuze and Guattari (2009), these flows of capital and people are vital for the capitalist city existence and its functions, particularly its constant economic growth. These neoliberal policies, including city-marketing, generally promise, or fantasise, further enjoyment to their residents, local/international investors and new arrivals, including tourists, expats and labours (Dovey, Woodcock, & Wood, 2009; Gunder, 2010).

Based on post-structuralism, particularly Lacan’s works, planning theorists such as Gunder and Hillier (2009) have investigated how the neoliberalised states have extensively deployed plans and policies to generate a fantasmatic images of their cities. These theorists have mainly provided an in-depth understanding of the role of planners in the production of these market-oriented policies in late capitalism.

In this context, the role of neoliberalised planning including city marketing in the production and accumulation of urban discontent is largely neglected in planning theory. This paper investigates this neglected side-effects of the implementation of city marketing policies in the production and accumulation of urban discontent in Auckland, the largest city of New Zealand. The production and accumulation of urban discontent in the neoliberalised cities has significantly increased socio-cultural conflict and its symptoms such as xenophobia, antagonistic behaviours.

2 NEOLIBERALISM, GLOBAL CITIES COMPETITION AND CITY MARKETING

Globalisation and its consequences have increasingly become a focal point in politics and also academic research. Globalisation is not a new phenomenon in the context of history (Banerjee, 2008, p. 1). “Globalisation is a process that can be described in terms of flows, networks, capacities, distribution, diffusions, and movement” (Pizarro, Wei, & Banerjee, 2003, p. 113). Population, capital, information and ideology movements are agents of globalisation (Pizarro et al., 2003, p. 112). Globalisation, as a process, inevitably affects cities – the nexus of global flows-and their inhabitants, whatever their position in the international global network hierarchy (Amen, Archer, & Bosman, 2006, p. 2). These global flows have significantly restructured local social-political institutions, reshaping the contemporary city’s spatial spaces (Marcuse & Kempen, 2000, p. 2).

This research considers neoliberal- globalisation as a universal trend that implants, as its dominant ideology, the adoption of market values, through its encouragement, or promises, of maximum levels of enjoyment by the maximisation of consumerism (Stavrakakis, 2008a, p. 101). Since the 1980s, neoliberal-globalism has constantly transformed local governments and their functions into as urban entrepreneurial organisations to respond to the market demands. Neoliberal globalism redefines planning and its functions as a component of the state apparatus. Sager (2012, p. 130) notes that “[p]olitical-