

Working Paper No. 83, 2025

The Metropolis and its Social Life

Conviviality, Urban Studies, and Thoughts on Thugs

Talja Blokland



Mecila:
Working
Paper
Series

The Mecila Working Paper Series is produced by:

The Maria Sibylla Merian Centre Conviviality-Inequality in Latin America (Mecila), Rua Morgado de Mateus, 615, São Paulo – SP, CEP 04015-051, Brazil.

Executive Editors: Sérgio Costa, Lateinamerika-Institut, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany
Joaquim Toledo Jr., Mecila, São Paulo, Brazil

Editing/Production: Ramiro Segura, Joaquim Toledo Jr., Paul Talcott, Vitoria Zandonadi

This working paper series is produced as part of the activities of the Maria Sibylla Merian Centre Conviviality-Inequality in Latin America (Mecila) funded by the German Federal Ministry of Research, Technology and Space (BMFTR).

All working papers are available free of charge on the Centre website: <http://mecila.net>

Printing of library and archival copies courtesy of the Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut, Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, Germany.

Citation: Blokland, Talja (2025): “The Metropolis and its Social Life: Conviviality, Urban Studies, and Thoughts on Thugs”, *Mecila Working Paper Series*, No. 83, São Paulo: The Maria Sibylla Merian Centre Conviviality-Inequality in Latin America.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.46877/blokland.2025.83>

Copyright for this edition:

© Talja Blokland

This work is provided under a Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). The text of the license can be read at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>.

The Maria Sibylla Merian Centre Conviviality-Inequality in Latin America cannot be held responsible for errors or any consequences arising from the use of information contained in this Working Paper; the views and opinions expressed are solely those of the author or authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Maria Sibylla Merian Centre Conviviality-Inequality in Latin America, its research projects or sponsors.

Inclusion of a paper in the *Mecila Working Paper Series* does not constitute publication and should not limit publication (with permission of the copyright holder or holders) in any other venue.

Cover photo: © Nicolas Wasser

The Metropolis and its Social Life: Conviviality, Urban Studies, and Thoughts on Thugs

Talja Blokland

Abstract

This paper explores the question of why urban studies of conviviality have paid so little attention to hate and fear in urban social life. It summarizes two main or mainstream insights on conviviality in urban studies and its spatiality: its focus on walkable neighbourhoods, and the idea that further public space is anonymous – and violence is always elsewhere and external. The paper shows that the “thug” has long been known as the figure of *The Hate U Give*, as in the novel of Angie Thomas or the tattoo of the rapper Tupac – just not in urban conviviality writings. It suggests that this may have its causes in the idea of the anonymous city life versus the parochial neighbourhood community, a contrast that underplays hate and fear and fails to include the workings of violence on various scales. We may create conviviality on the neighbourhood level, yet the thug emerges from the hate we give, emulated by narratives of denunciation which are not at all new – but still relevant.

Keywords: urban studies | public space | conviviality | encounters

About the Author

Talja Blokland received her PhD in 1998 from the University of Amsterdam. Since 2009, she has been professor of urban sociology at Humboldt University Berlin, where she also directed the Georg Simmel Center for Urban Studies. Blokland is an urban sociologist whose work focuses on urban inequalities and how life in cities fosters social and spatial segregation. She explores how trust, safety, and shared understandings of urban life emerge, and has written extensively on themes related to conviviality, including public familiarity, community as urban practice, and urban comfort zones. She is the author of *Community as Urban Practice* (Polity Press, 2017), among other books.

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Conviviality in Urban Studies	4
2.1	Conviviality as Not-Always-Nice-But-Still-Harmless	4
2.2	Violence as the Threat from Outside	7
3.	Nothing New: Urban Marginalization, Fear and Securitization	8
3.1	“Safe Neighbourhoods”	9
3.2	“Dangerous Places”	12
3.3	“The Hate U Give”	13
3.4	Why the Absences?	15
3.5	Functional Diversity and Fear	15
3.6	Urban Space as Impersonal Void	17
4.	Conclusion	19
5.	Bibliography	22

1. Introduction

The attack on the Kibbutz Be’eri on 7 October 2023 made clear, once more, that the militarization of space (Davis 2011) will always fail.¹ On that day, Hamas fighters murdered Vivian Silver. She had spent her life working for peace and human rights for Palestinians. She was one of thousands of people who died in the attacks of Hamas and the genocide that followed. She was a human rights activist who worked vigorously on peaceful conviviality including recognition of Palestinian entitlements. Entering the Kibbutz required crossing a secured border that ghettoized Gaza, into a gated community secured with walls with barbed wire, high tech gates and camera-surveillance. The devices did not keep people safe. Israeli citizens and Palestinians have lived for decades with violence, and risks thereof. The massacre of Be’eri showed that higher walls, more fences, more securitizing technology and more arms lead nowhere but into deeper darkness. That the course of events left me speechless reflects the privileged position from which I have learnt to think about the social world. The urban studies literature on conviviality does not address the possibility of violence or the potential of hate.

The dehumanization necessary to kill the people of Gaza did not begin only after the attack. The attack followed failed attempts to ghettoise and structurally exclude Palestinians and was followed by destroying those humans and livelihoods which had withstood failed attempts to contain and oppress. These attempts themselves must be framed geopolitically and require another expertise than mine. The recurrent attacks of Hamas and Hezbollah on Israel, year after year, fed into what conflict studies calls a “conflict ethos”. In 2017, a representative survey among Israeli and Palestinians showed that “ongoing violence engenders more violence through a vicious circle of violence by increasing the psychological distress of the civilian population and magnifying threat perceptions of particularly of collective threat, leading to increased support for the ethos of conflict, and decreased support for political compromise” (Canetti et al. 2017: 100). The authors called for new ways of conflict resolution. They warned that the dominant ethos of conflict was taking a destructive course. Enduring peace required social and psychological changes on both sides.

Human rights violations and subtler forms of marginalization act on and produce hate, a social product of a narrative nature. Paul Gilroy remarked in the context of the “war on terror” that “the figure of the [...] terrorist has emerged to hold hands with

¹ I am grateful to all the members of the Mecila community for their feedback and their sharing of ideas, especially to the wonderful conversations I had with the other 2024 junior and senior fellows, and for Joaquim Toledo Jr. and his team for copy-editing and editorial guidance. Writing this paper would not have been possible without the excellent staff of Mecila, who made my stay in 2024 to an unforgettable experience. I am indebted to Bianca Tavolari, Eduardo Marques, Renata Bichir, Felip Link, and Juan Piovani, and the anonymous reviewers of my paper for their excellent feedback, thoughtful questions and suggestions, as well as to Nina Margies, Hannah Schilling, and the organizers and participants in the 2023 conference *Who Owns the City?*, most of all to Yishai Blank.

the other well-known icon representation of immanent racial chaos and disorder: the street criminal” (Gilroy 2006: 43) – or thug. Veena Das (1998) analysed violence against Sikhs in the resettlement colonies in Delhi in 1984 after Gandhi’s murder and concluded: “images of hate between social groups may take a volatile form when the social order is threatened by a critical event and so transform the world that the worst becomes not only possible but also probable” (Das 1998: 126). Scholarship on urban encounters, defined as everyday negotiations and interactions or conviviality (Mecila 2017: 7–8), may not be taking seriously enough the hate engendered by marginalization, including the emulation of disregard through story-telling (Tilly 1998) that forges hate symbolically. Marginalization, the dynamics of oppression, exploitation and opportunity hoarding produces socio-economic and cultural closure with spatial markers of territorial stigmatization (Wacquant 2007, 2008, 2009) as it is rooted in long histories of states disrespecting human rights, which can co-exist with support for state violence, as Teresa Caldeira discusses for Brazil (Caldeira 2002). Fortification fails us, humans, as it violates human rights – and it backfires. This is neither surprising nor new to other discussions in urban studies which focus directly on urban militarization (Davis 2011; Wacquant 2008; Graham 2009, 2012).

Yet hate also belongs to the realm of the ordinary (Ahmed 2007). The anthropologist and conflict mediator Beth Roy described processes of hate in *Some Trouble With Cows* (1994), a study of conflict in Bangladesh where “a cow ate some plants, and many people fought each other: on the surface a simple story [...] easy to dismiss”. But “the trouble is”, Roy continued, that “it is a story so often repeated in so many languages that we can dismiss it only at great peril”:

Even when [...] stereotypes of the others’ behaviour did grave injustice to reality, nonetheless their complaints – “*they* beat our children”, “*they* threw away food we had touched”, “*they* won’t hire us to work within their homes” – all contained elements of truth more profound and important than the misconceptions. Their grievances deserved redress. When new forces took power on the state level and failed to right the wrongs most deeply felt on the local level, people took matters into their own hands (Roy 1994: 185–186).

But violence tends to be discussed in other circles of urban studies than in the writings on conviviality. Alongside to two decades of contributions from urban studies in the *Journal of Intercultural Studies* (Noble 2006, 2013; Wessendorf 2014; Wise 2016), Mecila’s working papers archive contains an impressive collection of papers that address negotiations and conflicts over inequalities and difference, historically and in literature. But Mecila has done less work so far on the spatiality of such conflicts, or the spatio-temporal events that constitute places (Massey 2005: 130) through interactions “from the immensely global to the intimately tiny” in a sphere of coexisting

heterogeneity where “different trajectories exist” (Massey 2005: 9). Urban conviviality and diversity scholars have worked from the assumptions that neighbourly interactions create a parochial realm of conviviality (Lofland 1998). Parochial realms are free of conflicts. But they do rely on a basic premise of a potential peaceful coexistence, and trust as a possibility to be built. Sometimes we paid attention to structural violence and marginalization (Back and Shamser 2016), but not all the time. Much of what we have published in urban studies on conviviality has analysed settings without violence or did not make violence visible. Simultaneously a collective narrative of urban fear grew and urban residents indicate in surveys that lifestyle differences make them feel unsafe (Blokland 2009; Benz 2014). And in a parallel discussion, Southern urban theory and research in cities of walls like São Paulo thematized the fragmentation of urban space (Caldeira 2002; Villarreal 2021). Work bridging these two debates is rare, but scholars such as Tilmann Heil and Sérgio Costa have emphasized the need to incorporate power into conviviality studies (Heil 2019; Costa 2019).² In a special issue in the journal *City*, Anna Gawlewicz and Oren Yiftachel have pointed to the necessity to analyse “hostile environments” which they believed to be “of great concern to the reshaping of urban societies” (Gawlewicz and Yiftachel 2022: 346). Yet those studying conviviality (sometimes in other terms) in Amsterdam, London, Berlin or Geneva, Montreal or Sydney, seemed to just plough through.³ Our work has not paid attention to the thought that the legal scholar Yishai Blank put to me when I gave a talk on public familiarity and urban trust at the Hebrew University only three months before 7 October: What about hate?⁴

I do not have a definitive answer, and there is certainly more than one possible answer. This paper merely explores the question: Why have we paid so little attention to hate and fear in urban social life?⁵ Section two summarizes the main or mainstream insights on conviviality in urban studies and its spatiality, which tend to focus on a concept of neighbourhood where the “entanglement of power with convivial social interactions remains under-explored” as Hart (2002: 684) criticized in his study of Jaffa. These writings generally assume an absence of the figure of “thugs”. In section three, I show

2 Achille Mbembe’s point that power is inherent to conviviality reflects in for example Costa’s proposal to study the inequality-conviviality nexus, and Heil’s use of the concept in his work on Rio (Mbembe 1992; Heil 2019; Costa 2019).

3 To name a few of such studies: On Amsterdam: Huijbens 2023; Antwerp: Blommaert 2014; Birmingham: Karner and Parker 2011; Berlin: Blokland and Schultze 2018; Geneva: Felder 2020; London: among others Wessendorf 2011, Back and Shamser 2016, Bates 2018 and Wilson 2013; Manchester: Hudson et al. 2009; Montreal: Radice 2016; Sydney: among others Wise and Velayutham 2009, 2013.

4 I am thankful to the organizers of the conference *Who Owns the City?* at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem on 19-21 April 19-21, 2023, which helped me to start to think about this issue.

5 Obviously, one could simply say “it is Eurocentrism that’s done it” but then the question remains: how?

that the THUG has long been known as what the novelist Angie Thomas (2018) aptly expresses as the figure of “The Hate U Give” – just not in urban conviviality writings (Thomas 2018). The fourth section discusses why this may be so – I discuss the idea of the anonymous city life versus the parochial neighbourhood community. This contrast underplays hate and fear and fails to include the workings of violence on various scales. I then conclude that however much conviviality we may create on the neighbourhood level, the thug comes from the hate we give, and that by cocooning in conviviality in secured comfort zones, we allow state institutions to remove certain bodies and certain lives from presence. Narratives of denunciation emulate these processes, which are not at all new – but are still relevant.

2. Conviviality in Urban Studies

This section discusses the absence of the thug in mainstream conviviality studies. It argues that this absence is connected to a specific understanding of public space which is either seen as parochial, or as empty or irrelevant.

2.1 Conviviality as Not-Always-Nice-But-Still-Harmless

Conviviality as a concept was introduced by Catholic priest and philosopher Ivan Illich (1973), as Magdalena Nowicka and Tilmann Heil traced, to address the possibilities of institutions to foster togetherness in urban industrial societies (Illich 2001 [1973]; Nowicka and Heil 2016). It described an ideal of human engagement against technocratic and capitalist developments of his time. Extensive literature overviews, such as Linda Lapiņa's, show Gilroy's influence, who described conviviality as “a social pattern in which different metropolitan groups dwell in close proximity but where their racial, linguistic and religious particularities do not [...] add up to discontinuities of experience or insuperable problems of communication” (Gilroy 2006: 40). Gilroy used conviviality to write about urban spaces where people continuously lived together daily, and differences were not essentialized. Gilroy applied it for describing a “small (local), counter-narrative to dominant radicalizing discourses, spontaneously occurring and descriptive rather than normative” (Lapina 2016: 35). The critical perspective on the nation and nationhood was powerful but also reinforced community development arguments known to not always be progressive (Blokland 2017). As Lapiņa noted:

an emphasis on conviviality, or mundane everyday (or even ‘successful’) [...] getting along reflects political and politicized research agendas – on one hand, countering dominant narratives of segregated neighbourhoods [...] and on the other hand falling in line with interventions that aim to facilitate social cohesion (Lapina 2016: 33).

Urban studies journals also address conviviality to acknowledge that difference and inequality define urban life as an ongoing practice (Semi et al. 2009). This has long been obvious to Latin American urban scholars. The Brazilian geographer Milton Santos, for example, discussed urban polarization as spatial expression of economic dynamics (Santos 2021). Flávia Feitosa et al. demonstrated that economic growth and decreasing inequalities did not translate into less segregation in the São Paulo metropolitan region (Feitosa et al. 2021: 522). Urban segregation continues to structure people's networks in São Paulo or Santiago de Chile, and also the production of public space (Marques 2012; Link 2014). Caldeira explains that São Paulo has become a "city of walls" which severed the "maintain[ing of] the principles of open and free circulation which have been the most significant organizing values of modern cities" (Caldeira 1996: 303) and sees this as a "new" segregation which developed in the 1990s. Residential and social segregation produce a spatiality of conviviality.

Many studies on conviviality have contributed to our understanding of how we use everyday encounters for urban belonging under conditions of diversity (Wise and Velayutham 2013; Lapina 2016). Suzanna Hall does so for a London shopping street, Martha Radice for Montreal's commercial venues, Sarah Neal et al. for leisure space and parks in London, Milton Keynes and Leicester in the UK, Vincent et al. for elementary schools in London, and Hannah Jones et al. for franchise coffee shops, in the same British cities (Hall 2012; Radice 2016; Neal et al. 2013, Neal et al. 2015; Vincent et al. 2017; Jones et al. 2015). Darya Malyutina provides an empirical example with her study of friendships of young Russian migrants through the lens of conviviality in a London bar (Malyutina 2018). Megha Amrith discusses friendly and convivial relations existing alongside competition and distancing practices among migrants in São Paulo (Amrith 2018).⁶ Overall, conviviality in the literature applies to interactions that fit the idea of successful encounters of difference which nevertheless require "constant labour" (Noble 2013; Nowicka and Vertovec 2014; Nowicka and Heil 2016; Back and Shamser 2016).

Such studies, first, tend to expect non-violent interactions between residents, often in dense neighbourhoods or in neighbourhood sites like schools and school yards, parks, coffee houses, playgrounds, kindergartens, shopping streets, and the like. These reflect ideas around "third places", which Ray Oldenburg believed to provide a "sense of wholeness and distinctiveness" outside the duties of home life and work where people primarily enjoy each other's company (Oldenburg 1999: 265). They resonate with Georg Simmel's idea of sociability as play (Simmel 1949 [1910]) and remind us of the very first sociology paper ever published in the *American Journal of Sociology*,

6 Other examples include Alicia Izharuddin's work on Malay women and Andrew Webb et al.'s work on multi-culture and conviviality in Chilean schools, but these works do not discuss urban dimensions (Izharuddin 2023; Webb et al. 2023).

which addressed the fleeting sociability of the saloon (Moore 1897). Heike Hanhörster and Sabine Weck discuss such sites as micro-publics (Hanhoerster and Weck 2020) following Ash Amin: “settings where engagement with strangers in a common activity disrupts easy labelling of the stranger as enemy and initiates new attachments” (Amin 2002: 969). In most of urban writing on conviviality, little attention is paid to fear and if so, it tends to be seen as a deficit in multicultural competences, a racist attitude, simplicity of mind of certain individuals (and not the author). Helen Wilson and Jonathan Darling summarize encounters where others are made into strangers (Wilson and Darling 2016: 4).⁷ Deborah Lupton found in an Australian study that participants constructed the “unpredictable stranger” as a threat. What was familiar provided ontological security: doing boundary work of stranger-making has regularly been addressed as “work to maintain the borders of subjectivity and social order” (Lupton 1999: 14). We are socialized into a “cultural mythology” of the home as safe and public places as “highly dangerous in terms of abduction or attacks from strangers”:

Mythologized places of danger, thus, are seen to be dangerous particularly because they are associated with people from deviant and marginalized social groups [...] for those who fear such places, media representations of such places, notions circulating in gossip networks and lack of personal experience with them contribute to their views of these places as dangerous (Lupton 1999: 10).

I find it unsettling that such interpretations show the governmentality of fear but also suggest that one should not fear. Noble critiques such an individualized notion of fear but maintains that the habituation of urban living implies “a practical orientation in which engaging with people and goods from other cultures in daily practice allows people to open themselves to a broader humanity beyond local, racial and national affiliations” (Noble 2013: 177; he does not mention social class). Habituation is developed through responses to unexpected situations in which we form practices of ethics. Yet again, this assumes a baseline. Conviviality draws on a normalcy of non-violence and deliberation that is, situationally or normatively (Miszta 2001), to be expected and conviviality is to be found in such normalcy where we engage with each other without robbing, beating or killing. It analyses the urban world as if criminal (or any other) violence is something external (e.g. Rodney Stark in his “ecology of crime” (Stark 1987)), and its perpetrators excluded from local communities, although we know that they are not (Blokland 2008a; Feltran 2020). In the small city where I did my ethnographic work for “Facing Violence: Everyday Risks in an American Housing Project”, all my interlocutors knew that the distinction between “the thugs” (or hoodlums, in Elijah Anderson’s (2013) words)

⁷ Following Engin F. Isin, Wilson and Darling also refer to the less-researched relevance of encounters for citizen claims of visibility and voice (Isin 2002; Wilson and Darling 2016: 7).

and decent folks was not strict (Blokland 2008a). The elected president of the official Resident Council of the Public Housing Authority had sons active in the drug trade, and more than one had been shot. The better people's knowledge of the organization of crime, the deeper their understanding of the risks of violence in the neighbourhood is. All apparent conviviality still bore somehow a relation to the violence. Men who made money with violence donated sodas, burgers, and hotdogs to community cook-outs.

2.2 Violence as the Threat from Outside

Urban studies tend to reduce the relevance of non-civil behaviour as an outside threat to conviviality. Conviviality evokes a scene of enjoyable diversity in presence for those skilled, politically enlightened or robust enough to not be bothered, or not pay attention to it altogether within its temporality (Kern 2016). And although urban fear became a collective narrative, certain urban middle classes continued to organize neighbourhood activities from the assumption that, if “we” – and that often includes us, academics – do community in our blocks of streets, we can live together nicely. In our gentrified village-like neighbourhood, carefully protected by the sociability of farmers' markets, street art events, we slowly push the urban frontiers, preferably with leftist activism for the vulnerable neighbours (Kern 2016). We plant bushes and trees with women in a community garden, but not with their sons and cousins, whom policy makers, community activists and police alike categorize as “outside” the community (Blokland 2008b). And yet, as the picture below shows, the outsiders may be literally in our face, where the men wait for their narcotics customers while community activists do the planning. Had I studied the community garden project in isolation, I would never have guessed who else was in the picture (Figure 1).

Figure 1: Coexistence of Illicit and Civic Activity in a Shared Urban Space



Source: Photo by the author.

London, Berlin, New York, Montreal and Amsterdam – all sites of studies of conviviality – are “adopting walls, separations and policing of boundaries” (Caldeira 2002) to maintain social segregation as cities like São Paulo do, only in subtler ways. Roger Keil has warned for the bias in our scholarship to study certain urban neighbourhoods while a majority retreats to the suburbs (Keil 2013). Students of urban public life (with some exceptions) continue to turn to sites of interactions in high density, lively streets and urban venues as if their cities look like Jane Jacobs’ Greenwich Village. Often, quite a few of the visitors to Berlin admire its walkability, dense infrastructure, and high diversity, but tend to walk in neighbourhoods inside the “urban rail ring” – and like tourists, urban scholars pay little attention to what life is like for the approximately 70% of residents living outside those neighbourhoods (Kraetzer 2019). In earlier work, I have argued that middle and upper middle classes are not only “padding their bunkers” (Atkinson 2006). When they do not, they still socially segregate in urban institutions like schools (Giustozzi et al. 2016), a point also made in other studies on gentrification or social mix (Bridge et al. 2013). Margaret Kohn connects the idea that proximity may “breed defensiveness”, a mild analysis of the inequality consequence of segregation in conviviality to how:

[s]egregation itself makes it difficult for members of privileged groups to recognize the existence of injustice. It makes the reality of deprivation invisible for those who do not live in the zones of danger. Without exposure to deprivation or even difference, the privileged become unable to recognize their own advantages and unlikely to question the system that produces systematic disadvantages (Kohn 2004: 8).

Encounters, Gill Valentine noted, are meetings with “antagonism or opposition at heart” (Valentine 2008: 326). As *Black in White Space* (Anderson 2023) showed, for BPOC citizens, encounters in gentrified diverse neighbourhoods are situated in dominant whiteness: bodies entering an urban setting are predefined by the expectation of whiteness (Ahmed 2007). Overall, many urban studies of conviviality only locate citizens in neighbourhoods but omit thugs as full urban citizens in the urban fabric and leave the study of these agents to other parts of the field of urban studies and criminology.

3. Nothing New: Urban Marginalization, Fear and Securitization

How are members of marginalized groups then expected to adhere to such practices of ethics while at the same time witnessing the symbolic violence implied in hate (if not other forms of denunciation)? Of course, marginalized people organize in urban resistance in “grey spaces” (Yiftachel 2009), collectively move and quietly encroach

(Bayat 2012), sometimes revolutionarily, and through acts as small as killing the cats in a 18th century Parisian workshop or “popular culture” (Darnton 2009). As Michel de Certeau wrote, with informality scarcely being regulated and eliminated by a panoptic concept city, all sort of stuff happens (Certeau 1984: 96). While urban studies colleagues have been arguing that urban fortresses destroy urban public life (Davis 2011), a good part of contemporary urban scholarship, my own work included, has written about the urban world while bracketing out violence, and another corner of the discipline sees radical resistance just about everywhere (Lancione 2016). A sociology of hate has also boomed with the increase of hate speech in social media and the rise of hate crime but tends to view such hate as the individual expression of deviant attitudes. Public interpersonal violence working on various scales may bridge some of these literatures.⁸

3.1 “Safe Neighbourhoods”

After 9 pm, the most common figures on the residential streets directly around my middle-class condominium in São Paulo are working-class men who provide service to those who live inside: opening and closing doors and parking house gates, driving people to places or waiting for them to board taxis or hired cars, delivering food and other orders by motorbikes. The drivers and deliverymen sometimes engage in small talk with doormen; some deliverymen park their motorbikes in a small street where they await orders. The streets are covered in cameras, watched by men whom one does not see from the street, but they see you (as a resident, the gate opens for you before you ring). We walk these streets not anonymously, but in constant view of others. The streets may appear empty with “nobody” walking at night, but they are not. Men are *paid to pay attention* to the danger constructed as coming from other men. What this paying to pay attention means to create spaces where violence does not happen remains an empirical question, that Susana Durão has researched in her extensive ethnography of what she calls “security hospitality”, defined as “a form of protection created in and for elite and middle-class spaces, fundamental for understanding social life, and the reproduction of inequalities and infrastructure in urban areas”, that creates a racialized landscape that reinforces whiteness as elite through its “moral topography” (Durão 2023: 3, 22) by the employment of low-paid, low-educated precarious employees, which in itself, Durão argues, perpetuates violence against marginalized groups. Maybe violence may be deterred by the presence of the watchful eyes of others rather than by the security installations themselves. Or maybe it only appears as such on the surface of the “hospitality” that those who pay for such security get to really see.

⁸ Violence that takes place either outside of interpersonal relations within the home (so including police violence inside the home but excluding domestic violence taking place inside the home),

A first field to analyse violence and conviviality expectations of exposure to violence draws attention to the neighbourhoods mixed in social class or inhabited by predominantly middle-class residents where they have sought to retreat behind gates and fences, and which in the public imagination and sometimes in crime statistics are considered “safe”.

Maybe such neighbourhoods attract poverty-driven crime like robberies and theft that is a bit more organized: Citizens in these areas being likely to have valuables may make this rational. I hypothesize that in addition, the distance to the person harmed is large enough to preclude having to cope with sympathy. The hate we, as societies, give through structural racism and exclusions, including their spatiality in urban infrastructures, may move from society’s scale to the individual victim, who has no personhood. For Brazilian cities, Loïc Wacquant argued that:

ramifying criminal violence (fed by extreme inequality and mass poverty), class and colour discrimination in judicial processing, unchecked police brutality, and the catastrophic condition and chaotic operation of the carceral system combine to make the aggressive deployment of the penal apparatus in Brazil a surefire recipe for further disorder and disrespect for the law at the bottom of the urban hierarchy and steers the country into an institutional impasse (Wacquant 2008: 56).

On a Saturday afternoon, I walked home from the park. There is a short street with a rather non-descript stretch of about 300 meters, walled on both sides, with many lanes for cars converging at the highway entrance. I am always attentive walking there. I know that the man with his brown blanket will stand talking to himself, or sleep on the pavement, and a somewhat younger man without shoes may either sleep or have the energy of his high. Sometimes the two sit a block away, chatting with others on a concrete bench. I know that on school days, the school bus drivers spend the hours between their tours here, watching videos on their phones and eating snacks. I know there is other life in the middle of the night from signs of recently charred trash. A man on a bike came from behind, passed me, turned around, and passed again. I was on alert. He disappeared around the corner. I relaxed. A man on a mountain-bike came towards me, with a delivery bag on his back. In passing, his face came very close to mine, he strongly pushed against my upper chest and very quickly pulled back. I screamed and saw something dangling in his hand as he regained his balance. On his bike only then I realized: my necklace. He entered the park. I then learned the mythology of camera security and guards. The guards at that gate could have warned the guards at the other gates, but they did not. They went through moves of recognition of my concern, they reported it on WhatsApp, typed some more on their phones. I left wondering whether there had been a problem at all. A *gringa* had her necklace stolen.

Nobody got hurt. It was a sunny afternoon. The security guard told the people not to bike on the pedestrian path.

I went to the police and the policeman who was watching videos on his phone believed that Brazil's president was to blame and wanted to know if the sociologists think that a robber should be part of society. He shared his biography spontaneously when I answered that robbers are not born robbing. He was raised by a single mother and came from the periphery, yet did not rob. The park's police said they would drive around and have a look and God should bless me. Nobody believed that the cameras did anything to help find a perpetrator, ever. They do not deter theft, and they do not solve problems. They are part of a mythology of security and the job of the security services is to keep that mythology at a level that we may half-way believe that it "works". Durão's work supports this thought: her review of the literature shows that security tends to be seen as "a moral good" and not simply a commercially paid service, and traces the presence of the guards who are to keep security on place in cultural representations, as TV series, songs and (also historical) paintings (Durão 2023: 18–19).

The officer that I had chatted to is not a single individual with mistaken ideas in his head, and once more, relational analyses are needed. In Salvador, Bahia, police officers admitted in interviews that trainings make officers, especially among the military police, think all Black people are suspects, and definitely all Black men, and none of this comes as surprise to people familiar with the subject of police violence in Brazil (Alves and Evanson 2011; Rocha 2012).

After this, I became fearful. I was not scared that something would happen to me again. But I had been taken by surprise and misread an everyday urban situation. It was not that I now thought every man on a bike with a delivery bag would try to rob me. This disguise aroused anger as if I had been betrayed. My stereotypes had not worked. My body, in my heart rate, my muscles – all went on alert when I walked that same street again. In the first few days, I reacted with a light panic when someone approached me ahead of me, and I did a lot of scanning. I had also lost the brisk pace of my walk and my upright body posture. I had turned into an elderly woman walking alone in the street, where I used to be an urban ethnographer approaching the world with a confident curiosity. But as it affected my interactions in public space – I am more convinced than before this experience that the urban study of conviviality needs to do a little more with fear and violence than it has so far. And that fear is more complicated than a misplaced middle-class repulsion felt in the presence of the out-of-place "underbelly of the society" (Lupton 1999: 13).

Such violence enacted by states and privatized security in neoliberal regimes which follows from the militarization is historically connected with colonialism. The challenge

is to understand its downscaling to individual interpersonal hate that, as noted in the introduction, feeds the support for the ethics of conflict. For Mary Louise Pratt, urban space is “a social space where cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetric relations of power, such as colonialism, slavery or their aftermaths as they are lived out in many parts of the world” (Pratt 1991: 34).⁹ She highlights how marginalized groups “select and invent from materials transmitted by a dominant metropolitan culture” and shows that such contact zones are not to be understood as settings of encounters of cooperation and sharing rules of what “is” in “place”: “we may sometimes be playing the same game” (Pratt 1991: 38) but often we are not, and some agents exert authority that others do (not) question.¹⁰

3.2 “Dangerous Places”

The second analysis of violence is to be differentiated from others in relation to conviviality of the exposure to violence in dangerous places of highly segregated cities, where a badly fired bullet or a violation of the morals of violence and crime may happen. Behind this lies a theory of place-making that while relevant, cannot be discussed in this paper. In the context of organized crime, as in São Paulo or Rio, the governance of security may mean both a fear of violence and a sense of safety ambiguously at the same time (Suarez et al. 2021; Hoelscher and Norheim-Martinsen 2014). A lot of wonderful work has been done on the challenges and resilience of living in stigmatized urban spaces under militarized urban conditions: Silvia Pasquetti analyses the everyday life of Palestinians living under surveillance regimes in Lydda/Lod, Israel and shows both the adaptation to its stigmatization and moments of care (Pasquetti 2019). In the work of Åsne Håndlykken-Luz, such experiences of radicalized policing of favela residents in Rio stand in focus (Håndlykken-Luz 2020). Henry Giroux discussed US American zero-tolerance policies as a war against urban youth (Giroux 2003). We do not lack accounts of the everyday consequences of securitization. Most works address state violence and privatized security. Fewer works discuss interpersonal public violence, which tends to be left to the psychologists and criminologists.

9 Before the popularity of conviviality and its criticisms, Pratt made her arguments in the quite similar debate on the usefulness (or its absence) of the notion of community, and closer to a critical assessment of Benedict Anderson’s work on imagined communities, she argued against the common underlying assumptions in academia about language, communication, and culture in the community concept.

10 That such questioning or not questioning is not fixed can also be well discussed in the film *7 prisioneiros* (Moratto 2021).

3.3 “The Hate U Give”

The focus of conviviality is always on interactions that happen, so that where convivial connections are not made, we assume the absence of any “we”. Violence requires the absence of a “we”, and hate requires organization, as Ahmed argues. Interestingly, besides analyses of digital hate expressions, the study of hate has been left to psychologists. Aaron T. Beck, for example, applies principles of cognitive psychology to acts of hate, and upscales them to collective levels (Beck 1999). Robert J. Sternberg and Karin Sternberg write in *The Nature of Hate* about the necessary combination of psychological processes of self-assessments, the bi-directional relation between violence and hate and discuss various theories of hate (Sternberg and Sternberg 2008). I refrain from a full discussion of the analysis of hate, as my aim is to explain the absence of hate and violence in the urban studies concerned with conviviality. But that absence is the absence of an imaginary figure, especially also in studies on neighbourhood collective efficacy in relation to conviviality, namely the criminal, the “youth hanging around”, the “deviant” – often a male figure, often a young person, and racialized. W. E. B. DuBois noted as early as 1926 that fear is hate and hate is fear – and the fear was the fear of white US America to not be able to keep the Black men down (DuBois 1926). Anderson’s *Black in White Spaces* shows that Blacks, especially men, always must watch out when they enter white spaces (Anderson 2023).

The Black Lives Matter movement and other movements against racialized police violence have demanded (renewed) attention for the marginalization and criminalization of Black men. This literature shows the ordinariness of the emotion of hate, and its apparent “entitlement” to a place in the everydayness of conviviality. Ahmed writes that hate is not just a bad mindset or attitude in an individual’s head, to be challenged by a few more encounters in conviviality; instead, hate:

works to animate the ordinary subject [...] by constituting the ordinary as in crisis, and the ordinary person as the *real victim*. The ordinary becomes that which is *already* under threat by the imagined others whose proximity becomes a crime against person as well as place. Hate is *distributed* in such narratives across various figures [...] all of which come to embody the danger of impurity [...]. They threaten to violate the pure bodies; such bodies can only be imagined as pure by the perpetual restaging of this fantasy of violation. Given this, hate cannot be found in one figure, but works to create the very outline of different figures or objects of hate, a creation that crucially aligns the figures together, and constitutes them as a “common” threat. Importantly, then, hate does not *reside* in a given subject or object. Hate is economic; it circulates between signifiers in relationships of difference and displacement (Ahmed 2001: 358, emphasis in the original).

Besides extensive work on the marginalization and violation of human rights of Black men and other persons in peripheries and inner-city neighbourhoods (Collins 1998; Garfield 2010), or of racialization of policing of migrant minority youth in cities (Body-Gendrot 2001; Sandercock 2017), the militarization of urban space and the fortification of urban neighbourhoods is extensively and critically discussed in urban studies (Calonge-Reillo 2023; Anderson 2013; Atkinson and Blandy 2007).¹¹

There is an abundance of knowledge that supports the idea that the term “thug” should be understood as an acronym for “The Hate U Give”, an expression from the novel by Angie Thomas (2018). In this novel, 16-year-old Starr is in the car when her friend Khalil is killed by a police officer in a routine check. Most of the novel deals with her fight for justice for Khalil. In the film that followed the book, the main characters in Khalil’s car where he recalls “The Hate U Give” as a notion from the rapper Tupac Shakur, who had “THUG LIFE” tattooed in capital letters on his torso. Tupac Shakur, better known as 2pac, turned Thug Life into an acronym, which stood for The Hate U Give Little Infants F*cks Everybody. As acronym for a lifestyle that one lives where men like him, a Black man from East Harlem, succeed against all odds, it stood for gangster rap, certain dress codes and consumption styles. In an interview, Tupac Shakur (who was killed 27 years ago in a drive-by shooting) clarified that the thug life had to be understood as the result of systematic symbolic and physical violence – and of hate that comes back if you socialize a child by hate. While media demonized his work as inviting violence, for example after two white boys shot at their fellow students and teachers at a schoolyard in Arkansas in 1998 and one turned out to be a fan. The racist dimension of this becomes clear in the simple comparison made by Barry Glassner, that nobody would check if a white guy who killed someone had listened to Johnny Cash. This life experience of knowing that “he lived in a society that still didn’t view him as human” which he had to “either battle or embrace” (Glassner 1999:126) resonates with Spike Lee’s films, such as his *Do The Right Thing* (1989) in which what seems joyful conviviality at first with many encounters in which difference is negotiated, turns into the burning down of a pizza restaurant, a police killing and a major riot in the streets of a New York neighbourhood. The film provokes the thought that conviviality under conditions of structural racism and economic conditions (such as housing market pressures and gentrification) may not be understood well when analysed.¹²

11 See also my own work with urban youth in Den Haag or Berlin (Binken and Blokland 2012; Blokland and Serbedzija 2020).

12 Countless reviews and discussions of this film have been published, see for example Reid (1997).

3.4 Why the Absences?

Why is all this knowledge from other parts of social sciences not more influential in works on conviviality? The brief answer: because it focuses on neighbourhoods and neighbourhood institutions which do not fully include all users as agents and sees public space as void when researchers do not see obvious meaningful interactions. This omission follows from two core ideas in urban studies which we may all appreciate greatly but nevertheless pose challenges.

3.5 Functional Diversity and Fear

One thesis on which much of such urban thinking in US America and Europe has been built, and that has, as Bianca Tavori demonstrated, also influenced for example urban planner in a place like São Paulo, is Jane Jacobs' *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (Tavori 2019). Tavori praises Jacobs' work for its recognition of "pedestrian knowledge" and her fight against the "destruction of urban vitality" of "the streets as the quintessential public space" (Tavori 2019: 19, 20). I agree with Tavori that as a critique on planning, the book is hugely important. Yet I believe that one of its theses also had a flaw.

The New York architect and resident of Greenwich Village in the 1960s argued against redevelopment plans for a highway that would wipe out the Village as what is now promoted as a walkable city. One of Jacobs's arguments was that such urban design brings eyes on the street. She believed that watching each other live our lives would generate informal social control.¹³ Functional diversity and social diversity would go hand-in-hand to produce positive sociability and good neighbourhood life. But how (through what social mechanism) and under which conditions (e.g. in which contexts) does the throwntogetherness of people who happen to be in the same spot mean that people actually pay attention (Schilling et al. 2019) in a way that produces care and not hate? She had not fully considered that proximity is both a requirement to maintain social hierarchies and a precondition to challenge them. As Herbert J. Gans noted in an early critique, Jacobs conflated the visible functional diversity and diversity of use of infrastructure with social diversity, especially across class boundaries (Gans 1994 [1968]).

Empirically testing the thesis that eyes on the street produce a non-violent and attentive conviviality in Rotterdam, the Netherlands, the issue of how we move from eyes on the street to eyes for each other turned out to be much more complicated (Blokland 2009). I found that insecurities in streets and squares were not determined by local networks

¹³ Today we say informal local care arrangements as we think social control cannot be a critical concept.

nor by the functional diversity itself. Fearfulness was also not directly linked to the experience of diversity. Instead, residents of four disadvantaged neighbourhoods in Rotterdam talked about fear in relation to a feeling of disengagement, exclusion and boundary work. The experience of diversity related directly to fear when public familiarity was absent. People with low practical neighbourhood use were less likely to live in a public familiarity context, they were therefore less likely to know what to expect from others, and this, then, impacted their sense of safety. This qualified the idea that functional diversity will by definition create a setting used by a diversity of people who will engage with each other, without any further mechanisms, and hence contribute to safety. Urban design of diversity can be a supportive, but not a sufficient condition to “place” conviviality. Such repeated intersections affect expectations of the behaviour of others, as Noble discussed (Noble 2013). But the throwntogetherness does not preclude that we beat each other up:

[W]hat is special about place is precisely that throwntogetherness, the unavoidable challenge of negotiating here-and-now (itself drawing on a history and a geography of thens and theres) and a negotiation which must take place within and between both humans and non-humans [...] this is the event of place (Massey 2005: 129).

Diverse places can thus also carry fear. Reactions of established residents to the arrival of migrants in an Australian urban neighbourhood that Noble studied were not civil inattention, but “uncivil attention”: residents talked about newcomers in “a language of discomfort”. Noble’s research participants expressed a need of a sense of stability, achieved by “techniques of composure”, and the need of such a “fit [...] in relation to the spaces we inhabit and the practices we perform” (Noble 2006: 114).

Fear is a response to danger, which, as Green argued, “penetrates social memory” and works its way into relationships through ambiguities, gossip and suspicion (Green 1994). Frank Furedi sees a societal shift from fear as reply to expected danger to fear of the unknown, so we socialize each other into a belief in safe rooms, safe spaces and a reduction of risk-taking – in vain, as we have seen (Furedi 2018). Lupton, discussed above, argued that fear is a localized circuit of knowledge and a cultural mythology of what is (not) safe (Lupton 1999). The mythology of securitization through walls and cameras is now clear to us all. But I hesitate to assume that difference is simply the basis for fear, reminded of the equivalence that Mary Douglas observed between contemporary “modern” perceptions of danger and witches:

witches are the social equivalents of beetles and spiders who live in the cracks of the walls [...]. They attract the fears and dislikes which other ambiguities and contradictions attract in other thought structures, and the kind of powers

attributed to them symbolize their ambiguous, inarticulate status (Douglas 1966: 127).

Fear builds primarily on learning by socialization and not by experience (D. M. Smith 1999).

3.6 Urban Space as Impersonal Void

Fear assumes an “out there” public space, void of care and trust by virtue of anonymity, which results from the urban way of life epitomized in the figure of the blasé. This is the second core idea implicit in conviviality. The focus of urban studies on neighbourhoods and neighbourhood institutions reflects the contrast of inward and outward orientation that Richard Sennett discussed in *The Conscience of the Eye* (Sennett 1990). The Christian city of the European Middle Ages had the parish grounds as the “zone of immunity that protected people from the city” (Sennett 1990: 18–19). That we think of the refuge, from the parish ground to the privacy of the home, as being culturally “away from the neutrality of city streets” developed historically in the Global North. Cities built by colonial powers in Latin America, which Felipe Fernández-Armesto discussed, shared some of these features (Fernández-Armesto 2013). Homes versus streets, villages versus cities, and neighbours versus large crowds: over the course of urban life’s cultural history, we have developed an understanding of a refuge where we are our true selves and find ourselves, and it is not in public. In the 19th century, empty streets became the sign that “masses were successfully kept out” (Sennett 1990: 31) and a clean and cleared city became a legible city (Sennett 1990: 37).¹⁴ This neutrality also works as an instrument of power, as “neutral space becomes an act of dominating others” (Sennett 1990: 54–55). Sennett’s analyses resonate with the domestication of respectability that affected middle class (and then all) women’s lives as illustrated in Christine Stansell’s historical study:

Enclosed, protected, and privatized, the home and the patterns of family life on which it was based thus represented to middle-class women and men a crucial institution of civilization [...] [A] particular geography of social life – the engagement of the poor in street life rather than in the enclave of the home – became in itself evidence of parental neglect, family disintegration, and a pervasive urban social pathology (Stansell 1982: 311).

Making urban space legible and defining order as the absence of masses contrasts to some extent with a (later) concern of the impoverishment of public life. Decrease in organized civic life, for which the bowling league was exemplary in Robert D. Putnam’s

¹⁴ It is striking how strongly this idea currently guides the ideas of Berlin’s mayor on how to approach the city’s increasing expressions of poverty and housing crisis in public space.

Bowling Alone, threatened the public life of social capital (Putnam 2000). Putnam assumed that neighbourhoods are or should be sites for face-to-face interactions and network ties. Since then, urban citizens have been scaled down to neighbours and community has been diminished to a shell of small-scale goodness on the local level. As I have argued together with Doug Rae, we can trace historical reasons for this empirical process (Blokland and Rae 2008). Many public discussions and initiatives now conceptualize community as a stable construct, formed through network ties with kin, friends or neighbours – at the expense of thinking about public cultures.

Sennett discusses Baudelaire to show that, by the end of the 19th century, “the life in common of the city is inferior to a real life happening inside each person in the crowd” (Sennett 1990: 126). The experience of the city was an experience of difference, to be sure, but of an “individual spirit struggling with impersonal collective form” (Sennett 1990: 126; Amin 2002). For the Chicago School that followed, Sennett continues (Sennett 1990: 126–127), the idea that anyone different could not be as different if it was not for the city granting the liberty developed into the idea that no moral order dominates in a city. Therefore, the metropolis can be a mosaic of social worlds. This continues the distinction between an inner and an outer life, with parochial realms of neighbourhoods where we care, interact and live in convivial co-existence with the idea of indifference towards difference and disengagement that Simmel wrote about.

Simmel described metropolitan life as expression of modernity, as distant, isolated and reserved, rational and calculating, offering a tolerance to live one’s life freely (Simmel 1950: 423). Urban dwellers adapted and adjusted to urban rhythms and forms and become urban themselves – following the diagnosis common in sociology at the end of the 19th century that the meaningfulness of social ties became lost with urbanization. The city dweller was rational in his relationships as was the currency which defined his transactions, money. Simmel theorized that urbanites pass each other indifferently, because absorbing all the impulses of streets exhausted their mental capacities.

But one could also argue that remaining blasé should be seen as only performance, including Simmel’s other idea of the partial nature of sociability as a form of play, enabling temporary, located conviviality. Maybe other banalities – of violence, fear, and care in fluid urban encounters – were not so pressing from the standpoint of an intellectual man as they may have been “from the standpoint of women” (D. E. Smith 1999: 13). One banality of everyday life is the denial of the right for women to take urban risks that Khan Phadke et al. discusses from Mumbai (Phadke et al. 2011).¹⁵ The

¹⁵ Loitering, with its dictionary definition of standing around doing “nothing”, obviously needs unpacking — but not within these 10,000 words. Timur and Bagli (2006) raise initial questions, drawing on the perspective of an outsider looking at the “no loitering” signs in US cities.

gendered, classed, and radicalized inequalities in public space are now well-known. The metropolis has a public life, as it historically had. Women do pay attention, and they are not alone: LGBTQi persons, Jewish and Muslim citizens, BIPOC citizens, as well as the homeless, unhoused, mentally ill or people living with disabilities must keep a watchful eye. To think that citizens in general can walk blasé rests on an overly atomistic understanding of the individual agent, which is surprising given the high quality of Simmel's relational analysis in other parts of his work. A focus on mental life instead of social life fails to see that in public space categorical boundaries are drawn and emulated, and violations do happen. Sometimes it takes us by surprise. Sometimes we all think similarly about what to expect. In high-crime areas in Berlin and Rotterdam alike, to the question "what do you think people in this area would do when an old woman collapsed in the street", 94% to 98% of the interviewees answered: "People will help". 69% of the respondents in the Berlin survey still expected this even if the person was visibly under the influence of alcohol or drugs.¹⁶ This confirms that the everydayness of hate and fear matter to the study of care and conviviality.

There is a lot to like in Simmel's essay. But Simmel did not force us to see that navigating urban space includes a symbolic use of the space for identification and appropriations that make places, even when we simply pass through the city.¹⁷ From the standpoint of women, the freedom to be blasé follows from familiarization, not anonymity.¹⁸ A standpoint of women could have helped to see that the hate a society gives comes back in public space, and that we can only be blasé as long as others do not violate us. And perhaps our socialization into a blasé attitude in public urban space contributes to the idea of an impersonal void. Such a void, in turn, is a political neutralization that opens up possibilities for violence, imposed by security regimes as part of marginalization.

4. Conclusion

Violence and subtler forms of marginalization act on and produce hate. Hate – not just my hating of you, which I could deny, but your hating of me, or our hating of them, which of course is absent, but their hating of us – is ordinary and so is violence.¹⁹ But as we have seen, scholarship on conviviality in urban studies has not thought about it

16 These statistics are discussed in Blokland 2009: 159 and Blokland 2021: 74–75.

17 Recently, public transport has even been discussed for its potentials in public life (Sheller 2023).

18 And freedom also has limits in contexts so familiar that they become the sites of performance of proper gender roles.

19 This dynamic is dealt with in *Parasite* (2019), the Oscar-winning South Korean film directed by Bong Joon-ho. In this film, the son of a family struggling with poverty and unemployment gets a chance to work as tutor for a wealthy family, and devises a plan to get his entire family employed under false pretenses. As they gradually manipulate their way into various positions within the family, things go terribly differently than planned. The film ends with bloody killings at a birthday party.

much. I have discussed that much of the work on conviviality in urban studies locates it at the neighbourhood level or in neighbourhood institutions. It contributes little to an understanding of the city (and, I would now like to add, urban citizenship), whereas the scale of urban violence as acted out in militarization and ghettoization of urban space isolates neighbourhoods. I have also argued that urban studies on conviviality ignore or overlook everyday interpersonal violence and does so through an exclusion of the figure of the thug. *The Hate U Give* stands for the violence coming from the hate we, as society, give in marginalization and exclusion processes.

I have found answers in two influential ideas, namely the idea that diversity on the neighbourhood level will produce convivial relations but not violence (derived from Jane Jacobs), and the idea that outside of parochial realms of neighbourhoods and neighbourhood institutions, public space is an impersonal void. I agree with Oren Yiftachel, an Israeli scholar and activist, that the “thrown apartness” that our states and politicians move us into needs to be challenged and urban studies has a role to play (Gawlewicz and Yiftachel 2022).

Baldwin’s writing in *The Fire Next Time* (1963) (cited in Sennett 1990: 145–148) showed that the hate we give does not have to be received. The potential transgression of encounters lies in the possibility that difference is overruled or pushed back by the sharing of “not becoming otherwise”, but of becoming similar, as “similarity and difference are negotiated in the moment” (Wilson 2016: 455). Structural inequalities create interpersonal interactions that may instil fear. Fearfulness creates withdrawal; stories told about reasons to be fearful create places that are unsafe, and the vicious cycle that follows takes life out of urban space. Often, in gentrification areas for example, who gets to appropriate a relational setting as a public place is an expression of and contributor to opportunity hoarding as a mechanism of durable inequality. Two processes help sustain such inequality, according to Charles Tilly: emulation and adaptation. Emulation is “the copying of established categorically based organizational models and/or the transplanting of existing social relations from one setting to another” (Tilly 1998: 174). The sociological concept of a thug, therefore, is not a matter of the morals of an individual doing something to another individual. Yet, where people rub shoulders with unknown others in public space, there is much more going on than the civil inattention (Goffman 1963) and a blasé ballet in which nobody pays attention.

In urban studies, we may therefore want to think about what we can and should expect, not from micro-publics, but from a public “bigger” than that, in terms of geographical scope beyond the neighbourhood and in terms of politics. An idea of a much wider understanding of “public” from the point of view of doing politics (more than sociability) can be found in Ann Mische and Matthew J. Chandler, who refer to Mische’s study of the Brazilian Black students’ movement (Mische and Chandler 2019). She learnt that

students organized through sharing less rather than more of their identities. Publics are “sites positioned ‘in between’ more segmented networks marked by homophily, hierarchy, and specialization”. They call such publics essential “wherever participants from segmented groups seek to build commonality,”²⁰ while engaging their identities “selectively”, sometimes “suppressing other affiliations” to achieve commonality (Mische and Chandler 2019: 479). Unlike writings on conviviality, such publics do not assume localness. Perhaps more empirical case studies of third places and practices of small-scale conviviality stand in the way of thinking bigger.

But a dominant ethos of conflict, to repeat what Daphna Canetti et al. concluded, increases also individually our fear (Canetti et al. 2017). Vivian Silver “believed that an eye for an eye will leave the whole world blind”, as she is cited in a text in her memory by her friend a co-director of the Arab Jewish Centre for Equality, Empowerment and Cooperation, a women’s activist organization that worked for peace and human rights for years, Amal Elsana Alh’jooj writes:

Beneath our identities lies our essence. This essence with one voice and one face. This essence called ‘humanity’. Vivian, your smile will always shine, reminding all of us who have dedicated their lives to advocating for a shared society on that piece of land, all of us who feel lost, all of us who don’t know what to do, to still believe in humanity (Alh’jooj 2023).

20 I thank Eduardo Marques for pointing me to the work of Ann Mische.

5. Bibliography

- Ahmed, Sara (2001): "The Organization of Hate", in: *Law and Critique*, 12, 345–365.
- (2007): "A Phenomenology of Whiteness", in: *Feminist Theory*, 8, 2, 149–168.
- Alh'jooj, Amal Elsana (2023): "In Memory of Vivan Silver (1949-2023)", in: *fathom*, November 2023, at: <https://fathomjournal.org/in-memory-of-vivian-silver-1949-2023/> (Last access 06.05.2025).
- Alves, Maria Helena Moreira and Evanson, Philip (2011): *Living in the Crossfire: Favela Residents, Drug Dealers and Police Violence in Rio de Janeiro*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Amin, Ash (2002): "Ethnicity and the Multicultural City: Living with Diversity", in: *Environment and Planning A*, 34, 6, 959–980.
- Amrith, Megha (2018): "Tentative Friendships among Low-Income Migrants in São Paulo's Commercial Districts", in: *Urban Studies*, 55, 3, 522–537.
- Anderson, Elijah (2013): *Streetwise: Race, Class, and Change in an Urban Community*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, Elijah (2023): *Black in White Space: The Enduring Impact of Color in Everyday Life*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Anderson, Ryan Lee (2013): *The Effect of Urban Fortification on Public Space* [Doctoral thesis], Milwaukee: UW-Milwaukee.
- Atkinson, Rowland (2006): "Padding the Bunker: Strategies of Middle-Class Disaffiliation and Colonisation in the City", in: *Urban Studies*, 43, 4, 819–832.
- Atkinson, Rowland and Blandy, Sarah (2007): "Panic Rooms: The Rise of Defensive Homeownership", in: *Housing Studies*, 22, 4, 443–458.
- Back, Les and Shamser, Sinha (2016): "Multicultural Conviviality in the Midst of Racism's Ruins", in: *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 37, 5, 517–532.
- Bates, Charlotte (2018): "Conviviality, Disability and Design in the City", in: *The Sociological Review*, 66, 5, 984–999.
- Bayat, Asef (2012): "Politics in the City-Inside-Out", in: *City & Society*, 24, 2, 110–128.

- Beck, Aaron T. (1999): *Prisoners of Hate: The Cognitive Basis of Anger, Hostility, and Violence*, New York: HarperCollins.
- Benz, Terressa A. (2014): "At the Intersection of Urban Sociology and Criminology: Fear Of Crime and the Postindustrial City", in: *Sociology Compass*, 8, 1, 10–19.
- Binken, Saskia and Blokland, Talja (2012): "Why Repressive Policies Towards Urban Youths Do Not Make Streets Safe: Four Hypotheses", in: *The Sociological Review*, 60, 2, 292–311.
- Blokland, Talja (2008a): "Facing Violence: Everyday Risks in an American Housing Project", in: *Sociology*, 42, 2, 601–617.
- (2008b): "Gardening with a Little Help of Your (Middle Class) Friends: Bridging Social Capital Across Race and Class in a Mixed Neighborhood.", in: Blokland, Talja and Savage, Mike (eds.), *Networked Urbanism: Social Capital in the City*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 141–171.
- (2009): *Oog voor Elkaar: Veiligheidsbeleving en Sociale Controle in de Grote Stad*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- (2017): *Community as Urban Practice*, Malden MA: Polity Press.
- (2021): *Leben zwischen Dreck und Drogen. Sicherheitsempfinden am Kottbusser Tor, Berlin*, Berlin: Logos.
- Blokland, Talja and Rae, Douglas (2008): "The End to Urbanism: How the Changing Spatial Structure of Cities Affected Its Social Capital Potentials", in: Blokland, Talja and Savage, Mike (eds.), *Networked Urbanism: Social Capital in the City*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 24–39.
- Blokland, Talja and Schultze, Henrik (2018): "Belonging, Conviviality or Public Familiarity?: Making Sense of Urbanity in Rapidly Transforming Neighborhoods through the Lens of Berlin and Rotterdam", in: Ferro, Lígia; Gómez, María Victoria; Kurtenbach, Sebastian; Pereira, Patrícia; Smagacz-Poziemska, Marta and Villalón, Juan José (eds.), *Moving Cities: Contested Views on Urban Life*, Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden; Imprint: Springer VS, 243–264.

- Blokland, Talja and Šerbedžija, Vojin (2019): “Feeling Safe, Defining Crime and Urban Youth in Berlin’s Inner City: An Exploration of the Construction of ‘Unsafety’ and ‘Youth’ as Symbolic Violence”, in: Smagacz-Poziemska, Marta; Gomez, Maria Victoria; Pereira, Patricia; Guarino, Laura; Kurtenbach, Sebastian and Villalón, Juan José (eds.), *Inequality and Uncertainty: Current Challenges for Cities*, Berlin: Springer Nature, 161–183.
- Blommaert, Jan (2014): “Infrastructures of Superdiversity: Conviviality and Language in an Antwerp Neighborhood”, 17, 4, 431–451.
- Body-Gendrot, Sophie (2001): “The Politics of Urban Crime”, in: *Urban Studies*, 38, 5-6, 915–928.
- Bridge, Gary; Butler, Tim and Lees, Loreta (eds.) (2013): *Mixed Communities: Gentrification by Stealth?*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Caldeira, Teresa Pires do Rio (1996): “Fortified Enclaves: The New Urban Segregation”, in: *Public Culture*, 8, 2, 303–328.
- (2002): “The Paradox of Police Violence in Democratic Brazil”, in: *Ethnography*, 3, 3, 235–263.
- Calonge-Reillo, Fernando (2023): “More Fear, Less Walking: Taking a Walk in Fortified Housing Environments in Urban Mexico”, in: *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 37, 1, 443–458.
- Canetti, Daphna; Elad-Strenger, Julia; Lavi, Iris; Guy, Dana and Bar-Tal, Daniel (2017): “Exposure to Violence, Ethos of Conflict, and Support for Compromise: Surveys in Israel, East Jerusalem, West Bank, and Gaza”, in: *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 61, 1, 84–113.
- Certeau, Michel de (1984): *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clark, Peter (ed.) (2013): *The Oxford Handbook of Cities in World History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collins, Patricia Hill (1998): “The Tie That Binds: Race, Gender and US Violence”, in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 21, 5, 917–938.
- Costa, Sergio (2019): “The Neglected Nexus between Conviviality and Inequality”, *Mecila Working Paper Series*, No. 17, São Paulo: The Maria Sibylla Merian Centre Conviviality-Inequality Latin America.

- Darnton, Robert (2009): *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History*, New York: Basic Books.
- Das, Veena (1998): "Specificities: Official Narratives, Rumor, and the Social Production of Hate", in: *Social Identities*, 4, 1, 109–130.
- Davis, Mike (2011): "Fortress Los Angeles: The Militarization of Urban Space", in: Ferrell, Jeff and Hayward, Keith (eds.), *Cultural Criminology: Theories of Crime*, Surrey England, Burlington VT: Ashgate, 287–314.
- Douglas, Mary (1966): *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, New York: Free Press.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1926): "The Shape of Fear", in: *The North American Review*, 223, 831, 291–304.
- Durão, Susana (2023): "Conviviality in Inequality: Security in the City (São Paulo)", *Mecila Working Paper Series*, No. 62, São Paulo: Mecila.
- Feitosa, Flávia; Barros, Joana; Marques, Eduardo and Gianotti, Mariana (2021): "Measuring Changes in Residential Segregation in São Paulo in the 2000s", in: Ham, Marten van; Tammaru, Tiit; Ubarevičiene, Rūta and Janssen, Helen (eds.), *Urban Socio-Economic Segregation and Income Inequality: A Global Perspective*, New York: Springer, 507–523.
- Felder, Maxime (2020): "Who Are the Strangers? Neighbour Relations in Socially and Ethnically Heterogeneous Residential Buildings in Geneva", in: Oosterlynck, Stijn; Verschraegen, Gert and van Kempen, Ronald (eds.), *Diversity: Understanding Super-Diversity in Deprived and Mixed Neighbourhoods*, Bristol: Policy Press, 25–46.
- Feltran, Gabriel (2020): *Entangled City: Crime as Urban Fabric in São Paulo*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Fernández-Armesto, Felipe (2013): "Latin America", in: Clark, Peter (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Cities in World History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 364–382.
- Ferrell, Jeff and Hayward, Keith (eds.) (2011): *Cultural Criminology: Theories of Crime*, Surrey England, Burlington VT: Ashgate.
- Furedi, Frank (2018): *How Fear Works: Culture of Fear in the Twenty-First Century*, New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

- Gans, Herbert J. (1994 [1968]): *People, Plans, and Policies: Essays on Poverty, Racism, and Other National Urban Problems*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Garfield, Gail (2010): *Through Our Eyes: African American Men's Experiences of Race, Gender, and Violence*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Gawlewicz, Anna and Yiftachel, Oren (2022): "'Throwntogetherness' in Hostile Environments: Migration and the Remaking of Urban Citizenship", in: *City*, 26, 2-3, 346–358.
- Gilroy, Paul (2006): "Multiculture in Times of War: An Inaugural Lecture Given in London School of Economics", in: *Critical Quarterly*, 48, 4, 27–45.
- Giroux, Henry (2003): *The Abandoned Generation: Democracy Beyond the Culture of Fear*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Giustozzi, Carlotta; Blokland, Talja and Freitag, N. (2016): "Secluding: Middle Class Segregation in Schools and Neighbourhoods", in: Blokland, Talja; Giustozzi, Carlotta; Krüger, Daniela and Schilling, Hannah (eds.), *Creating the Unequal City: The Exclusionary Consequences of Everyday Routines in Berlin*, London: Routledge, 53–70.
- Glassner, Barry (1999): *The Culture of Fear: Why Americans Are Afraid of the Wrong Things*, London: Hachette.
- Goffman, Erving (1963): *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*, New York: Free Press.
- Graham, Stephen (2009): "The Urban 'Battlespace'", in: *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26, 7-8, 278–288.
- (2012): "When Life itself is War: On the Urbanization of Military and Security Doctrine", in: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 36, 1, 136–155.
- Green, Linda (1994): "Fear as a Way of Life", in: *Cultural Anthropology*, 9, 2, 227–256.
- Hall, Suzanna (2012): *City, Street and Citizen: The Measure of The Ordinary*, Oxford: Routledge.
- Håndlykken-Luz, Åsne (2020): "'Racism is a Perfect Crime': Favela Residents' Everyday Experiences of Police Pacification, Urban Militarization, and Prejudice in Rio de Janeiro", in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 43, 16, 348–367.

- Hanhoerster, Heike and Weck, Sabine (2020): "Middle-Class Family Encounters and the Role of Micro-Publics for Cross-Social Interaction", in: Musterd, Sako (ed.), *Handbook of Urban Segregation*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 254–269.
- Hart, Joel (2022): "Rethinking Conviviality: Materiality, Sociability, and Power in Israel/Palestine", in: *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 45, 16, 684–707.
- Heil, Tillman (2019): "Conviviality on the Brink", *Mecila Working Paper Series*, No. 14, São Paulo: The Maria Sibylla Merian Centre Conviviality-Inequality Latin America.
- Hoelscher, Kristian and Norheim-Martinsen, Per M. (2014): "Urban Violence and the Militarisation of Security: Brazilian 'Peacekeeping' in Rio de Janeiro and Port-au-Prince", in: *Small Wars & Insurgencies*, 25, 5-6, 957–975.
- Hudson, Maria; Phillips, Joan and Ray, Kathryn (2009): "Rubbing along with the Neighbours: Everyday Interactions in a Diverse Neighbourhood in the North of England", in: Wise, Amanda and Velayutham, Selvaraj (eds.), *Everyday Multiculturalism*, New York NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Huijbens, Edward H. (2023): "Convivial Encounters in the City: On Welcoming the Other", in: *Current Issues in Tourism*, 26, 2, 258–269.
- Illich, Ivan (2001 [1973]): *Tools for Conviviality*, London: Marion Boyars.
- Isin, Engin F. (2002): "City, Democracy and Citizenship: Historical Images, Contemporary Practices", in: Isin, Engin F. and Turner, Bryan S. (eds.), *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, London: SAGE, 305–316.
- Izharuddin, Alicia (2023): "Counterpublics of Care: Making Space for Mediated Intimacy and Romantic Self-Making in Malaysia", in: *Gender, Place & Culture*, 30, 1, 50–69.
- Jones, Hannah; Neal, Sarah; Mohan, Giles; Connell, Kieran; Cochrane, Allan and Bennett, Katy (2015): "Urban Multiculture and Everyday Encounters in Semi-Public, Franchised Cafe Spaces", in: *The Sociological Review*, 63, 3, 644–661.
- Karner, Christian and Parker, David (2011): "Conviviality and Conflict: Pluralism, Resilience and Hope in Inner-City Birmingham", in: *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37, 3, 355–372.

- Keil, Roger (2013): *Suburban Constellations: Governance, Land and Infrastructure in the 21st century*, Berlin: Jovis Verlag.
- Kern, Leslie (2016): "Rhythms of Gentrification: Eventfulness and Slow Violence in a Happening Neighbourhood", in: *Cultural Geographies*, 23, 3, 441–457.
- Kohn, Margaret (2004): *Brave New Neighborhoods*, New York: Routledge.
- Kraetzer, Ulrich (2019): "In Berlins Innenstadt wohnen nur wenige", in: *Berliner Morgenpost*, August 09, 2019.
- Lancione, Michele (ed.) (2016): *Rethinking Life at the Margins: The Assemblage of Contexts, Subjects, and Politics*, London: Routledge.
- Lapina, Linda (2016): "Besides Conviviality: Paradoxes in Being 'At Ease' with Diversity in a Copenhagen District", in: *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 6, 1, 33–41.
- Link, Felipe (2014): "Social Networks and Urban Structure: From Local Integration to Metropolitan Isolation in Santiago De Chile", in: *Sociologia Urbana e Rurale*, 105, 84–101.
- Lofland, Lyn H. (1998): *The Public Realm: Exploring the City's Quintessential Social Territory*, Hawthorne, N.Y: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Lupton, Deborah (1999): "Dangerous Places and the Unpredictable Stranger: Constructions of Fear of Crime", in: *Australia & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 32, 1, 1–15.
- Malyutina, Darya (2018): "Friendship in a 'Russian bar' in London: An Ethnography of a Young Russian-Speaking Migrant Community", in: *Urban Studies*, 55, 3, 589–604.
- Marques, Eduardo (2012): "Social Networks, Segregation and Poverty in São Paulo", in: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 36, 5, 958–979.
- Massey, Doreen (2005): *For Space*, London: SAGE.
- Mbembe, Achille (1992): "Provisional Notes on the Postcolony", in: *Africa*, 62, 1, 3–37.
- Mecila (2017): "Conviviality in Unequal Societies: Perspectives from Latin America. Thematic Scope and Research Programme", *Mecila Working Paper Series*, No. 1, São Paulo: The Maria Sibylla Merian Centre Conviviality-Inequality Latin America.

- Mische, Ann and Chandler, Matthew J. (2019): "Narratives, Networks and Publics", in: Grindstaff, Laura; Lo, Ming-Cheng and Hall, John R. (eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Cultural Sociology*, London, New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 478–485.
- Misztal, Barbara A. (2001): "Normality and Trust in Goffman's Theory of Interaction Order", in: *Sociological Theory*, 19, 3, 312–324.
- Moore, E. C. (1897): "The Social Value of the Saloon", in: *American Journal of Sociology*, 3, 1, 1–12.
- Moratto, Alexandre (2021): *7 prisioneiros* [Film], Rio de Janeiro: O2 Filmes.
- Neal, Sarah; Bennett, Katy; Cochrane, Allan and Mohan, Gilles (2013): "Living Multiculture: Understanding the New Spatial and Social Relations of Ethnicity and Multiculture in England", in: *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 31, 2, 308–323.
- Neal, Sarah; Bennett, Katy; Jones, Hannah and Cochrane, Allan (2015): "Multiculture and Public Parks: Researching Super-Diversity and Attachment in Public Green Space: Multiculture and Public Parks", in: *Population, Space and Place*, 21, 5, 463–475.
- Noble, Greg (2006): "The Discomfort of Strangers: Racism, Incivility and Ontological Security in a Relaxed and Comfortable Nation", in: *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 26, 1/2, 107–120.
- (2013): "Cosmopolitan Habits: The Capacities and Habitats of Intercultural Conviviality", 19, 2-3, 162-185.
- Nowicka, Magdalena and Heil, Tilmann (2016): *On the Analytical and Normative Dimensions of Conviviality and Cosmopolitanism*, Tübingen: Eberhard Karls University of Tübingen.
- Nowicka, Magdalena and Vertovec, Steven (2014): "Comparing Convivialities: Dreams and Realities of Living-with-Difference", in: *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 17, 4, 341–356.
- Oldenburg, Ramon and Brisset, Dennis (1982): "The Third Place", in: *Qualitative Sociology*, 5, 265-284.
- Oosterlynck, Stijn; Verschraegen, Gert, and Kempen, Ronald van (eds.) (2020): *Divercities: Understanding Super-Diversity in Deprived and Mixed Neighbourhoods*, Bristol: Policy Press.

- Pasquetti, Silvia (2019): "Experiences of Urban Militarism: Spatial Stigma, Ruins and Everyday Life", in: *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 43, 5, 848–869.
- Phadke, Shilpa; Khan, Sameera and Ranade, Shilpa (2011): *Why Loiter?: Women and Risk on Mumbai Streets*, New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- Pratt, Mary Louise (1991): "Arts of the Contact Zone", in: *Profession*, 33–40.
- Putnam, Robert D. (2000): *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Radice, Martha (2016): "Unpacking Intercultural Conviviality in Multiethnic Commercial Streets", in: *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 37, 5, 432–448.
- Reid, Mark A. (ed.) (1997): *Spike Lee's Do the Right Thing*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rocha, Luciane (2012): "Black Mothers' Experiences of Violence in Rio de Janeiro", in: *Cultural Dynamics*, 24, 1, 59–73.
- Rooksby, Emma (ed.) (2017): *Habitus: A Sense of Place*, London: Routledge.
- Roy, Beth (1994): *Some Trouble with Cows: Making Sense of Social Conflict*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sandercock, Leonie (2017): "Difference, Fear and Habitus: A Political Economy of Urban Fear", in: Rooksby, Emma (ed.), *Habitus: A sense of Place*, London: Routledge, 235–250.
- Santos, Milton (2021): *For a New Geography*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Schilling, Hannah; Blokland, Talja and Simone, AbdouMaliq (2019): "Working Precarity: Urban Youth Tactics to Make Livelihoods in Instable Conditions in Abidjan, Athens, Berlin and Jakarta", in: *The Sociological Review*, 67, 6, 1333–1349.
- Semi, Giovanni; Colombo, Enzo; Camozzi, Ilenya and Frisina, Annalisa (2009): "Practices of Difference: Analysing Multiculturalism in Everyday Life", in: Wise, Amanda and Velayutham, Selvaraj (eds.), *Everyday Multiculturalism*, New York NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 66–84.
- Sennett, Richard (1990): *The Conscience of the Eye: the Design and Social Life of Cities*, New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

- Sheller, Mimi (2023): "Public Spaces of Transport as Mobile Public Spheres and Atmospheric Publics", in: *Urban Studies*, 60, 15, 3158–3164.
- Simmel, Georg (1949 [1910]): "The Sociology of Sociability", in: *American Journal of Sociology*, 55, 3, 254–261.
- (1950): *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, New York: The Free Press.
- Smith, David M. (1999): "Geography, Community and Morality", in: *Environment and Planning*, 31, 1, 19–55.
- Smith, Dorothy E. (1999): "From Women's Standpoint to a Sociology for People", in: Abu-Lughod, Janet L. (ed.), *Sociology for the Twenty-First Century: Continuities and Cutting Edges*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 65–82.
- Stansell, Christine (1982): "Women, Children, and the Uses of the Streets: Class and Gender Conflict in New York City, 1850-1860", in: *Feminist Studies*, 8, 2, 309–335.
- Stark, Rodney (1987): "Deviant Places: A Theory of Ecology of Crime", in: *Criminology*, 25, 893–910.
- Sternberg, Robert J. and Sternberg, Karin (2008): *The Nature of Hate*, Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Suarez, Marcial A. G.; Souza, Luís Antônio Francisco de and Serra, Carlos Henrique Aguiar (2021): "The Violence Dynamics in Public Security: Military Interventions and Police-Related Deaths in Brazil", in: *Oñati Socio-Legal Series*, 11, 3, 787–808.
- Tavolari, Bianca (2019): "Jane Jacobs: Contradições e tensões", in: *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais*, 21, 1, 13–25.
- Thomas, Angie (2018): *The Hate U Give*, London: Walker Books.
- Tilly, Charles (1998): *Durable Inequality*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Timur, Sebnem and Bagli, Melike (2006): "A Bodily Sign of 'Doing Nothing': Loitering or the Silence before the Storm. Loitering as a Sign of 'Doing Nothing'", in: *M/C Journal*, 9, 3, at: <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/0607/05-timur-bagli.php> (Last access 29.04.2025).
- Valentine, Gill (2008): "Living with Difference: Reflections on Geographies of Encounter", in: *Progress in Human Geography*, 32, 3, 323–337.

- Villarreal, Ana (2021): "Reconceptualizing Urban Violence from the Global South", in: *City and Community*, 20, 1, 48–58.
- Vincent, Carol; Neal, Sarah and Iqbal, Humera (2017): "Encounters with Diversity: Children's Friendships and Parental Responses", in: *Urban Studies*, 54, 8, 1974–1989.
- Wacquant, Loïc (2007): "Territorial Stigmatization in the Age of Advanced Marginality", in: *Thesis Eleven*, 91, 1, 66–77.
- (2008): "The Militarization of Urban Marginality: Lessons from the Brazilian Metropolis", in: *International Political Sociology*, 2, 1, 56–74.
- (2009): *Urban Outcasts*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Webb, Andrew; Becerra, Sandra and Sepulveda, Macarena (2023): "Moving Beyond Racism?: Tensions Between Interculturalism and Conviviality in Chilean Schools from a Figural Perspective", in: *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 44, 4, 455–471.
- Wessendorf, Susanne (2011): "Commonplace Diversity and the 'Ethos of Mixing': Perceptions of Difference in a London Neighbourhood", *MMG Working Paper*, 11-09, Göttingen: Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity.
- Wessendorf, Susanne (2014): "'Being Open, but Sometimes Closed': Conviviality in a Super-Diverse London Neighbourhood", in: *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 17, 4, 392–405.
- Wilson, Helen (2013): "Collective Life: Parents, Playground Encounters and the Multicultural City", in: *Social and Cultural Geography*, 14, 6, 625–648.
- (2016): "On Geography and Encounter: Bodies, Borders and Difference", in: *Progress in Human Geography*, 4, 4, 451–471.
- Wilson, Helen and Darling, Jonathan (eds.) (2016): *Encountering the City: Urban Encounters from Accra to New York*, London: Routledge.
- Wilson, Helen and Darling, Jonathan (2016): "The Possibilities of Encounter", in: Wilson, Helen and Darling, Jonathan (eds.), *Encountering the City: Urban Encounters from Accra to New York*, London: Routledge, 1–24.
- Wise, Amanda (2016): "Convivialities: An Introduction", in: *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 37, 5, 423–431.

Wise, Amanda and Velayutham, Selvaraj (2013): "Conviviality in Everyday Multiculturalism: Some Brief Comparisons between Singapore and Sydney", in: *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 17, 4, 406–430.

Yiftachel, Oren (2009): "Theoretical Notes On 'Gray Cities': the Coming of Urban Apartheid?", in: *Planning Theory*, 8, 1, 88–100.

Working Papers published since 2017:

1. Maria Sybilla Merian International Centre for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences Conviviality-Inequality in Latin America (Mecila) (2017): "Conviviality in Unequal Societies: Perspectives from Latin America: Thematic Scope and Preliminary Research Programme".
2. Müller, Gesine (2018): "Conviviality in (Post)Colonial Societies: Caribbean Literature in the Nineteenth Century".
3. Adloff, Frank (2018): "Practices of Conviviality and the Social and Political Theory of Convivialism".
4. Montero, Paula (2018): "Syncretism and Pluralism in the Configuration of Religious Diversity in Brazil".
5. Appadurai, Arjun (2018): "The Risks of Dialogue".
6. Inuca Lechón, José Benjamín (2018): "Llaktapura sumak kawsay / Vida plena entre pueblos. Un concepto emancipatorio de las nacionalidades del Ecuador".
7. Wade, Peter (2018): "*Mestizaje* and Conviviality in Brazil, Colombia and Mexico".
8. Graubart, Karen (2018): "Imperial Conviviality: What Medieval Spanish Legal Practice Can Teach Us about Colonial Latin America".
9. Gutiérrez, Felipe Castro (2018): "La violencia rutinaria y los límites de la convivencia en una sociedad colonial".
10. Wasser, Nicolas (2018): "The Affects of Conviviality-Inequality in Female Domestic Labour".
11. Segura, Ramiro (2019): "Convivialidad en ciudades latinoamericanas. Un ensayo bibliográfico desde la antropología".
12. Scarato, Luciane (2019): "Conviviality through Time in Brazil, Mexico, Peru, and Río de la Plata".
13. Barreneche, Osvaldo (2019): "Conviviality, Diversidad, Fraternidad. Conceptos en diálogo".
14. Heil, Tilmann (2019): "Conviviality on the Brink".

15. Manzi, Maya (2019): "Fighting against or Coexisting with Drought? Conviviality, Inequality and Peasant Mobility in Northeast Brazil".
16. Guiteras Mombiola, Anna (2019): "School Centres for 'Savages': In Pursuit of a Convivial Sociability in the Bolivian Amazon".
17. Costa, Sérgio (2019): "The Neglected Nexus between Conviviality and Inequality".
18. Banzato, Guillermo (2019): "Soberanía del conocimiento para superar inequidades. Políticas de Acceso Abierto para revistas científicas en América Latina".
19. Gil Montero, Raquel and Albiez, Sarah (2019): "Conviviality as a Tool for Creating Networks: The Case of an Early Modern Global Peasant Traveler".
20. Briones, Claudia (2019): "Políticas contemporáneas de convivencia. Aportes desde los pueblos originarios de América Latina".
21. Rojas Scheffer, Raquel (2020): "Articulating Differences and Inequalities: Paid Domestic Workers' and Housewives' Struggles for Rights in Uruguay and Paraguay".
22. Potthast, Barbara (2020): "*Mestizaje* and Conviviality in Paraguay".
23. Mailhe, Alejandra (2020): "¿Legados prestigiosos? La revalorización del sustrato cultural indígena en la construcción identitaria argentina, entre fines del siglo XIX y los años treinta".
24. Sigsfeld, Julia von (2020): "Ancestral Knowledges and the Ecuadorian Knowledge Society".
25. Baldraia, Fernando (2020): "Epistemologies for Conviviality, or Zumbification".
26. Feltran, Gabriel (2020): "Marginal Conviviality: On Inequalities and Violence Reproduction".
27. Rojas Scheffer, Raquel (2020): "Physically Close, Socially Distant: Paid Domestic Work and (Dis-)Encounters in Latin America's Private Households".
28. Gil Montero, Raquel (2020): "Esclavitud, servidumbre y libertad en Charcas".
29. Manzi, Maya (2020): "More-Than-Human Conviviality-Inequality in Latin America".

30. Klengel, Susanne (2020): "Pandemic Avant-Garde: Urban Coexistence in Mário de Andrade's *Pauliceia Desvairada* (1922) After the Spanish Flu".
31. Gomes, Nilma L. (2021): "Antiracism in Times of Uncertainty: The Brazilian Black Movement and Emancipatory Knowledges".
32. Rocha, Camila (2021): "The New Brazilian Right and the Public Sphere".
33. Boesten, Jan (2021): "Violence and Democracy in Colombia: The Conviviality of Citizenship Defects in Colombia's Nation-State".
34. Pappas, Gregory F. (2021): "Horizontal Models of Conviviality or Radical Democracy in the Americas: Zapatistas, Boggs Center, Casa Pueblo".
35. Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Encarnación (2021): "Entangled Migrations: The Coloniality of Migration and Creolizing Conviviality".
36. Reis, João José (2021): "Slaves Who Owned Slaves in Nineteenth-Century Bahia, Brazil".
37. Strega, Juliana M. (2021): "*Aquilombar* Democracy: Fugitive Routes from the End of the World".
38. Chicote, Gloria (2021): "Los tortuosos pactos de convivencia en *El juguete rabioso* de Roberto Arlt".
39. Penna, Clemente (2021): "The Saga of Teofila: Slavery and Credit Circulation in 19th-Century Rio de Janeiro".
40. Cohen, Yves (2021): "Horizontality in the 2010s: Social Movements, Collective Activities, Social Fabric, and Conviviality".
41. Tosold, Léa (2021): "The Quilombo as a Regime of Conviviality: *Sentipensando* Memory Politics with Beatriz Nascimento".
42. Estrada, Jorge (2022): "Ruthless Desires of Living Together in Roberto Bolaño's 2666: Conviviality between *Potestas* and *Potentia*".
43. Stefan, Madalina (2022): "Conviviality, Ecocriticism and the Anthropocene: An Approach to Postcolonial Resistance and Ecofeminism in the Latin American Jungle Novel".
44. Teixeira, Mariana (2022): "Vulnerability: A Critical Tool for Conviviality-Inequality Studies".
45. Costa, Sérgio (2022): "Unequal and Divided: The Middle Classes in Contemporary Brazil".

46. Suárez, Nicolás (2022): "Museos del cine latinoamericanos: Políticas de preservación fílmica en contextos conviviales y desiguales".
47. Wanschelbaum, Cinthia (2022): "El proyecto educativo conservador del gobierno de Macri y los vínculos con actores privados".
48. Rojas Scheffer, Raquel (2022): "Another Turn of the Screw: The COVID-19 Crisis and the Reinforced Separation of Capital and Care".
49. Pinedo, Jerónimo (2022): "'¿Cómo se vivió aquí en la pandemia?'. La trama convivial de la covid-19".
50. Schultz, Susanne (2022): "Intersectional Convivialities: Brazilian Black and Popular Feminists Debating the *Justiça Reprodutiva* Agenda and Allyship Framework".
51. Castellón Osegueda, José Ricardo (2022): "Inequidades y convivialidades en movimiento. La familia y los inicios de la migración del Triángulo Norte de Centroamérica hacia los Estados Unidos".
52. Moschkovich, Marília (2023): "'Família' e a nova gramática dos direitos humanos no governo de Jair Bolsonaro (2019-2021)".
53. Kessler, Gabriel; Vommaro, Gabriel y Assusa, Gonzalo (2023): "El proceso de polarización en América Latina: entre la secularización y el conflicto distributivo".
54. Dünne, Jörg (2023): "Interspecific Contact Scenes: Humans and Street Dogs in the Margins of the City".
55. Toji, Simone (2023): "Conviviality-in-Action: Of Silence and Memory in the Cultural Performance of Generations of Japanese Migrants in a Riverine Town in Brazil".
56. Piovani, Juan Ignacio; Alzugaray, Lucas; Peiró, María Laura y Santa Maria, Juliana (2023): "Convivialidad en el ámbito doméstico. Arreglos familiares y relaciones de género en los hogares del Área Metropolitana de Buenos Aires durante la pandemia de Covid-19".
57. Flamand, Laura; Alba Vega, Carlos; Aparicio, Rosario y Serna, Erick (2023): "Trabajo remunerado y de cuidados en la Ciudad de México. Los efectos de la pandemia de covid-19 sobre las desigualdades sociales y la convivialidad".
58. O'Leary, Jessica (2023): "The Trial of Íria Álvares: Conviviality and Inequality in the Portuguese Inquisition Records".

59. Brun, Élodie y Carrillo, Jesús (2023): "La política global como una 'configuración convivial': hacia un entendimiento holístico de las desigualdades mundiales interestatales".
60. Costa, Sérgio; Teixeira, Mariana, and Mattos, Thomás (2023): "Conviviality-Inequality during the Pandemic: The Case of Berlin".
61. Massuchetto, Vanessa (2023): "Women, Normativities, and Scandal: The Crime of Concubinage through Conviviality Lenses in Southern Portuguese America in the Late 18th Century".
62. Durão, Susana (2023): "Conviviality in Inequality: Security in the City (São Paulo)".
63. Torquato, Ana Carolina (2023): "Animal Display in Fiction: Clarice Lispector's '*O búfalo*' and Other Stories Framing Animal Captivity".
64. Kolb, Patrizia (2024): "The Impact of the Corona Crisis on the Gender Gap in Care Work And Housework".
65. Schapira, Raphael (2024): "Brazilian Jiu-jitsu as a Marker of Whiteness and Anti-Blackness: Embodying Inclusive Conservative Conviviality in Rio de Janeiro".
66. Callsen, Berit (2024): "Liquid Conviviality in Chilean Documentary Film: Dynamics of Confluences and Counter/fluences".
67. Moszczynska, Joanna M. (2024): "Truths That Hurt: Socialist Affects and Conviviality in the Literary Journalism of Gabriel García Márquez and Ryszard Kapuściński".
68. Bianchi, Guilherme (2024): "As formas da comunidade: convivialidade, corpo e política pós-conflito entre os Ashaninka do rio Ene (Amazônia peruana)".
69. Gandhi, Ajay (2024): "The Porous and the Pure: An Artifactual History of Ties Between Asia, Europe, and Latin America".
70. Medeiros da Silva, Mário Augusto (2024): "Social Memory, Conviviality, and Contemporary Antiracism: Valongo, Pretos Novos, Aflitos, and Saracura".
71. Etzold, Jörn (2024) "Theatres of the Proto-Juridical".
72. Brage, Eugenia (2024): "Tramas populares-comunitarias de convivialidad. Reflexiones en torno a la sostenibilidad de la vida y la producción de lo común en contextos transfronterizos".

73. Strasser, Melanie (2024): "Receiving Words: Towards a Poetics of Hospitality".
74. Gil Mariño, Cecilia Nuria (2024): "Reversos de la oscuridad. Fantasías, erotismo y acosos en las salas de cine de Buenos Aires y São Paulo en la primera mitad del siglo XX".
75. Costa, Sérgio; Cavalcanti, Mariana; Domingues, José Maurício; Knöbl, Wolfgang (2024): "On the Earth Ethic: Interview with Dipesh Chakrabarty".
76. Fischer, Georg (2024): "Agrarian Colonization and the Problem of Conviviality-Inequality in Twentieth-Century Latin America".
77. Alarcón López, Cristina (2024): "¿Música de derecha? Imaginarios de convivialidad en los anuncios y jingles de candidatos presidenciales de derecha de Chile y Argentina".
78. Rosa, Allan da (2024): "Apresento o meu amigo! O que ele merece?: Lábia, estéticas afrodiáspóricas, jogo e convivialidade entre negros de São Paulo".
79. Witthaus, Jan-Henrik (2025): "Mapeando 'soberanías menores' en la narrativa sobre el narcotráfico. Entre México y Colombia".
80. Meireles, Flavia (2025): "Corpo-território: Práticas artísticas e ativismo indígena".
81. Melo, Rúrion (2025): "When Conviviality Hides Inequality: Lélia Gonzalez on Brazilian Racial Democracy".
82. Marins, Cristina T. (2025): "Perceptions of Precariousness and Entrepreneurship among Informal Workers in the Platform Economy".
83. Blokland, Talja (2025): "The Metropolis and its Social Life: Conviviality, Urban Studies, and Thoughts on Thugs".



UNIVERSITÄT
ZU KÖLN



Ibero-Amerikanisches
Institut
Preußischer Kulturbesitz



CEBRAP
centro brasileiro de análise e planejamento



IdIHCS Instituto de Investigaciones en
Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales



EL COLEGIO
DE MÉXICO



The Maria Sibylla Merian Centre Conviviality-Inequality in Latin America (Mecila) was founded in April 2017 by three German and four Latin American partner institutions and is funded by the German Federal Ministry of Research, Technology and Space (BMFTR). The participating researchers investigate coexistence in unequal societies from an interdisciplinary and global perspective. The following institutions are involved: Freie Universität Berlin, Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut/Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Universität zu Köln, Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Centro Brasileiro de Análise e Planejamento (CEBRAP), IdIHCS (CONICET/Universidad Nacional de La Plata), and El Colegio de México. Further information at <http://www.mecila.net>.

Contact

Coordination Office
Maria Sybilla Merian Centre
Conviviality-Inequality in Latin America

Rua Morgado de Mateus, 615
São Paulo – SP
CEP 04015-051
Brazil

mecila@cebrap.org.br

With funding from the:



Federal Ministry
of Research, Technology
and Space