SSOAR
Open Access Repository
www.ssoar.info

Public transport as public space in European cities

Tuvikene, Tauri; Kębłowski, Wojciech; Weicker, Tonio; Finch, Jason; Sgibnev, Wladimir; Sträuli, Louise; Laine, Silja; Dobruszkes, Frédéric; Ianchenko, Aleksandra

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Forschungsbericht / research report

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:
Tuvikene, T., Kębłowski, W., Weicker, T., Finch, J., Sgibnev, W., Sträuli, L., ... Ianchenko, A. (2021). *Public transport as public space in European cities.* (Forum IfL, 39). Leipzig: Leibniz-Institut für Länderkunde e.V. (IfL). https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-72914-5

Nutzungsbedingungen:
Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.
Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:
This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.
By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Mitglied der
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

forum

PUTSPACE Project Team

Public transport as public space in European cities

Heft 39 ▪ 2021

Leibniz-Institut
für Länderkunde

forum

herausgegeben vom Leibniz-Institut für Länderkunde

Heft 39

PUTSPACE project team

Tauri Tuvikene*, Wojciech Kębłowski, Tonio Weicker, Jason Finch, Wladimir Sgibnev, Louise Sträuli, Silja Laine, Frédéric Dobruszkes, Aleksandra Ianchenko

* Corresponding author (tauri.tuvikene@tlu.ee)

Public transport as public space in European cities

The project “Public transport as public space in European cities: Narrating, experiencing, contesting (PUT-SPACE)” is financially supported by the HERA Joint Research Programme (www.heranet.info) which is co-funded by AKA, BMBF via DLRPT, ETAg, and the European Commission through Horizon 2020.

Leibniz-Institut für Länderkunde
Leipzig 2021

Die Reihe **forum ifl** des Leibniz-Instituts für Länderkunde dient der zeitnahen Publikation von Erkenntnissen aus Forschungsprojekten des IfL, der Dokumentation von Veranstaltungen sowie der Veröffentlichung von aktuellen Datenanalysen. Ziel ist es, den Austausch unter Fachwissenschaftlern und den Wissenstransfer in die Praxis zu fördern. Die Beiträge werden in einem einfachen, internen Verfahren begutachtet und geben die Ansichten der Autoren wieder, die nicht unbedingt mit denen des IfL gleichzusetzen sind.

Impressum

Verlag: Selbstverlag Leibniz-Institut für Länderkunde e. V.
Schongauerstraße 9, 04328 Leipzig
Tel.: +49 341 600 55-141
Fax: +49 341 600 55-198
E_Mueller@leibniz-ifl.de
www.leibniz-ifl.de

© 2021
Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlags unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

ISBN 978-3-86082-112-1
Online frei verfügbar unter: https://leibniz-ifl.de/forschung/publikationen-1/zeitschriften-und-reihen

Table of contents

I. Introduction....1

II. Learning from more-than-technological approaches....4

1. Publicness, public space and public sphere....4

2. From experiences of mobilities to critical inquiries into productions of urban mobility....6

III. Public Space Meets Public Transport....9

IV. Expanding a Public Space Perspective to Public Transport....12

1. Price as a means of controlling public transport's publicness....13

2. Histories of public transport experiences, production and power inequalities....14

3. Modernization and Europeanization....16

V. Concluding discussion: European integration through public transport....18

References....20

I. Introduction

This working paper discusses how public transport (PT) can be conceptualized as public space. The purpose of the paper is to provide an overview of current debates surrounding this constellation, to identify research needs, and to discuss possible multidisciplinary approaches for further work.

While the term 'public space' is problematic from the very beginning, occupying the complicated border between public and private, there is nevertheless one basic statement upon which the authors of this paper can agree, looking back on the plethora of works that have been dedicated to it. This is that the term is both complex and multi-dimensional. We assume that categories of public and private are culturally and historically formed, with ever-changing, challenged or violently enforced boundaries. We furthermore subscribe to the basic assumption that the term 'public space' has a history of its own, with its often Global North past of conceptualization, and ensuing inequalities in related knowledge productions and applicability for different settings, even though the term has been widely used in different political registers globally. Furthermore, the term enjoys a wide popularity in different discursive scales: both denoting existing physical spaces such as streets and squares, and an ideal – a benchmark – to assess the 'publicness' of a given space. The current paper comes to terms with these complexities.

Public space as a descriptor for physical spaces refers to spots and areas where people who do not know each other congregate; spaces which are open and inviting, generating potential for encounters and conversations, and thus creating a sense of the 'public'. The benchmarking meaning of public space refers to openness, inclusivity and its democratic potential, developing the concept of 'public sphere' discussed by Jürgen Habermas (1989). Following this approach, public space lies at the core of democratic societies: it is where different opinions are voiced, and where differences are not only tolerated but even potentially overcome. This, once again, underlines the complexity of the term when dealing with societies not typically described as democracies.

The connection between these two ways of conceptualizing public space – as physical space and normative ideal – has led to a long-standing idealization of public space in scholarly discourses, with consequences for urban research and planning. In such approaches, the *agora,* or central meeting space of an Ancient Greek *polis*, becomes the quintessential public space. There has been much debate about the nature or character of the Greek agora, often described as a political space for white, wealthy men which excluded women, slaves and much of the population. Apart from its institutional character the polis was, however, also an open physical space where people from different strata of society could encounter each other (Vlassopoulos 2007, p. 34). Today, similar functions are ascribed to plazas or streets – and similar problems arise when discussing e.g. commercialization and its effects on political practices and the experience of social difference. What is left to conclude, however is that while these sites do not necessarily fulfil the ideal, there is a perceived potential for that, at least.

Apart from the classical centrally-located open spaces, public space research has led to the inclusion of zones not traditionally interpreted as such: cafés, shopping malls, digital spaces, festivals and so on. Following this thread, we explore whether and how PT can be seen as a form of public space, and the implications such a perception has on scholarly knowledge production, mostly with regard to mobility studies, human and urban geography, literature studies, intersecting these also with transport and cultural histories. In the following sections, we explore two potential ways of conceptualizing PT as public space. Firstly, we bring PT into scholarly debates on public space, which have tended to take streets and squares as their main research objects. That is, we conceptualize PT as a special kind of street or square.[1] Nonetheless, PT is different in its *intensity* (a closed and defined space of intimate encounter in which there are difficulties distancing oneself from others), in the importance of *trust* (which you need to have towards others in confined spaces), in its *unavoidability* (a very diverse space, which people not only *want* to use but *have* to use) and its *spectacularity* (related to future scenarios, city visions and new infrastructures). Secondly, we bring public space to bear on PT debates, framing the latter as a system that affects publicness. We are interested in establishing whether PT provides a site for encounters with the potential to build a common public sphere. Critically engaging with the Habermasian conceptualizations, we seek to understand whether PT is indeed 'public' in the sense of the term's ideal-type connotations. Such publicness, then, brings in societal narratives of past and future, of idealized transport systems and desires for modernization.

This working paper investigates these topics through a discussion of different sets of literature, including those on public space (and its intersection with PT), mobilities and critical inquiries into urban political geographies. Exploring PT as public space allows a closer engagement of public space literature with mobile environments such as public transport, but it also offers ways to think beyond dominant framings of PT. Namely, the working paper offers novel approaches in comparison to transport studies, still predominantly technocratic. PT literature and practice is organized around a core of 'neoclassical' and 'sustainable' approaches (Kębłowski & Bassens 2018). The 'neoclassical' view builds on transport engineering and economics, and centres upon issues of utility, efficiency, and economic growth achieved through 'rational' planning and decision-making (Girnau & Blennemann 1989; Grant-Muller et al. 2001). The 'sustainable' set of approaches to mobility has emerged in the aftermath of the oil crises of the 1970s, and introduced a number of environmental and social issues to the debate, thus positioning 'sustainable development' as a critique of neoclassical approaches (Banister 2008). However, both neoclassical and sustainable approaches fail to engage with structural factors underpinning mobility problems, notably socio-spatial segregation and inequality often reproduced (rather than addressed) by PT policy and infrastructure (Enright 2016; Farmer 2011; Reigner & Brenac 2019). We combine the critical inquiries of urban regimes with the reading of PT from a mobilities perspective which underlines the significance of everyday movements, and of everyday encounters which these bring about (Bissell 2018), equally exploring political discussions and contestations within and on PT. We have to stay aware of unequal access to mobility options in terms of scope, quality, accessibility, affordability or safety; involving ourselves in discussions, then, which are increasingly framed in the terms of 'mobility justice' (Sheller 2018). Reading PT from a humanities perspective combined with epistemologies and modes

1 Note the links between streets and PT in arguments about fare-free public transport arguments: as streets are free to use, so should PT be (Kębłowski 2018).

of inquiries from social sciences enables a move beyond the confines of economic and environmental concerns, and entails an increased attention to cultural aspects and their change over time and space, as well as a more nuanced and context-sensitive perspective on empirical data. This approach enables us to begin exploring how citizens negotiate norms of behaviour, confrontation, and accommodation of diversity. This entails engagement with feminist and post-colonial writings, also with regard to governmentality of both space and knowledge (Tlostanova & Mignolo 2009).

We seek to place PT at the front line of contesting what is, can be, or should be *public* in the city. We embrace the assumption that PT indeed is a form of public space. However, our ambition is to leave space for doubt and criticism and stay alert to the elicited problematic assumptions that the public space concept brings about. We are eager to learn how taking a public space perspective increases our understanding of PT and vice versa. With this goal in mind, we necessarily have to question what exactly 'PT' is, in its own right. This includes a critical stance towards knowledge asymmetries about how PT systems are being built, practiced and imagined. Thus, in our approach to public space in relation to PT, we are inspired by Paget-Seekins and Tironi's (2016) four-fold division of publicness of PT wherein they see it not only as space for interactions but also as public good and public property, also referring to public concerns and debates raised by activist groups. Relatedly, we examine narratives that generate publicness – and the reasons why such narratives exist. We ask how PT is actually public: what is the quality of its publicness? Mobility and movement, indeed, could be assumed to make it differently public than, for example, the ways in which squares and streets are public spaces. We seek to understand publicness both in the everyday mundane encounters taking place on PT but we also argue that public space matters in different ways: in how access to sites is governed, how historical narratives generate the sense of desirable systems and qualities and what the meaning of modernization is in formal and informal narratives as well as contestations.

II. Learning from more-than-technological approaches

In this literature review section, we lay down how a study of PT can benefit from opening up to humanities-oriented research such as cultural, literary and historical studies, as well as to critical human geography and mobilities literature. We pursue this endeavour of examining the relationships of PT and public space in two steps. Firstly, we provide an overview of previous studies of public space, and the ways they have appreciated the emergence of the public sphere, mourned the disappearance of 'truly' public spaces and looked for ways to stress the convivial qualities of encounters in unrecognized public spaces. In the following step we highlight the move from a classical understanding of transport as mechanically connecting two points in space, to a broadly conceived understanding of mobility as a culturally and politically meaningful activity – a conceptual paradigm shift which has been largely unthinkable without inspiration drawn from humanities. Nevertheless, not only attentive to mobilities, we turn to critical approaches to PT that build on the traditions of critical inquiries to gain insights into urban political regimes, power relations and inequalities. Bringing public space research together with mobilities turn literature and the political economy inquiry, we conclude by hinting at an interlinkage of public space and PT.

1. Publicness, public space and public sphere

Publicness and public space build on lines of thought that have already been the subject of a substantial amount of research and literature, which shall be briefly introduced in this section. Most frequently, public space is identified as *urban* public space, be it city streets, buildings or parks (Nissen 2008). Neal (2009, p. 1) offers a fundamental albeit broad definition of public space as '[…] all areas that are open and accessible to all members of the public in a society, in principle though not necessarily in practice', but simultaneously acknowledges that it is ultimately the perspective taken that best determines the conceptualization of the term (Neal 2010). While a legal-economic categorization of public space uses a classical juxtaposition of the private and the public, where the extent of openness and the intended purpose, as well as questions of provision, financing and maintenance are decisive, scholars with a socio-spatial perspective focus less on defining what constitutes a public space, but how it is used. Accordingly, Lynch in his seminal *The Image of the City* (1960) explored how spatial features support the creation of mental maps that help individuals understand and navigate complex environments. Whyte (1980), meanwhile, conducted one of the earliest in-depth anthropological studies of the physical environment, analysing how infrastructural elements in public spaces influence the dynamics of the place, including movements, interactions and individuals (Neal 2010). Low's research into the ethno-historical development of plazas in Latin America and their impact on the cultural and social environment, highlights public spaces as places of contested meanings as much as public sociability, personal and democratic interactions in civil society and diverse uses (Low 2000). Individuals who occupy, shape, create, and ultimately produce public space constitute the linkage point of numerous socio-spatial studies. For Jacobs (1961) it is precisely the users, be they residents or visitors of urban neighbourhoods, occupying public squares or sidewalks as well as visiting private facilities such as shops, restaurants, bars or cafés that provide the vitality and security of urban neighbourhoods (Jacobs 1961). Half a century later Zukin (2010) proposed that this very urge for diverse use and local distinctiveness, sought by Jacobs, has been used as a tool for the privatization and commercialization of public space. In many American as well as Western European cities, she claims, the application of Jacobs's ideas has led to a process of gentrification and displacement of the public collectivity, reducing diversity and excluding population groups that shaped the development of cities in the first place (Zukin 2010; Jayne 2017).

The use and appropriation of public space is also a central theme in investigations of public space which have a political perspective, reflecting an expressive or representational understanding of space. Since public space is meant to be characterized by openness and accessibility to all members of a determined public, some theorists have emphasized the importance of it as a space for civil engagement, political participation or the promotion of democracy. Arendt conceptualized the public realm in *The Human Condition* (1998) as a discursive space where individuals meet and work together to achieve and pursue real political action (Neal 2010). The public, in her understanding, is characterized by its visibility and openness, as well as by the fact that it constitutes the common world, which is formed and shaped between people, made by human interaction and artefacts and distinguished from privately owned places (Arendt 1998). Similarly, Habermas (1989) conceives the public sphere as an abstract, not physical but conceptual public space, in which ideas and opinions on public interest are formed and debates held. Although taken as a reference notion by many subsequent researchers, Habermas' concept of the public sphere has come in for a

great deal of criticism. In *Rethinking the Public Sphere* (1990) Fraser criticizes the ideal from a feminist perspective, arguing that public space concept promotes Eurocentric, bourgeois male hegemony and is not democratically inclusive, but rather exclusive, especially towards women and alternative publics. Nevertheless, Fraser emphasizes the socio-political importance of the public sphere as a 'space in which citizens deliberate about their common affairs, hence, an institutionalized arena of discursive interaction […] a site for the production and circulation of discourses that can in principle be critical of the state.' (Fraser 1990, p. 57). The political potential ascribed to public spaces is closely linked to civil liberties and responsibilities. In *The Right to the City* (1968) Lefebvre claims that an individual has the right of access to physical space, which enables exchange, assembly and interaction, as well as to discursive space, enabling political participation. With regard to PT, discussions of the political rights and needs of urban citizens rightly fuel debates on fare-free PT. Indeed, the right to access physical spaces entails the right to mobility: one needs to get to these places.

Furthermore, the proclamation of the decay of public space has been extensively featured in various studies and literature over the last decades. A forerunner was Sennett's provocative *The Fall of Public Man* (1977), in which he claims that through the pursuit of increasingly more private lives, political engagement as well as the use and availability of public space have gone into decline, leaving the ideals of freedom and democracy threatened (Watson & Studdert 2006). The privatization of public space, one of the most frequently advanced reasons for the disintegration of public space, is taken up in Mitchell's field study on the People's Park in Berkeley, California (Mitchell 1995; 2017). Mitchell maintains that the loss of material space causes the loss of democratic rights of expression and spaces for contestation and the recognition of marginalized groups of people, such as the homeless. The topical question of inclusion and exclusion in public space is also discussed by Iveson (2007), who introduces the concept of the *public address*, which refers to public opinions and activities in real as well as cyberspace. Iveson traces a shift from an embedded notion of public space, in which the encounter of strangers was recognized and welcomed, to a neoliberal understanding of public space, in which differences are seen as a threat and therefore avoided (Arefi 2009). Looking beyond the private-public dichotomy, Low and Smith (2006) argue that the loss of public, democratic spaces in contemporary societies is due to an increased commercialization and privatization, which goes back as far as seventeenth- and eighteenth-century economic theories, and did not – as often assumed – first emerge in the neoliberal or anti-terrorist agendas of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Through their contribution, Low and Smith open up discussion of a geography of public space that transcends spatial boundaries, recognizing that public space includes geographies of everyday movement that are as much local, regional, global, as they are virtual, electronic or institutional (Low & Smith 2006).

2. From experiences of mobilities to critical inquiries into productions of urban mobility

The way people move and how such movement is experienced is not just an epiphenomenon of societal economic, cultural or political structures but is of significance on itself. The mobilities turn made mobilities important for researchers who since Urry's (2007) *Mobilities*, Cresswell's (2006) *On the Move*, the inauguration of the journal *Mobilities* in 2006

and other earlier works have studied practices, meanings and politics of various modes of mobility, including PT. The key contribution to spatial and social analysis by research into mobility has been the way it has raised the significance of mundane, everyday mobilities, where transport is both a way of transitioning from one place to another and a sense of being or belonging (Bissell 2018). The time of movement, moreover, is not wasted, but used to carry out work (Laurier 2004; Lyons & Urry 2005), to socialize or to gather one's thoughts before moving from the mode of being associated with home to work with different relationships and intensities. Nevertheless, mobility is societal and public – not just as movement but as a symbolic aspect or source of politics (Cresswell 2010). The provisioning, coverage, accessibility, affordability of PT is entangled with citizens' mobility and opportunities of integration. Not all areas are equally serviced by PT and hence the potential engagement with various societal opportunities across locations is different. Mobility is about matters of justice including stark social and economic inequalities (Martens 2017; Sheller 2018).

On the one hand, mobility is an experience of movement. Research inspired by non-representational thinking has tried to capture this experience with different degrees of success. Indeed, there is burgeoning literature on mobile methods (Büscher et al. 2011; Sheller 2015). The mobile methods have attended to the experience of driving (Laurier 2004; Laurier et al. 2008), walk-alongs with pedestrians (Degen et al. 2010; Degen & Rose 2012), ethnographic works on PT (Koefoed et al. 2017; Wilson 2011). While PT might provide a researchable space for anyone trained in anthropology, this field has not produced many studies of PT sites. This might result from the character of such spaces, lacking any stable community where one can only study fleeting and constantly changing collectives. Previous ethnographies have attended to stops and stations (Stasik 2017), intersecting also with ethnographies of streets (Stovall 2019). Indeed, stations and terminals produce more regular and understandable ethnographic sites with clearer place qualities: a location, boundaries and key more or less stable actors. Nevertheless, we need more attentive eyes and ears as well as to use all the other senses if we are to understand the co-production of movement in PT vehicles. On the other hand, mobilities produce interlinked systems wherein various elements are combined. Thus, Urry introduced the notion of 'the system of automobility' (Urry 2004) – a network comprising huge numbers of cars but also petrol stations, roads, advertising and the use cultures of automobilities (Beckmann 2001). PT, however, appears antagonistic to the system of car-based mobilities. Cities that revolve around car mobilities have limited PT systems, whereas cities which boast strong PT systems usually display lower car-based modal shares. Bringing out such division, Newman and Kenworthy (1996) developed a classical regionalization of world cities based on energy consumption and land use density, showing car-based American cities at one end, and very dense and public transit-oriented Asian cities on the other end, with European cities somewhere in the middle. While motorization is one way to achieve modernization, the development of European cities goes much more hand in hand with the development of PT. In this way, Europeanization of cities could be perceived as an entanglement with processes of PT development.

Sociotechnical PT assemblages effectively deny or impede access to urban mobility networks for some, through barriers, regulation frameworks, ticketing and non-inclusive communication to name but a few elements. Thus PT systems reflect a city's socio-spatial disparities on a micro and macro level. Appreciating how urban mobility flows are segregated according to class, ethnicity and socioeconomic income enhances the analysis

of urban inequality. PT space is a case of *governmobilities*, a term introduced by Jorgen Bærenholdt in analysing and applying Foucault's concept of governmentality to mobility regimes and policies (Foucault & Burchell 2011). So, speaking about governmobilities means that 'if power relations are fundamentally mobile, government and governmentality do not only deal and cope with mobility; they work through mobility' (Bærenholdt 2013, p. 27). This refers to the thesis that mobility as a concept, challenge and routine is to an extent integrated into our collective perception of contemporary societies that enact self-government by people: 'governmobility means ruling through connections – mobilising mobilities' (ibid, p. 29). Therefore, the discursive character of the public in urban mobility assemblages invites thought about how PT is appropriated by diverse ideological interests (Owens 1995). Questions include who the subject of public space is, who defines 'the public' and who profits from it (Deutsche 1990).

Inquiries into PT should take into account the question of the inclusion and exclusion processes which mobilities induce or impede (Hine 2003; Kenyon et al. 2002; Lucas 2012), the accessibility PT provides or limits (Farrington 2007; Preston & Rajé 2007) and the inequality it generates, contributes to reproduce, or addresses (Ahmed et al. 2008; Lucas 2012; Pereira et al. 2017). Critical perspectives on transport have advanced these inquires by exploring how mobility is conditioned by power relations and norms, not least related to class, gender (Hanson & Pratt 1995; Law 1999; Uteng & Cresswell 2008), and race and ethnicity (Golub et al. 2013; Preston & McLafferty 2016; Steinbach et al. 2011). This involves exploring how urban regimes and regulatory frameworks shape particular policies and practices, such as those related to PT (Addie 2013; Aldred 2012; Enright 2016; Farmer 2011), assessing the uneven distribution of PT-related costs and benefits in economic, political or symbolic terms (Ahmed et al. 2008; Lucas 2012; Pereira et al. 2017), and identifying the political economic choices that underpin diverse policies, project and practices related to PT.

This appears all the more important as PT continues to function as a playground for the logic what David Harvey (1989) recognized as 'urban entrepreneurialism'. This essentially neoliberal, speculative and revanchist strategy centres on inter- and intra-urban competition, in which it engages by prioritising supply-side interventions in specific territories and for particular social groups, to create optimal conditions for attracting financial and human capital that can supposedly 'trickle down' towards the rest of urban space and society. Urban entrepreneurialism is particularly tangible in the field of transport and mobility. Across the global North, South and East, after all, the provision of PT infrastructure is frequently conceptualized as key for boosting territorial competitiveness. Diverse urban actors including mayors, chambers of commerce, transport operators and construction companies tend to argue for improving connectivity between strategic nodes, corridors and 'premium network spaces' (Graham 2000) by increasing the capacity and speed of local transport networks as a measure deemed essential to attracting external investment. Urban regimes conceptualize transport infrastructure as a crucial asset in strategies geared towards capital accumulation, rent valorisation and gentrification (Enright 2016; Lin & Chung 2017; Lung-Amam et al. 2019), which often hinge on risk-prone public-private partnerships (Haughton & McManus 2012; Siemiatycki 2013). Local elites frame the construction and maintenance of PT infrastructure as a largely 'technical' process of managing traffic flows through 'rational' solutions, rather than a question of governance over essentially political choices regarding socio-spatial distribution of costs and benefits related to urban development.

Besides elected officials and public agencies responsible for strategic urban development, the process of conceiving transport policies and translating them into infrastructural projects involves diverse government-related enterprises and entities managed according to the principles of new public management, public and (semi-)privatized mass transport operators, construction and engineering companies, international consultants and experts, (st)architects, urban planners and designers. While these groups' inclusion in transport policy-making may create the impression that it is becoming more consensual and democratic, growing evidence shows that framing transport agendas and planning metropolitan networks hinges on coalitions forged among local elites (Enright 2016). As these processes are largely informed by techno-managerial circuits of knowledge, transport is effectively removed from the public debate, and the uneven geographies and power relations it (re)produces and power become largely obfuscated and de-politicized. While transport authorities may frame citizen participation as a way of democratizing decision-making, it often functions as a smokescreen for building legitimacy and acceptability for 'best solutions' in tune with entrepreneurial agendas – a narrative that uncritically reverberates in transport studies (Epprecht et al. 2014; Isaksson & Richardson 2009). Therefore, as argued by critical inquiries into participation (Hillier 2018; Kemp et al. 2015; Lombard 2013), its processes should be scrutinized by assessing their inclusivity and capacity to accommodate deliberation among top-down and bottom-up actors, to articulate both consensus and conflict, and to valorise the expertise of transports users and workers (Enright 2019; Sosa López & Montero 2018). These demands underpin diverse bottom-up social movements that – whether attacking urban light rail stations in East Jerusalem (Nolte 2016), contesting the development of a high-frequency freight rail link crossing the Netherlands (Van der Heijden 2006), or protesting against PT fare hikes in Chile – have resisted the top-down ways in which transport is made. Despite operating in very different local contexts, their message is strikingly coherent: such movements connect transport to broader political struggles for more democratic urban decision-making and citizen appropriation of urban space. Their resistance against urban regimes thus represents 'a desire for a fully-fledged transformation of the political structuring of life, against exclusive, oligarchic, and consensual governance' (Wilson & Swyngedouw 2014, p. 3).

To summarize, mobility experiences and systems of mobility are important means of grasping how cities are organized and understood but they should be understood together with the political economy of how PT is made. This is to say, mobilities need relating to 'revanchist' urban regimes, boosterist and entrepreneurial policies, exclusions of marginalized groups as an outcome of splintered infrastructures (Graham & Marvin 2001), post-political planning regimes and instances of gentrification, which is often exacerbated by PT investments.

III. Public Space Meets Public Transport

To recap the argument here, as this multitude of perspectives and studies on public space shows, the interest in investigating public space, which was long dominated by researchers in political theory, as well as urban studies, has expanded into other disciplines in recent decades, exploring the democratic potential, societal uses, and micro-level sociologies of public spaces. As nominally open places, public spaces are sites of intersecting mobilities, generating potentials of wider generations of public sphere. Nevertheless, instead of such

generation, the death of public space has become a powerful narrative – especially if public space is discussed in relation to mobility, considering the influence of automobility. However, we should heed Watson (2006, p. 7), who argues that instead of centring on the dark narratives of public space, positive accounts seeing public space as 'life enhancing, exciting, safe and inclusive', do not just offer analytical observations but 'can take us far in creating those spaces in just that way'. Researchers should hence be more open and accommodating to account for the conviviality of public spaces and pay attention to domestication not just in a critical sense but as producing homely spaces (Koch & Latham 2012; 2013). Such interactions between strangers indeed happen in public spaces. PT is one of the principal sites for such encounters, highlighting the mundane, the everyday, but also the meaningful, identity-related and citizenship-generating qualities of PT as public space. Thus, whichever perspective we favour – the more embodied and interactionist or expressive and representational – defining public space clearly and unambiguously is complicated if we agree with Iveson's observation that 'such clarity [of definition] would inevitably come at the cost of ignoring the very complexity which ought to be at the heart of investigations into the spatiality of publicness (and privacy)' (2007, p. 9). We argue that PT provides a particularly pertinent ground for such analysis.

Indeed, PT figures rarely in the key writings of public space. Mostly, public spaces entail 'streets, parks and plazas,' as even Iris Marion Young in her influential book noted (1990, p. 240), despite her otherwise being open to a diversity of spaces. Yet, many public space scholars attend to PT in their work, even if it remains merely in the background. Thus, Iveson refers to examples of spreading message in PT constituting then one of the principal public spaces in this regard. For Low (2002), similarly, the square as a public space starts when one steps out of a bus; the bus is where she starts her narration of a fieldwork site – a park. Nevertheless, some classical works are more attentive to PT in their narration of public space. Watson (2006), thus, pays attention to PT when she refers to respondents' experiences of public and private: such as the feeling of safety or the informal rules of behaviour. Yet PT is not explicitly a question of public space: The stress on marginal places, everyday and mundane interactions – the very ordinary – as exemplified by public ponds, street markets, bathing sites or allotments could easily also include PT vehicles. Following her observation of the 'striking paucity of studies of the mundane and commonplace spaces of the city where people simply muddle through or rub along' (p. 16) we could easily position PT as precisely one such space.

The extent to which PT and spaces like it – mundane, ordinary, characterized by frequent use and unspoken interactions – enter studies dealing with public spaces depends much on what perspective is taken in studies of PT. These may be embodied interactions, but also more than talk, addressing 'bodies and their micro-movements' (Watson 2006, p. 6). Mattiolli (2014) looked explicitly into PT use, concluding that the mundane encounters and public sphere are not separate but intersect. He notes how 'PT allows a kind of negotiation of the stranger phenomenon' (p. 74) associated with attitudes more tolerant than the secessionist and individualistic ones usual in cities that are car-dominated and sprawling. Mobilities, whether related to PT or not, both challenge and produce public spaces, in all of the diverse meanings of the term. Mobilities challenge publicness if we stress that mutual understandings and thus common feelings of publicness rely on extended periods of interaction. It takes time for mutuality to emerge and mobility disrupts it. Indeed, Simmel (1903) influentially argued that to be blasé is the defining characteristic of modern life. This is

as exemplified by the experience of a PT ride in which people share a space for extended periods as complete strangers without striking up a conversation (Jensen 2006). Nevertheless, simply seeing mobilities as evaporating and diminishing publicness is a very limited view: public space is also produced by mobilities, considering that publicness relies on the shifts of individuals in citizen constellations. Indeed, the entrance of new actors works towards the emergence of commonality and mutual understandings across a wider group. Contact between strangers – the difference and intersection of multi-cultures – is at the core of public space (Watson 2006). Such interactions could form a shared acceptance of one another. But more than mere acceptance, such comings-together are also all face-to-face interactions between strangers, coordinated by tacit rules. As such, they facilitate the existence of publicness (Jensen 2006, building on Goffman).

Still, PT is unlike any other public space. Specifically, PT is a particularly intense site of encounters, characterized by density and proximity (Bissell 2010). Additionally, it can be one of the most regulated types of public spaces, where a range of (in)formal/tacit norms of behaviour are enacted and subverted. Density and corporeal proximity only accentuate the compliance or negotiation dynamics of what is (in)appropriate, (un)acceptable collective or individual behaviour in transport. PT embodies non-agora-like public space – seen as the characteristic experience for modern urbanity. It is 'modern' in its blasé environment and it is non-agoric because of the ways in which it entails collective and restricted mobilities. This intense site of encounters shapes perceptions of others and can add to collective experience (Paget-Seekins & Tironi 2016), to conviviality and 'intercultural dialogue' (Koefoed et al. 2017). At the same time, it is entangled with processes 'of differentiation and exclusion' (Wilson 2011, p. 635) resulting in 'racialisation, stigmatisation and intolerance' (Koefoed et al. 2017). Thus, close encounters on PT are sites of everyday multiculturalism (Lobo 2014) as well as forms of racialized and (passively) aggressive micro-encounters (Purifoye 2015). Like any public space, PT is convivial and inviting but also segregating and restricting. But differently from many other public spaces, these dimensions play out in constrained spaces, in which mobility also functions as physical closure, resulting in an impossibility of escaping unwelcome situations. As Mattiolli (2014, p. 61) notes 'PT is one of the main contexts where urban dwellers experience two of the defining features of public space and urbanity: sharing space with strangers and dealing with diversity' but this occurs in a particular physical setting with its own peculiar characteristics.

Thus, to understand the kind of public space PT is, we also should not forget the main aim of PT. The reason why these systems are introduced and developed in cities is still to transport people from one place to another. This is what the public expects from PT and this is what politicians and planners aim for. Yet, this raison d'être of PT is not in any way straightforward. The choice of transport modes is also shaped by potential practices within them. Instead of 'a narrow economic perspective' with the focus on the transit time as wasted time, Bissell (2018, p. 76) shows its neglect of 'how commuting time is lived, perceived, and managed by commuters, generating various opportunities and challenges'. Such lived time characterizes all sorts of commutes, with drive time a time for being alone, listening music (Bull 2004), talking with children (Laurier et al. 2008), or immersing oneself in urban atmospheres (Middleton 2011). Yet, PT is a particularly welcoming space for reading, watching films, chatting on smartphones or conversing with friends (Lyons & Urry 2005), and commuters develop increasingly sophisticated skills for handling laptops and other work equipment to do their jobs while on transit (Bissell 2018). Thus, there are various potential

uses of the time while on PT. While these are usually activities carried on in private they can also be activities enhancing and generating a form of publicness. PT entails potential value for passengers as their private time while in collective to do some work, relax before getting to a destination or simply gaze out of the window or engage in people-watching (Lyons & Urry 2005). This is an important dimension, especially considering the planning PT systems but also for devising events on PT to enhance its publicness: riders might want to be on their own instead of becoming part of some public performance.

While much of the commute is indeed solitary and a way to find time to carry out work activities or seek solitary leisure time, the community of transit spaces is produced both involuntarily (as external effects of listening to others' conversations, observing strangers and receiving the attention, often unwanted, of fellow passengers) as well as voluntarily. The voluntary dimension is observable in emerging conversations between strangers or artistic interventions in the internal spaces of PT as well as tackling its symbolic and political significance in urban space by re-designing stops, stations and the exterior of transport vehicles (Radice 2018). PT is individual and yet also social and collective, it is 'collectivity without festival and solitude without isolation' (Augé 2002, p. 30).

Seeing PT as a space of sociability and deliberation shows that people can learn and expand their minds on PT (Bissell 2018). However, perhaps even more importantly, PT could provide a space in which to build something shared with people we do not talk to. For instance, we can think about how the bus queue, the metro station and customs about entering and exiting trains might bond citizens together. The examples of 'stand clear of the doors, please' and 'mind the gap' on the London Underground provide some examples of such shared experiences. Arguably, we could be able to develop shared attitudes, a worldview, and do so even with people we do not necessarily talk to. The status of PT as a shared collective experience of society results from the way in which PT is often experienced via regular travel and not just a few memorable and remarkable rides. In tandem with this regularity, PT is frequently a space in which certain outlooks are developed and exercised, for example towards the city and towards one's fellow citizens riding on the same route. In this sense, 'people not only observe the city whilst moving through it, rather they constitute the city by practising mobility' (Jensen 2009, p. 140).

The very experience of PT journeys does not simply reflect and expose pre-existing identities and differences but can turn them into transformative experiences with positive and negative effects. The mobilities literature hence offers important insights which justify studying PT as public space. Nevertheless, there is still very limited knowledge of what kind of public space PT is, of how or whether it creates spaces of sociability and deliberation, or of whether it is ultimately a site of integration rather than social exclusion. Moreover, the ideal properties and values ascribed to public space in general and PT in particular play out differentially in different times and places and produce different socialities shaped by 'historical legacies of individual public spaces' (Amin 2008, p. 22). PT is commemorated and a historical site, as part of the public spaces of cities and as itself a historically valued public space. Drawing from the article by Paget-Seekins and Tironi (2016), the public qualities of public space are not merely about interactions in confined space but also about public organizing and funding as well as public protest, deliberation and democracy, making PT a public concern. This ties the public space character of PT to the previously discussed

inquiries into urban mobility productions wherein attention should be paid to the power relations within which the planning, construction and use of PT is related to.

IV. Expanding a Public Space Perspective to Public Transport

In what follows, we provide possible routes into the nexus where public transport and public space meet, and discuss potential roadways and approaches for fruitful research. We propose to do so by paying attention to three dimensions: while the daily encounter on vehicles is the obvious means of bringing a public-space perspective to PT and expanding on the limited engineering-based view, such a perspective also necessitates paying attention to various mediations: of regulation, history and the future (or modernization). Then, firstly, public space experience and PT narration are affected by past spaces and practices. Secondly, the potentials of generating publicness are shaped by forms of regulation, considering the importance of free and welcoming access to PT as controlled by tickets and their enforcement. The third important dimension is modernization as well as contestations of it and proposals to seek different forms of modernization, both embedded in (critical) ideas of Europeanization. What matters in this paper, then, is not just the everyday experience of PT as public space through its use – which was unpacked importantly in the previous section. It is how such use is shaped by modes of regulating access – reflected through past practices and memories – and is part of imaginations of the future as reflected in ideas of modernization and Europeanization.

1. Price as a means of controlling public transport's publicness

The interaction and tension between the various interests and stakeholders involved in PT, and, consequently, its function as public space that has the capacity to promote and impede social and spatial justice, rests on various elements. From these multiple elements that influence PT inclusiveness, it is that of fares, with their complicated and often restricting controlling measures, which is perhaps the most influential and significant. Moreover, as discussed already, free access is a principal criterion of defining high-quality public space in much of the public space literature. PT fares can be viewed through the lens of four main sets of perspectives on urban transport, as distinguished by Kębłowski and Bassens (2018).

First, PT fares can be analysed through the neoclassical lens, which perceives transport as a 'rational' system geared towards economic growth and individual utility. Neoclassical transport economists consider fares necessary in terms of assuring the financial stability of transport networks, generating important income for PT authorities (CERTU 2010; FNAUT 2015; Storchmann 2003). This revenue is – at least in theory – continuously reinvested to provide a modern infrastructure geared towards improving network efficiency and capacity. Besides assuring cost effectiveness, PT fares allow transport engineers to control passenger flows (Baum 1973; Cats et al. 2014; Duhamel 2004). They act as a demand management mechanism that prevents short or marginal trips – in extreme cases referred to as 'useless mobility' – which may lead to overcrowding, insecurity, increased demand and maintenance

costs (Cervero 1990; Duhamel 2004; Fearnley 2013). Furthermore, fares are meant to function as a price tag that makes passengers recognize the value of PT – following an idea that whatever has no price and is free, has no value, or is devalued, and therefore suffers from disrespect and disinvestment. Nevertheless, even if a radical perspective on the self-sufficiency of PT is not taken – for instance in many European cities, where PT remains significantly supported from state budgets – fares still act as potential sources for income enabling operators to invest in the system.

Secondly, PT fares play an important role in visions of sustainable transport (Buehler & Pucher 2011; de Groot & Steg 2006; Owens 1995). Aiming at decreasing the modal share of private vehicles, which are recognized as a cause of important externalities (pollution, noise, accidents) that make a negative impact on urban open public spaces (Banister 2008), thus decreasing 'liveability', proponents of 'sustainable' transport promote an increase of PT quality: in particular among more affluent middle-class car drivers (De Witte & Macharis 2010). Accordingly, this might actually mean that PT fares are convenient tools to police access to the PT system: fares function as a barrier protecting the high-quality service from users who could diminish the perception of PT quality among wealthier citizens. Fares function to attract middle-classes through bringing money into the system but also as a way to make the service more exclusive.

Thirdly, more critical perspectives on urban transport, in part building on critical urban studies, consider fares as a cause of social exclusion, as they make one's usage of PT conditional on one's financial and, in part then, social capital. Fares can also be considered as an 'unjust' additional payment that individual passengers are required to make on top of their contribution via various municipal, regional and national taxes, from which the PT services is subsidized in many cities. The apparent solution to this problem lies in providing 'social' reduced fares for specific groups (Hodson 2008). However, this policy has been criticized as a stigmatizing device as it, for instance, requires users to officially declare themselves as 'poor' in order to obtain access to cheaper PT tickets (Harmony 2018). Following this system, then, there would be users who fully deserve their access as they themselves bought their ticket whereas others rely on support.

Fourthly and finally, fares – whether full or reduced – furthermore act as tools of biopolitical control, providing the State and its various actors with an excuse for collecting, storing, and using personal user data (Kleiner 2010; Rice & Parkin 2010). There is increasing evidence that the very tool of fare control is increasingly applied across Europe as a tool of police control, not least to identify, search and arrest 'undocumented' transnational migrants (Niang 2013; Rensonnet 2018; Tsjeng 2013).

Such critiques of fares have suggested the policy of fare-free PT (FFPT) as an immediate response to the fare question (Kębłowski 2019). There is evidence that provision of free goods (such as housing, water, or energy) has strong distributional effects in the lower social strata, with limited impact on the upper strata. Thus, providing infrastructures without charging for them furthers achievement of social justice. This is significantly a reason why various social movements and activist groups have formed their critique of fares and advocated free public rides (Larrabure 2016; Maricato 2013; Verlinghieri & Venturini 2017). The Swedish group Planka.nu (2016) is perhaps one of the most famous of those, active since the early 2000s. One of its functions is to act as a cooperative fund helping with

payment of fines, it also works as part of broader arguments for a sustainable city through advocating of a free PT system. In this way, FFPT is potentially more open and public infrastructure. Nevertheless, even if the FFPT is implemented, it is important to pay attention to the political conditions it is introduced and the 'unintended' consequences that might make the system eventually less just than expected, even if the negative effects happen outside the place of policy implementation (Kębłowski et al. 2019).

2. Histories of public transport experiences, production and power inequalities

Insights from the histories of PT in different European environments illuminate the contemporary role of PT as public space and how it has a potential to aid or hinder social integration. One record of the impact of price-related inequalities, for example, is the accumulated archive of PT experiences accessible through texts, visual images and material cultures. Investigation of such resources provides evidence of past social encounters so aiding understanding of European presents, modelling a 'stratigraphy' (Westphal 2011) of PT as public space, excavating its experience layers and meanings over time. Approaches to historical research built around cultural memory (Rigney & Erll 2009) and the history of technology (Schivelbusch 2014 [1977]), provide means for understanding how narratives of the past in cities, including the presence of PT networks such as trams in those pasts, continue to effect varied presents and decisions about the future. Histories of PT experience(s) reveal cartographies and narratives of contestation that contribute further to discussions of PT futures.

Historicized approaches to public space have sometimes put it into a narrative stretching back to the ancient Greek agora. While free speech in Ancient Athenian democratic institutions was restricted to free men and others were excluded, the physical space of the agora was, however, a free space for all people of the society. Such encounters might not have been political in nature, but there was the possibility for that (Vlassopoulos 2007), indicating that the physical and material encounters which took place in spaces like the agora could be compared with later narratives of transport. For Harvey (2006, p. 17), the ideal of the agora has led to 'some kind of association or even identity' of 'the proper functioning of public space' and 'democratic governance' over a long period of time. An understanding of public space connecting it via a notion like the agora to democracy in the nation state could be challenged via PT. PT, after all, is a type of public space in modernity that is radically unlike the sense of space typically presented in idealized views of the agora (as a zone of free and open contact between people who know each other). Much twentieth-century public space thinking, from Jacobs (1961) to Sennett (1993), while critical of some of this idealism, still importantly rested on trying to create an agora-like public space, even if socially more inclusive than Greek agoras, in the modern city which, as Engels and Simmel (and modernist literary authors) recognized, was profoundly unlike that. The notion of the agora, arguably, has been used to judge and grade spaces in ways that misunderstands their qualities and potentials. In this way, PT seems to easily fall short of qualifying as public space. Being surrounded by strangers on a long journey to and from a work place is almost the opposite of the agora as a space which you can enter and leave at will (if it weren't for fares and other restrictive measures explicated above). Yet this only holds true when limiting ourselves to the agora's political dimension: taking into account the physical and material

encounters, we might be able to explore conceptual similarities to PT. As already argued, PT might gain special significance among public spaces if it comes to typify public spaces that are in several ways unlike the agora ideal. It is a space of movement, repetition and confinement, usually with barriers of cost to entry, and yet it is perhaps the quintessential modern urban public space.

Histories of PT as public space involve holistic investigations of varying cities' unique PT stories. In London, trams have an important position in the world history of PT, being active from 1860 to 1952. However, the ways in which trams functioned in and as public spaces during this period have almost entirely disappeared from views of the city's past in that period, which it was the capital of a global empire and, in the earlier decades, the largest city on earth. Retracing otherwise lost cartographies and narrative histories of London tramscapes unearths qualities of exclusion and unruliness that cast light on twenty-first-century cities efforts to plan, with varied degrees of financial and spatial accessibility, PT networks. In fact, trams and their potential value for the global city have not been forgotten, as evidence from archives and enthusiasts' activities demonstrates, and their history matters in contemporary ideas. Looked at through the concept of cultural memory, PT can connect past and present (Rigney & Erll 2009). And trams can be restored to conceptions of cities as imaginative places (Finch 2016). So memories of past PT, such as the tram, continues to affect the present. In Turku, Finland, the mode of attending to the past is often nostalgic, as can be seen in many publications devoted to the tram network there which closed in 1972. Evidence of its lost routes remain in the present infrastructure and memories. Transport history thus constitutes a very important part of local urban memory. Yet, any local transport system is also tied to larger, international networks of ideas and planning procedures as well as transport imaginations, forming part of public memory.

Histories of PT written using varied methodologies and approaches from branches of history, literary and cultural studies teach not just about what happened in single historical pasts or in a temporally-organized narrative, but also how history is present in the contemporary moment. Finally, urban experience is inescapably historical: that is, city plans record past power structures and city planning is based on what was there before. PT systems with a long history such as the London Underground, portions of which date back to the 1860s, indicate the layered nature of all cities in which portions of the past tend to reassert themselves. Last but not least, PT's multifarious qualities as public space are valuably revealed by the tales people tell about PT experience. These include representations of PT vehicles, interiors, stops and stations in literary texts such as novels, but also the memoirs of staff and passengers (Elborough & Kerr 2018; Vass 2018).

3. Modernization and Europeanization

Apart from relationships with the past, future perspectives also influence the experience of PT. Attention here to modernization and its frequent entanglement with Europeanization.

If Sheller's is right to observe that communities are increasingly established through 'mobile publics', which are characterized as 'momentary stabilisations of collective identities' (Sheller 2004, p. 50), then the provision, design and efficiency of 'European' PT systems becomes a crucial area of encounter in urban societies. PT space would thus not only shape the image of an implicitly perceived community and include certain citizens in circumscribed mobility

networks, allowing access to shared resources and knowledge, but furthermore establish and reproduce inherited logics of predominant mobility regimes. Entering from this perspective, notions of modernization, publicness and diversity are mediated and framed, advanced or condemned in PT spaces. This discursive dimension builds a further entry point to analyse the development of PT as public space.

The ideal type of the agora as a quintessential public space has been already criticized in this paper as a euphemism, concealing the social and legal access restrictions and power hierarchies involved in it. Yet, the agora implies another notion, referring as it does back to Greek ideals. It further functions to legitimize the idea of public space as a uniquely European concept. The symbolic branding of PT networks, shaping the impression of European cities, squares and infrastructure for centuries, superficially seem to support this idea, especially when compared to apparently more car-dependent North American cities (Wickham 2006), with claims even made that PT provides a potential basis for European citizenship. Besides the material presence of large PT systems in European cities, Wickham also suggests that the regulation framework and the great involvement of municipalities lay the ground for a uniquely European way of PT provision (ibid.). This also becomes apparent, when following the ongoing discussion in the EU trying to create European space through infrastructural development funding and policies (Jensen & Richardson 2004; Misa & Schot 2005). Countless urban mobility plans have been published over the past few decades by city councils and transport planners, insisting on the outstanding social importance of a smart, modernized, barrier-free and environmentally friendly PT supply for their cities. Similarly, a competition among the most liveable and climate-friendly mobility networks has gained significant importance in European cities. Thus, as the 'new Europe' is proclaimed as a Europe of cities (Le Galès 2002, p. 145), the shape, shortcoming and prestige of established urban transport networks and infrastructures is more than a political concern but a tool to create hegemonic – even if symbolic – power over space in and outside the EU.

The influence and predominant role of EU-integration policies in the late 1990s and early 2000s on the marketization of urban life already described in this paper has fuelled extensive discussions, especially during past and ongoing EU-accession talks. Many scholars critically admit that the consolidation policy under the label of European integration 'has contributed to the vulnerability of specific models of capitalism' (Bohle 2018, p. 2). As the accession of countries in Eastern Europe to the EU was widely realized through an external policy strategy that has 'exercised remarkable control over the economic transformation in East and Central Europe' (Jacoby 2010, p. 418), many have pointed out that Europe's periphery has been developed into a liberal development state. This, it is argued, combines 'capacities for increasing the role of transnational markets in shaping developmental outcomes with the capacities to maintain and increase the market power of various categories of domestic actors' (Bruszt & Vukov 2017, p. 672).

The entanglements of public space, modernization and Europeanization are fundamental in this regard. Quijano has famously referred to the problematic colonial implications of modernization and development narratives:

> Eurocentrism locked intersubjective relations between the European and the non-European in a temporal frame that always positioned the European as more advanced. Whether the opposition pitted the civilized against the barbarians […]

> the modern against the premodern, or the developed against the underdeveloped, the superiority of the European was never questioned
>
> (Quijano 2008, p. 183).

This concept of a *coloniality* of power is directly connected to the governmentality of public space. Tlostanova and Mignolo have further described how a colonial matrix of power emerges from struggles for economic control, control over authority and the public sphere as well as the control of knowledge (Tlostanova & Mignolo 2009, p. 135). Thus, transferring this to EU infrastructure policies, the combination of exclusive expert knowledge, sovereignty over urban utopias and development objectives as well as the disposal over financial resources creates the asymmetrical framework of European modernization discourses.

The politics of infrastructure development become in this sense a matter of in-/ and exclusion, a matter of collective identity through a significant other as well as a general contribution to an omnipresent dispositif of European connectivity and propinquity (Jensen & Richardson 2007; Amin 2004). Contemporary ongoing reforms, for example of transport networks perceived as outdated networks in some European cities are therefore an interesting source to observe both the negative perception of the non-modern as well as an imagined solution for these problems affiliated in a European style of PT provision. Besides, the publicly articulated contestations of PT supply at Europe's peripheries reach far beyond local transport policies but help to deconstruct an oppressive dispositive of modernization inscribed in the notion of a European public space.

V. Concluding discussion: European integration through public transport

This working paper has outlined an approach to PT as public space in European cities. Such a perspective, we have argued, is importantly shaped by mobilities research, but there are also various other influences, including critical inquiries into urban political geographies. Fundamentally, it is important to keep in mind that the cities of the global North should not be positioned as the norm: even though our core empirical concern resides within European cities, a multiplicity of authors have complicated a simple narrative of what constitutes a 'normal' city (Robinson 2011; Roy 2011; Tuvikene 2016). Instead of stressing 'Europe' as the benchmark, European epistemologies should be provincialized (Chakrabarty 2000), highlighting the importance of diverse paths of development. In this sense, it is welcoming that public space is advancing in ways that go far beyond the European perspective, including for instance, conflicts between informal uses and formal plans of public spaces in Latin America (Donovan 2008), challenging general simple global Northern assumptions used in theory-making (Bodnar 2015). For us, the inspiration has thus been the work by Paget-Seekins and Tironi (2016), building precisely on the diverse experiences of public transport in Latin America and beyond, suggesting more politically-charged, actively contested experiences of public spaces than the classical European urban visions of squares and urban planning and design practices for streets typically allow us to perceive. Related to this is our claim that PT embodies a kind of public space that is markedly different

from that envisaged in the idea of the ancient Greek agora – or the later European city square – held as an ideal.

This paper has noted the already emerging and expanding literature that has explicitly discussed PT, in as one way or another, as public space. Still, the research literature on public space has avoided explicitly including PT in its corpus. We have argued that PT has the potential to develop new and enhanced understandings of public space in several different ways. Important in such developments are the historical dimension, the function of PT fares in managing (and limiting) access and processes of Europeanization. All of these dimensions suggest that PT can have an integrational role in Europe, bringing together citizens (sometimes convivially, sometimes antagonistically), generating affects (which are also collective experiences) and integrating politically and via governing practices. A meta-analysis of insights into histories, political contestations and user practices of PT as public space needs creating. Specifically, this would assess the extent to which European integration can be conceptualized through PT. This means attention to the appeal of different transport modes such as the much higher public regard for rail-based services, be they regional trains or trams, than that for trolley-buses and buses in general. Further vital questions include that of how artistic practices deal with PT and there is potential for generating public space through visual and performative artistic means. Another important question concerns the nature of the 'urban' dimension of PT and the supposedly more 'urban' dimensions of some PT modes, such as trams.

Thus we are interested in policy-regimes and the role of policy actors in developing and promoting certain PT services. We are equally interested in PT affects and affective atmospheres, which are produced both consciously by artists and even system developers, but also unconsciously by drivers, passengers, ticket controllers and other involved actors. The affects of PT in present-day European cities cannot be understood without a grasp of their historical inheritances, as recorded in diverse sources including works of fiction and municipal archives. We raise the question of the extent to which PT can be seen as more than simply a technological system: as social and emotional space. Beyond this, we explore how this system gains other characteristics, such as its becoming 'European' (Wickham 2006)? In many ways, PT systems make cities what they are. The history of cities is importantly shaped by PT developments, which have directed city buildings as well as generated a particular image of the cities. Citizens experience places through PT, which is one of the principal ways of coming together with other members of society. But this coming together is not mere being in the same condensed space but it is part of expectations of access, the emotions and affects the riding of PT or the mere idea of what it was, is or could be, generates, and manifold actions that different actors of PT do or plan to do. These are all dimensions that in the sense of this paper, make PT part of conceptualizations of public space.

References

Addie, J.-P. D. (2013). Metropolitics in Motion: The Dynamics of Transportation and State Reterritorialization in the Chicago and Toronto City-Regions. In: *Urban Geography* 34(2), 188-217.

Ahmed, Q. I., H. Lu & S. Ye (2008). Urban transportation and equity: A case study of Beijing and Karachi. In: *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 42(1), 125-139.

Aldred, R. (2012). Governing transport from welfare state to hollow state: The case of cycling in the UK. In: *Transport Policy 23*, 95-102.

Amin, A. (2004). Regions unbound: towards a new politics of place. In: *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 86(1), 33-44.

Amin, A. (2008). Collective Culture and Urban Public Space. In: *City* 12(1), 5-24.

Arefi, M. (2009). Book Review: Publics and the City by Kurt Iveson. *Journal of Urban Design 14*, 230-231.

Arendt, H. (1998). *The Human Condition* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Augè, M. (2002). *In the Metro*. University of Minnesota Press.

Banister, D. (2008). The sustainable mobility paradigm. In: *Transport Policy 15*, 73-80.

Baum, H. J. (1973). Free Public Transport. In: *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, *7*(1), 3-19.

Bærenholdt, J. O. (2013). Governmobility: The powers of mobility. In: *Mobilities* 8(1), 20-34.

Beckmann, J. (2001). Automobility - A Social Problem and Theoretical Concept. In: *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 19(5), 593-607.

Bissell, D. (2010). Passenger Mobilities: Affective Atmospheres and the Sociality of PT. In: *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28(2), 270-289.

Bissell, D. (2018). *Transit Life: How Commuting Is Transforming Our Cities*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Bodnar, J. (2015). Reclaiming Public Space. In: *Urban Studies* 52(12), 2090-2104.

Bohle, D. (2018). European integration, capitalist diversity and crises trajectories on Europe’s Eastern periphery. In: *New political economy* 23(2), 239-253.

Bruszt, L. & V. Vukov (2017). Making states for the single market. European integration and the reshaping of economic states in the Southern and Eastern peripheries of Europe. In: *West European Politics* 40(4), 663-687.

Bücher, M., J. Urry, & K. Witchger (2011). *Mobile Methods*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Buehler, R., & J. Pucher (2011). Making public transport financially sustainable. In: *Transport Policy 18*(1), 126-138.

Bull, M. (2004). Automobility and the Power of Sound. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 21(4-5), 243-259.

Cats, O., T. Reimal & Y. Susilo (2014). *Public Transport Pricing Policy – Empirical Evidence from a Fare-Free Scheme in Tallinn, Estonia*. 93rd Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C.

CERTU (2010). *Le débat: La gratuité des Transports Collectifs Urbains ?* (TRANS FLASH Bulletin d’information Des Déplacements Urbains Départementaux et Régionaux).

Cervero, R. (1990). Transit pricing research. In: *Transportation 17*(2), 117-139.

Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton & Oxford: Princenton University Press.

Cresswell, T. (2006). *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World*. New York & London: Routledge.

Cresswell, T. (2010). Towards a Politics of Mobility. In: *Environment and Planning. D: Society & Space* 28(1), 17-31.

Degen, M. M. & G. Rose (2012). The Sensory Experiencing of Urban Design: The Role of Walking and Perceptual Memory. In: *Urban Studies* 49(15), 3271-3287.

Degen, M., G. Rose & B. Basdas (2010). Bodies and Everyday Practices in Designed Urban Environments. In: *Science Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal for Science and Technology Studies* 23(2), 60-76.

de Groot, J., & L. Steg (2006). Impact of transport pricing on quality of life, acceptability, and intentions to reduce car use: An exploratory study in five European countries. In: *Journal of Transport Geography* 14(6), 463-470.

Deutsche, R. (1990). Uneven development: Public art in New York City. In: Ferguson, R., M. Gever, T. T. Minh-ha, F. González-Torres & C. West (Eds.): *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures*. The New Museum of Contemporary Art and The MIT Press, 107-132.

De Witte, A., & C. Macharis (2010). Commuting to Brussels: How attractive is ‘free’ public transport?’. In: *Brussels Studies 37*, 1-19.

Donovan, M. G. (2008). Informal cities and the contestation of public space: The case of Bogotá’s street vendors, 1988-2003. In: *Urban Studies* 45(1), 29-51.

Duhamel, Y. (2004). *Gratuité des transports publics urbains et repartition modale retour sur rapport final*. Axiales.

Elborough, T. & J. Kerr (Eds.) (2018). *Bus Fare: Writings on London’s Most Loved Means of Transport*. Basingstoke, UK: AA Media.

Enright, T. (2016). *The Making of Grand Paris: Metropolitan Urbanism in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Enright, T. (2019). Transit justice as spatial justice: learning from activists. In: *Mobilities* 14(5), 665-680.

Epprecht, N., T. von Wirth, C. Stünzi & Y. B. Blumer (2014). Anticipating transitions beyond the current mobility regimes: How acceptability matters. In: *Futures* 60, 30-40.

Farmer, S. (2011). Uneven Public Transportation Development in Neoliberalizing Chicago, USA. In: *Environment and Planning A* 43(5), 1154-1172.

Farrington, J. H. (2007). The new narrative of accessibility: Its potential contribution to discourses in (transport) geography. In: *Journal of Transport Geography* 15(5), 319-330.

Fearnley, N. (2013). Free Fares Policies: Impact on Public Transport Mode Share and Other Transport Policy Goals. In: *International Journal of Transportation* 1(1), 75-90.

Finch, J. (2016). *Deep Locational Criticism: Imaginative Place in Literary Research and Teaching*. John Benjamins.

FNAUT (2015). *La FNAUT: bilan et perspectives d'avenir. Conférence de presse.* Fédération Nationale des Associations d'Usagers des Transports.

Foucault, M. & G. Burchell (2011). *The government of self and others: Lectures at the College de France, 1982-1983*. Macmillan.

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. In: *Social Text* 25/26, 56-80.

Girnau, G. & F. Blennemann (1989). Cost-benefits in underground urban public transportation. *Tunnelling and Underground Space Technology* 4(1), 23-30.

Golub A., R. A. Marcantonio & T. W. Sanchez (2013). Race, Space, and Struggles for Mobility: Transportation Impacts on African Americans in Oakland and the East Bay. In: *Urban Geography* 34(5), 699-728.

Graham, S. (2000). Constructing premium network spaces: Reflections on infrastructure networks and contemporary urban development. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 24(1), 183-200.

Graham, S. & S. Marvin (2001). *Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities and the Urban Condition*. Routledge: London.

Grant-Muller, S. M., P. Mackie, J. Nellthorp & A. Pearman (2001). Economic appraisal of European transport projects: The state-of-the-art revisited. In: *Transport Reviews* 21(2), 237-261.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Harmony, X. (2018). Fare Policy and Vertical Equity: The Trade-off between Affordability and Cost Recovery. *Journal of Public Transportation* 21(2), 41-59.

Harvey, D. (1989). From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism. In: *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography* 71(1), 3-17.

Harvey, D. (2006). The political economy of public space. In: Low, S. M. & N. Smith (Eds.): *The Politics of Public Space*. New York: Routledge.

Haughton, G. & P. McManus (2012). Neoliberal Experiments with Urban Infrastructure: The Cross City Tunnel, Sydney: Neoliberal experiments with urban infrastructure in Sydney, Australia. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 36(1), 90-105.

Hanson, S. & G. Pratt (1995). *Gender,Work, And Space*. Routledge.

Hillier, J. (2018). Politics of The Ring: Limits to Public Participation in Engineering Practice. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 42(2), 334-356.

Hine, J. (2003). Social exclusion and transport systems. In: *Transport Policy* 10(4), 263.

Hodson, P. (2008). Social fares in urban public transport in Europe. In: *Public Transport International* 57(6), 17-19.

Isaksson, K. & T. Richardson (2009). Building legitimacy for risky policies: The cost of avoiding conflict in Stockholm. In: *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 43(3), 251-257.

Iveson, K. (2007). *Publics and the City*. Wiley.

Jacobs, J. (1961). *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House.

Jacoby, W. (2010): Managing globalization by managing Central and Eastern Europe. The EU's backyard as threat and opportunity. In: *Journal of European Public Policy* 17 (3), p. 416-432.

Jayne, M. (2017). Sharon Zukin. In: Koch, R. & A. Latham (Eds.): *Key Thinkers on Cities*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 249-254.

Jensen, O. B. (2006). Facework, Flow and the City: Simmel, Goffman, and Mobility in the Contemporary City. In: *Mobilities* 1(2), 143-65.

Jensen, O. B. (2009). Flows of meaning, cultures of movements–urban mobility as meaningful everyday life practice. In: *Mobilities* 4(1), 139-158.

Jensen, O. B. & T. Richardson (2004). *Making European Space. Mobility, Power and Territorial Identity*. Routledge.

Jensen, A. & T. Richardson (2007). New region, new story. Imagining mobile subjects in transnational space. In: *Space and Polity* 11(2), 137-150.

Kębłowski, W. (2020). Why (not) abolish fares? Exploring the global geography of fare-free public transport. In: *Transportation* 47, 2807-2835.

Kębłowski, W. & D. Bassens (2018). All Transport Problems Are Essentially Mathematical: The Uneven Resonance of Academic Transport and Mobility Knowledge in Brussels. In: *Urban Geography* 39(3), 413-437.

Kębłowski, W., T. Tuvikene, T. Pikner & J. S. Jauhiainen (2019). Towards an Urban Political Geography of Transport: Unpacking the Political and Scalar Dynamics of Fare-Free Public Transport in Tallinn, Estonia. In: *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 37(6), 967-84.

Kemp, A., H. Lebuhn & G. Rattner (2015). Between Neoliberal Governance and the Right to the City: Participatory politics in Berlin and Tel Aviv. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39(4), 704-725.

Kleiner, Y. S. (2010). Racial Profiling in the Name of National Security: Protecting Minority Travlers' Civil Liberties in the Age of Terrorism. In: *Boston College Third World Law Journal* 30, 103-144.

Kenyon, S., G. Lyons & J. Rafferty (2002). Transport and social exclusion: Investigating the possibility of promoting inclusion through virtual mobility. In: *Journal of Transport Geography*, *10*(3), 207-219.

Koch, R. & A. Latham (2012). Rethinking Urban Public Space: Accounts from a Junction in West London. In: *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 37(4), 515-529.

Koch, R. & A. Latham (2013). On the Hard Work of Domesticating a Public Space. In*: Urban Studies* 50(1), 6-21.

Koefoed, L., M. D. Christensen & K. Simonsen (2017). Mobile Encounters: Bus 5A as a Cross-Cultural Meeting Place. In: *Mobilities* 12(5), 726-739.

Larrabure, M. (2016). The struggle for the new commons in the Brazilian free transit movement. *Studies in Political Economy* 97(2), 175-194.

Laurier, E. (2004). Doing Office Work on the Motorway. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 21(4-5), 261-277.

Laurier, E., H. Lorimer, B. Brown, O. Jones, O. Juhlin, A. Noble, M. Perry, D. Pica, P. Sormani, I. Strebel, L. Swan, A. S. Taylor, L. Watts & A. Weilenmann (2008). Driving and 'Passengering: Notes on the Ordinary Organization of Car Travel. In: *Mobilities* 3(1), p. 1-23.

Law, R. (1999). Beyond 'women and transport': Towards new geographies of gender and daily mobility. In: *Progress in Human Geography* 23(4), 567-588.

Lefebvre, H. (1968). *Le droit à la ville.* Paris: Anthropos.

Le Galès, P. (2002). *European Cities: Social Conflicts and Governance,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lin, J.-J. & J.-C. Chung (2017). Metro-induced gentrification: A 17-year experience in Taipei. In: *Cities* 67, 53-62.

Lobo, M. (2014). Everyday Multiculturalism: Catching the Bus in Darwin, Australia. In: *Social & Cultural Geography* 15(7), 714-729.

Lombard, M. (2013). Citizen Participation in Urban Governance in the Context of Democratization: Evidence from Low-Income Neighbourhoods in Mexico: Citizen participation in Mexico. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37(1), 135-150.

Low, S. M. (2000). *On the Plaza*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Low, S. M. & N. Smith (2006). *The Politics of Public Space*. New York: Routledge.

Lucas, K. (2012). Transport and social exclusion: Where are we now. In: *Transport Policy* 20, 105-113.

Lung-Amam, W., R. Pendall & E. Knaap (2019). Mi Casa no es Su Casa: The Fight for Equitable Transit-Oriented Development in an Inner-Ring Suburb. In: *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 39(4), 442-455.

Lynch, K. (1960). *The Image of the City.* London, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Lyons, G. & J. Urry (2005). Travel Time Use in the Information Age. In*: Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 39(2), 257-276.

Maricato, E. (Ed.) (2013). *Cidades Rebeldes: Passe Livre e as Manifestações que Tomaram as Ruas do Brasil*. Boitempo.

Martens, K. (2017). *Transport Justice: Designing Fair Transportation Systems*. Routledge.

Mattiolli, G. (2014). Moving through the City with Strangers? PT as a Significant Type of Urban Public Space. In: Shortell, T. & E. Brown (Eds.): *Walking in the European City*. Farnham: Ashgate, 57-74.

Middleton, J. (2011). Walking in the City: The Geographies of Everyday Pedestrian Practices. In: *Geography Compass* 5(2), 90-105.

Misa, T. J. & J. Schot (2005). Introduction. Inventing Europe: Technology and the hidden integration of Europe. In: *History and Technology* 21(1), 1-19.

Mitchell, D. (1995). The End of Public Space? People's Park. Definitions of the Public, and Democracy. In: *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 85(1), 108-133.

Mitchell, D. (2017). People's Park again: on the end and ends of public space. In: *Environment and Planning A* 49(3), 503-518.

Neal, Z. (2009). Locating Public Space. In: Orum, A. & Z. Neal (Eds.): *Common Ground? Readings and Reflections on Public Space*. New York: Routledge, 1-12.

Neal, Z. (2010). Seeking common ground: three perspectives on public space. In: *Urban Design and Planning DP000*, 1-8.

Newman, P. W.G. & J. R. Kenworthy (1996). The Land Use - Transport Connection. In: *Land Use Policy* 13(1), 1-22.

Niang, M. (2013, February 22). *Politiker rasar mot kontroller av papperslösa | SVT Nyheter*. Svt.Se

Nissen, S. (2008). Urban Transformation from Public and Private Space to Spaces of Hybrid Character. In: *Czech Sociological Review* 44(6), 1129-1149.

Nolte, A. (2016). Political infrastructure and the politics of infrastructure: The Jerusalem Light Rail. In: *City 20*(3), 441-454.

Owens, S. (1995). From ‘predict and provide’ to ‘predict and prevent’? Pricing and planning in transport policy. In: *Transport Policy 2*(1), 43-49.

Paget-Seekins, L. & M. Tironi (2016). The Publicness of PT: The Changing Nature of PT in Latin American Cities. In: *Transport Policy* 49, 176-183.

Pereira, R. H. M., T. Schwanen & D. Banister (2017). Distributive justice and equity in transportation. In: *Transport Reviews 37*(2), 170-191.

Planka.nu (2016). *The Traffic Power Structure* (PM Press).

Preston, V. & S. McLafferty (2016). Revisiting Gender, Race, and Commuting in New York. In: *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 106(2), 1-11.

Preston, J. & F. Rajé (2007). Accessibility, mobility and transport-related social exclusion. In: *Journal of Transport Geography* 15(3), 151-160.

Purifoye, G. Y. (2015). Nice-Nastiness and Other Raced Social Interactions on PT Systems. In: *City & Community* 14(3), 286-310.

Quijano, A. (2008). Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Social Classification. In: Moraña, M., E. Dussel & C. C. Jauregui (Eds.): *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 181-224.

Radice, M. (2018). Putting the Public in Public Art: An Ethnographic Approach to Two Temporary Art Installations. In: *City & Society* 30(1), 45-67.

Reigner, H., & T. Brenac (2019). Safe, sustainable… but depoliticized and uneven – A critical view of urban transport policies in France. In: *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 121, 218-234.

Rensonnet, J. (2018, June 3). *Les Ecolos bruxellois dézippent leurs sweats pour que la STIB «arrête sa complicité dans les arrestations de sans-papiers»*. www.lavenir.net.

Rice, S. K. & W. S. Parkin (2010). New Avenues for Profiling and Bias Research. The Question of Muslim Americans. In: *Race, Ethnicity, and Policing: New and Essential Readings*, 450-467.

Rigney, A. & A. Erll (Eds.) (2009). *Mediation, Remediation, and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

Robinson, J. (2011). Cities in a world of cities: the comparative gesture. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35(1), 1-23.

Roy, A. (2011). Slumdog Cities: Rethinking Subaltern Urbanism. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35(2), 223-238.

Schivelbusch, W. (2014) [1977]. *The Railway Journey: The Industrialization of Time and Space in the Nineteenth Century*. Oakland, California: University of California Press.

Sennett, R. (1993). *The Fall of Public Man*. London: Faber and Faber.

Sheller, M. (2004). Mobile publics. Beyond the network perspective. In: *Environment and planning D: Society and Space 22*(1), 39-52.

Sheller, M. (2015). Vital Methodologies: Live Methods, Mobile Art, and Research-Creation. In: Vannini, P. (Ed.): *Non-Representational Methodologies Re-Envisioning Research*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge, 130-145.

Sheller, M. (2018). *Mobility Justice: The Politics of Movement in an Age of Extremes*. London, Brooklyn, New York: Verso.

Siemiatycki, M. (2013). The Global Production of Transportation Public–Private Partnerships. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37(4), 1254-1272.

Simmel, G. (1903). *The Metropolis and Mental Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sosa López, O. & S. Montero (2018). Expert-citizens: Producing and contesting mobility policy in Mexican cities. In: *Journal of Transport Geography* 67(2), 137-144.

Stasik, M. (2017): Rhythm, Resonance and Kinaesthetic Enskilment in a Ghanaian Bus Station. In: *Ethnos* 82(3), 545-568.

Steinbach, R., J. Green, J. Datta & P. Edwards (2011). Cycling and the city: A case study of how gendered, ethnic and class identities can shape healthy transport choices. In: *Social Science & Medicine 72*(7), 1123-1130.

Storchmann, K. (2003). Externalities by Automobiles and Fare-Free Transit in Germany - A Paradigm Shift. In: *Journal of Public Transportation* 6(4), 5.

Stovall, M. (2019). 'It's the Hood. But That Means It's Home!' African American Feminist Critical Geographic Wanderings in the Anthropology of Space and Place. In: *Transforming Anthropology* 27(1), 50-67.

Tlostanova, M. & W. Mignolo (2009). On Pluritopic Hermeneuics, Trans-modern Thinking and Decolonial Philosophy. In: *Encounters: International Journal for the Study of Culture and Society* 1(1), 9-26.

Tsjeng, Z. (2013, August 1). *Why Is the UK Border Agency Racially Profiling People On the Tube? - VICE*. Vice.Com.

Tuvikene, T. (2016). Strategies for comparative urbanism: post-socialism as a de-territorialized concept. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 40(1), 132-146.

Urry, J. (2004). The System of Automobility. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 21(4–5), p. 25-39.

Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*. Cambridge & Malden, MA: Polity.

Uteng, T. P. & T. Cresswell (2008). *Gendered Mobilities.* Aldershot; Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Van der Heijden, H.-A. (2006). Multi-level Environmentalism and the European Union: The Case of Trans-European Transport Networks. In: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 30*(1), 23-37.

Vass, N. (2018). *The Lines that Make Us: Stories from Nathan's Bus*. Seattle: Tome Press.

Verlinghieri, E. & F. Venturini (2017). Exploring the right to mobility through the 2013 mobilizations in Rio de Janeiro. In: *Journal of Transport Geography* 67.

Vlassopoulos, K. (2007). Free Spaces: Identity, Experience and Democracy in Classical Athens. In: *The Classical Quarterly* 57(1), 33-52.

Watson, S. (2006). *City Publics: The (Dis)Enchantments of Urban Encounters*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Watson, S. & D. Studdert (2006). *Markets as sites for social interaction: Spaces of diversity .* Bristol: Policy Press.

Westphal, B. (2011) [2007]: *Geocriticism: Real and Fictional Spaces*. Translated from French by Robert T. Tally Jr. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Whyte, W. H. (1980). *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces.* New York: Project for Public Spaces.

Wickham, J. (2006). Public Transport Systems: The Sinews of European Urban Citizenship. In: *European Societies* 8(1), 3-26.

Wilson, H. F. (2011). Passing Propinquities in the Multicultural City: The Everyday Encounters of Bus Passengering. In: *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 43(3), 634-649.

Wilson, J., & E. Swyngedouw (2014). *The Post-Political and Its Discontents: Spaces of Depoliticisation, Spectres of Radical Politics.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton University Press.

Zukin, S. (2010). *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places.* New York: Oxford University Press.