PHILOSOPHY AND ARCHITECTURE: Social Inequalities and Cities

Monday

12.00 Welcome

12.30-13.30 What is equality / **Jo Wolff**

This opening lecture reviews the main questions and issues of equality, the main philosophical theories and maps agreements and disagreements in contemporary egalitarian philosophy.

13.30-14.00 Avner de Shalit conducts a discussion: Why bother about inequality in the city as distinguished from inequality in the state? Various reasons will be discussed, e.g. the demographic, political and economic rise of the city and how it influences inequality; why methodologically measuring inequality in the city is so different from measuring it in the state?; what makes the city a different political and social institution compared to the state?

14.00-14.15 Break

14.15- 15.30 Immigration and inclusion in cities as an aspect of inequality / Avner de Shalit

This lecture's goal is, among other things, to suggest that equality in the city shoudl be conceived in terms which go beyond money and income and to see that in everyday life in the city we see inequality in a variety of spheres of life. Avner will lecture on 'Three cities and three models of inclusion', comparing Amsterdam, Berlin and Jerusalem as three rival models of inclusion. Jo Wolff will comment on Iris Young about immigration and inclusion in cities. Then both will conduct a discussion: Why is inclusion part of equality? And how is equality expressed in integration policies? Is there a need for a particular model or perhaps there is room for a variety of such models, as long as the goal is inclusion?

15.30-16.00 Break

16.00-17.00 Idis Turato/ ECOC 2020, Post-Form City and Culture

We live and work in a global world, where most thoughts about space and society are being moderated by different forms of market economies, and the habits of the analog civilization are being drastically changed by the development of new technologies and the overall mediatisation and digitalisation of cyber space. In such an environment the classically interpreted culture and art are held hostage by the spectacle, used for events intended for consumption and ephemeral consumerism. Unlike in the past, they now cannot be expected to perceive reality with a critical eye and bring about an adequate social change.

In such a thoroughly changed context, European cities are mindlessly and moralistically trying to find balance among changes caused by the unpredictability of economies, the challenges of an uncertain future, and the images of the past made more beautiful through embalmed heritage and paranoid protection. By adding sustainable development and ecology as new myths of today's world into the mix, we come to realise that good development of cities has completely lost the possibility to reinvent itself organically, it has neglected transgression as its sustainable heritage but it has also

completely overlooked the ever open possibility of turning to the ability of utopian thinking about the future.

The question is how to look at the City of Culture in such a context. Does this global system even need a different and new culture? What is the role of cities and local self-government in creating culture and its new challenges? As an answer to these perfectly clear questions, the European Capital of Culture – Rijeka 2020 is primarily a good opportunity to introduce a change of the paradigm, to look at reality from a different perspective, and to try to come up with a slightly different project. Encouraged by these very clear reasons and questions (to which, it seems, nobody on the local nor European Union level has a clear answer), in 2013 I joined the team responsible for creating the concept of the ECOC Rijeka 2020 project called "The Harbour of Diversity" and for submitting the application.

In the context of such a specific and certainly unpredictable project, culture and the city become platforms for rethinking the city, its revival and reinvention. The ECOC 2020 offers a unique opportunity to use the research in the field of culture to suggest and build a different framework for people who want to become voluntary prisoners of the idea of a different city, new inhabitants and enthusiasts of its lost urban culture. Such a project, a specific and controlled context, can also bring about a different image of the city, open new perspectives on housing, working, living standards, natural resource economy and the migration of Europe. The expansion of new individuality and mobility, as well as the creation of new languages and communications, has resulted in a clear need for redesigning the communal. Through the new collective attitude of the place, culture could create new and different art, explore new city architecture, as well as suggest and build new interfaces of spatial and emotional shells of everyday lives.

In such a new context, the city's art, design, architecture and urban planning are certainly losing their traditional meaning, the existing two-direction activity between the artist-architect and the society is no longer needed, and everybody is well aware that good results cannot be obtained. The aim of the five-year Rijeka ECOC 2020 project in front of us is not just construction but a permanent establishment of processes and the use of new methods of urbanisation. The future work within the project of the City of Culture is aimed at starting unstoppable processes after the Capital's "inauguration ceremony", the establishment of a state of continuous understanding, as well as the anticipation of things and events before they actually happen. The ECOC Rijeka 2020 is an opportunity to establish a new, open system of culture which clearly copes with anthropological questions, deals with trust among people, new ethics and morals, love and eros, passion, as well as death observed through and revived by completely different perspectives on the private, public, common, and social.

As it is evident from the very process and the act of applying for candidacy, in such a context and within challenges set in such a manner, ECOC Rijeka 2020 "The Harbour of Diversity" does not want to be a mass of predictable cultural events, ad hoc collection of events, nor a chance for a temporary visit or residence of creative individuals from across Europe. ECOC Rijeka is a clear and unambiguous project relying on culture, abandoned infrastructure, new migration of people to the city, and it permanently and clearly redefines the space, time and events in post-2020 Rijeka thanks to clear guidelines and the concepts of Work, Water and Migration.

Therefore, the ECOC Rijeka 2020 project sets culture and architecture free from typical tasks, and it finally sets us free from the spectacle of forms and aestheticisation as the sole observed and valued manifestation of the profession. This is the beginning of a period in which action which sees the profession of architects and cultural workers only in the context of elite art and in the service of

the market, as well as such a perspective are being abandoned. For starters, it places itself opposite consumerism and overall transience. The ECOC Rijeka 2020 means real action which encompasses intellectual property management, continuous education, encouragement of exploration, strengthening of risk management ability through the planning of projects, actions and events which set culture free from the traditional building, zone planning and intended use. We are entering the space of designing and managing systems. We are in the space of the Post-Form City and Culture.

17.00-18.00 Sandra Meireis/ Inequalities in Cities as Motive for Utopian Architectural Thinking

A great variety of architectural projects for temporary use emerged in the past two decades, especially in public and semi-public spaces of capital cities in the global North. The project initiators of these so-called alternative urban practices or critical spatial agency are in the majority of cases critical, and transdisciplinary working architects, who lately started making strategic contact with politicians. Thus, for instance in Berlin a debate was stimulated negotiating the central question, whether a formalization of such alternative urban concepts, i.e. including them in official urban planning policies, could unfold positive effects in the long run: Counterbalancing the negative effects of plain profit-maximization.

My research focuses on the increasing interest back in utopian concepts nowadays that grows proportionally with the perceived decline of democracy overall. As much as dialectics belong inherently to the general concept of utopian thinking, as much it is symptomatic for each of those projects to reveal its contradictoriness on closer examination, e. g. escapism or future vision. Barbara Goodwin and Keith Taylor put it in The Politics of Utopia as follows: 'Long debates […] take place between those who use "utopian" to mean "unrealizable because hopelessly idealistic" and those for whom it connotes an ideal society, a real alternative' (Goodwin and Taylor 1982: 15).

18.00-18.30 Break

18.30 - 19.30 Vladan Djokić, Zoran Lazović lecture on the Phenomena of Non/arcihtectural Pastiche in the Captial of Serbia.

Serbia and its capital Belgrade are undergoing a decades-long process of drastic change of the social system, in political turmoil, through leadership interchange of different and "opposing" political elites. At the same, Belgrade is absolutely privileged in comparison to other cities of Serbia in economic and cultural terms. And here, like anywhere else, architecture – as infrastructure and scenography of life – represents an indicator of trends of political will and relationships that dominate political scene and paints a true picture of the social and cultural condition in Serbia, distinguishing thus the characteristic of each period individually.

The most dominant process that takes place in the area is illegal construction of facilities and the attitude of the authorities towards it. This has bearing not only on suburban areas or the main traffic arteries leading from the centre to periphery, but also on city centres themselves. The existing building stock of architecture without architects, cobbled together and unfinished, without any standards or thermal insulation makes the overall impression of non-architectural pastiche of Serbian cities and their suburbs, as well as Belgrade. Around 1.5 million of informal and illegal objects has been built in Serbia, out of which 250.000 are found in Belgrade, and now they stand before the

state for regularization. They are, however, not much different from buildings that are built with all necessary zoning and construction permits. What is more, the latter are emerging as signed projects from architectural studios, mainly in the facet of "client architecture", seemingly designed and beautiful, even "intelligent", with tiny windows and balconies, however meaninglessly economical and built with poor materials. Several residential settlements in Belgrade built with the means of public housing fund. Of social character in name only, they are nevertheless intended for the market, completely unsuitable in terms of basic quality of housing, deprived of basic essentials and complementary content.

On the other hand, there is almost normalized violent behaviour of the state and city authorities, particularly in the selection of (ill-conceived) ideas and objects yet to be built, as well as in poor preservation and conversion of privatized, historically and culturally protected and listed buildings. The apex of such practices is evident in state's legal insurances for foreign investment partners and controversial businessmen in shape of „Lex Specialis" legislation, with which public and common space, fair conditions for investment, participation, construction and life for all is usurped and compromised. All previous indications may be considered as traits of mentality and human inherent exuberance, yet at the same time they may be the consequence of rational and organized political practice, political acts and inaction, in regards of ensuring privileges to a certain group of people. In sum, the emphasis is on decades-long malpractice and creation of exceedingly poor building stock, unsightly environment, poor management of public and taxpayer funds, reinforced inequalities in every conceivable sense and progressive deterioration of standards and values.

Tuesday

9.00 - 10.30 Inequality in the city: philosophical issues / Jo Wolff will talk about the joint (with Avner) research project and book *Disadvantage* and about how to think of Disadvantage and inequality in the context of the city. Jo will emphasize the issues of pluralism of disadvantage, and having one's functinoings at risk as a description of being disadvnataged. In addition he will explore the idea of people being involved in creating the condition of their own well-being.

10.30 - 10.45 Break

10.45 - 12.15 The quest for justice in cities / Avner de Shalit will elaborate a critique of the works of Susan Fainstein and David Harvey and the approach as if spatial justice exhausts the question of justice and equality in the city. At the same time he will show how their books did contribute to the discourse on justice and inequality in cities and to re-thinking about equality in cities.

12.15 - 12.30 Break

12.30 - 13.30 Snježana Prijić – Samaržija / *Polis* and *episteme*: city as a collective epistemic agent

In everyday speech we ofteh attribute virtues and vices, not only to individuals, but also to various kinds of groups, including cities. So, we habitually state that „The city is "smart" or that "The city courageously invests in culture" or even more specifically claim that '' Amsterdam is a tolerant city"

and "Palermo is slow."' Doing so, we assume - figuratively or not - that these collective entities and cities are certain kinds of agents, the bearers of features (states, beliefs, behaviors or like) for which they can be criticized or applauded. In this presentation I will be concerned with the following issues, which belong to a new area of investigations called *collective epistemology*: What makes a city an epistemic collective agent? What makes a city an epistemically virtuous collective agent? Does a city display epistemic virtues as a collective or as a cluster of virtuous individuals?

Relying on ancient virtues of knowledge, which consist of the unity of *episteme*, *techne* and *phronesis*, I will attempt to argue that an epistemically virtuous, intellectual or smart city is a city in which scientific knowledge (knowledge about what is real or *episteme*) is applied in everyday life (knowledge about how to act or *techne*) with the aim of improving the quality of overall life for all (knowledge about what is good or bad for citizens - *phronesis*). However, in everyday usage the concept of "smart cities" has recently been reduced to a mere metaphor for the urban modernity inherent to the metamorphosis of traditional cities into high-tech parks and for "network cities" inhabited by "knowledge processors" engaged in rapid exchanges of information. Smart cities are often associated with corporate storytelling and impose upon us the question of whether smart cities truly enable the bridging of existing inequalities, or simply deepen them. Since it seems that existing smart cities base their epistemic virtue dominantly or exclusively on *techne,* my conclusion is that a truly virtuous city needs to not only be a technopolis *(techne-*polis), but also an *episteme*–polis (epistemopolis) and a *phronesis* – polis (phronesopolis).

13.30-15.00 Lunch break

15.00 - 16.00 Sanja Bojanic / Affective Inequality in the Household, in the City

My aim in this exercise is to look closely at the nature of disadvantages presented in the "Story of Leah" (Introduction: *Disadvantages*). Referring directly to the narrative but also to Wolff's and de Shalit's arguments in the section 10.4 of the book (*Status Enhancement, Loneliness, and the Public/Private Distinction*), I also want before even getting out on the street and into the city (with Leah), to question the reasons of the "ugly and socially awkward" situation she was born in. What is at stake when we analyze inequalities within the family/private realm and would it be possible to thematize the specificities of the affective inequality not only through the lens of care ethics? I am not repeating the famous feminist adage "personal is political" but rather enlarge Wolff's and de Shalit's arguments with certain elements of the affect theory developed in feminist and legal studies.

16.00 - 17.00 Nebojša Zelić / City, Meaningful Work and Meaningful Leisure

Cities have always been centers of creativity. Certainly, they offer more jobs in creative sectors (art, science and creative industries). But they also provide more opportunity for people to develop their talents and creativity in their leisure time. These two aspects – creative jobs and creative leisure – is not available to everyone due to their social or economic background. Some people lack education, money or belong to marginalized group where these opportunities are not available. This is certainly one aspect of inequality in the city that can be faced on the level of municipal policies. Even if everyone can not have creative job there can be some progress in offering opportunities and incentives to everyone to have creative leisure which can also realize important aspects of creative jobs (such as self- respect, for example). I try to provide theoretical justification for these policies by interpreting and combining two principles – aristotelian principle saying that human beings enjoy

realization and exercise of their talents and difference principle which says that inequalities are justified if they make least advantaged better off (both principles are by John Rawls). Thus, I believe we can say that inequalities are justified only if they raise the level of public services and goods that (among other things) provide opportunities for people to develop their talents, creativity and interests.

17.00- 17.10 Break

17.15 - 18.15 Petar Bojanić / Poverty. Housing the Poor/the Workers

Primarily using two Reports – John Locke's 1697 "The Report on the Poor" and "A Philosophical Review of Poverty" (Wolff, Lamb, Zur-Szpiro) from 2015 – I intend to explain and determine relative and absolute poverty, ghetto, the dark ghetto (Shelby), the suburbs, slums, "worker cities" (Cités Ouvrières), the "social palace," etc.

18.20-19.30 Study in small groups, guided by lecturers: How should we think of inequality in cities and what do we have to measure? The students will be asked to come up with ideas about what is needed to know in order to construct a model for inequality in cities, how we can measure it, what we have to ask people in the street and so on.

Wednesday

9.00 - 10.30 Inequality in the city / **Jo Wolff and Avner de Shalit** conduct discussion with the students on philosophical and methodological issues. They will also put forward some of the ideas they have reached in their research on inequality in the city so far – what do people care about when they think of inequality in the city? What is wrong with applying the Gini coefficient index to the context of cities, and so on.

10.30 - 11.00 Break

11.00 - 13.00 Avner de Shalit on Methods of Research and preparation for the afternoon research. Method of interviews Jo and Avner developed and used (dynamic public reflective equilibrium) will be presented and taught; students will practice it before using it in the city in the next session.

13.00 - 16.00 Short Lunch break and then students practicing research in the city, supervised by Jo Wolff and Avner de Shalit

16.00 - 19.00 Gathering and discussing results (30 minutes break)

10.00 - 10.45 Ivan Cerovac / Epistemic Democracy and the Informal Political Public Sphere

Though democracy is highly valued and widely accepted as a collective decision-making procedure with legitimacy-generating potential, much of its appeal rests on the *formal* equality of citizens it introduces in the decision-making process. *Political egalitarianism*, the view that requires not only formal, but also *substantial* political equality characterized by equal availability of political input and influence over binding collective choices, is often rejected for various reasons. One of the important arguments against political egalitarianism is the epistemic one: some unequal distribution of political input in the informal political sphere (e.g. during political campaigns) may better promote substantively just or correct decisions by increasing the total level of political input. If we want to publicly justify a collective decision-making procedure by appealing (at least in part) to its instrumental epistemic qualities, we should favor some forms of inequality in the informal political sphere - those inequalities that increase the total level of political input in political campaigns on the one hand, but still distribute it so as to keep inequalities under control. I hope to refute this argument and to show that, from the epistemic view, substantive political equality should be favored over substantive political inequality (even when inequality produces greater level of total political input). I use a variation of the demographic objection stating that there might be some epistemically damaging features, characteristic for the group that has greater political influence, that countervail the admitted epistemic benefits of a greater level of the total political input. Since some of these damaging features might rest on empirically latent or conjectural features, there might be some epistemically damaging features that we do not know about, but it might still not be unreasonable to think that they will be introduced (and that they will countervail the beneficial epistemic effects of increased level of total political input) if we give greater political influence to the wealthier part of the political community. Since this is not an unreasonable objection (thought it need not be true), the unequal distribution of political input in the informal political public sphere cannot satisfy the liberal criterion of legitimacy.

10.45 – 11.30 Edoardo Fregonese / Ontology of the City and Spatial Justice

In this talk I will show a functionalist ontology of the city in order to speak about spatial justice. A functionalist ontology means that every building (from hospital to school but also street and so on) has a cluster of specific functions (i.e., one of the hospital functions is to accommodate people who are sick), so they are built to satisfy the common and general needs of human people.
In the second part of this talk I will briefly explain what 'spatial justice' means (fair distribution of resources, fair access to space). Then, given the functionalist ontology and the concept of spatial justice, I will argue that the first spatial injustice is the difference of distances between two different people and the same building (i.e. if you live in the city center, schools are very close, but if you live in the suburbs you always have to move with public transport): in fact, in an "utopian city" everything would be equidistant from everybody. But in the real world – and this is my last argument – in order to reduce the spatial disadvantage between citizens we could think to ways to compensate the distance from – or the lack of – resources (i.e., low-price bus tickets).

11.30 – 11.45 Break

11.45. – 12.45 Nicolas Cacciapaglia, Stefana Dilova, Alma Grossen, Daiana Rinja, Patrycja Stal /
Perspectives of Current Equality Debates in Berlin

To provide a brief insight into the current equality discourse in Berlin, we decided to choose different case studies that unfold the variety of themes being discussed predominantly in the fields of architecture and urban studies. Through five narratives, each of which representing another scale – from personal to global – we'd like to address the relevance of architectural discussions to other fields of study. After a short introduction, social and gender aspects, as well as urban, infrastructural and technological issues will be presented in the following order: "On the Role of Women in the Profession of Architecture" (a personal narrative by Stefana Dilova), "Reintroducing Divided Spaces?" (a gender narrative by Daiana Rinja), "A Case Study of Gentrification" (an urban narrative by Alma Grossen), "On the Rehabilitation of Homeless People" (a social infrastructure narrative by Nicolas Cacciapaglia) and "Exchange of Data and Safety in the Urban Space/City" (a technological narrative by Patrycja Stal). With that we hope to form a basis for further discussions!

12.45 – 13.30 **Iskra Krstić / The commercialisation of space in post-socialist urban centres**

The hallmark of urban change in post-socialist cities has been the rise of inequality and socio-spatial stratification, which go hand in hand. As Harloe noted: "Cities can be seen as stocks of physical assets whose privatization forms a large part of the capital involved in new class formation". So far, several phases of the privatisation and commercialisation of urban space have been played out. Firstly, the massive privatisation of the housing sector in the early nineties, allowed the inherited privileges and inequalities to solidify throughout the post-socialist region, while enabling new ones to emerge. The forming of the real estate market, on the basis of the privatisation of the housing sector, brought in focus the commercial value of the industrial land. Flipping it often became much more profitable than maintaining production. The privatisation and deindustrialisation turned as much as 30% of industrial land in Budapest and Warsaw, 40% in Bratislava and 60% in Belgrade into *brownfields* ready for *urban regeneration*. The pressure of privatisation, stemming from the expanding character of the free market and backed-up by the austerity discourse, recently turned towards what was left: public space, green and recreational areas, and traffic facilities.

13.30 – 15.00 Lunch break

15.00 – 15.45 Marko-Luka Zubčić/ Normative Diversity and the City

The relatively superior epistemic system is favourable from the position of any agent's self-interest, especially when facing the threat of global climate change. This epistemic system will to a large extent be grounded in the utilization of both the greatest number of epistemic agents and their maximal possible cognitive diversity (Landemore's democratic reason [DR]). As such, it in a significant part presents us with the case that not only do the obstacles for Epistemic Contribution (Fricker [EC]) of all and any must be removed (in turn reducing significant inequalities), but that normatively-diverse EC must be accelerated/incentivized. Reasons are given as to why cities (and neighborhoods) are uniquely favourable sites for EC/DR-based governance and should be utilized as such. Given the urgency our predicament calls for, how to accelerate/incetivize and harvest/streamline EC/DR, the paper argues, *should be* one of the key questions for epistemologists, political philosophers, social

scientists, policy experts and new media experts today. Certain plausible policy implications of EC/DR-based governance in the urban context are discussed.

15.45 – 16.30 Tal Eldar / Different cities and different interpretations of social goods: an urban reflection on "Spheres of Justice"

Most people will easily testify that different cities have different mentalities (or ethoses), different points of view and even different priorities. But what is it exactly, that makes Tel-Aviv (and its residents) so distinguished from Jerusalem (and its residents), and locates Shanghai so far from Beijing, and Hamburg so distinguished from Berlin? Though many explanations are available, such as historical ones, it remains interesting to reflect upon what is it exactly in different contemporary cities, that can make us act and feel so differently, by just taking a one hour bus drive in the city. In my presentation, I shall offer a new explanation for these differences, deriving from Michael Walzer's famous book, *Spheres of Justice*. According to Walzer, different goods (money, free time, recognition, political power, etc.), have different norms of distributive justice, that are derivatives of the social interpretation given to them. I suggest that in different cities a particular good can be interpreted differently and therefore these cities end up having the above mentioned differences.

16.30 – 17.45 Break

17.45 – 18.30 Marko Gavrilović / Mr. Walker vs. Mr. Wheeler - The strugle for power on the streets of our cities

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Henry Ford entered mass production of automobiles with the vision that every man should be able to get to his destination quickly and easily. Today, however, when he reaches his destination, that man is usually unable to park his car. Ford's vision of freedom of movement also became vulnerable in terms of the walking safety, and many other problems that arose. That problems could be discerned in the early twentieth century, when large amounts of cars began to appear on the streets of Europe, the streets designed for pedestrians and horsedrawn carts. However, the interests of manufacturers have won over the desire of individuals, so eventually streets adjusted to this new fashion, mainly subordinating all other forms to automobile traffic.

Only in recent years, with the latest economic crisis, and the actualization of the environmental consequences of shortterm planning, there is a number of movements around the world with the aim of combating car traffic in urban areas, all in favor of cycling or public transport.

This presentation is suposed to question what still holds this unberable situation status-quo in many places around the globe.

Friday

10.00 – 10.45 Andrea Mešanović/ Architecture and Epistemology of Institutions

What should a town do to make its citizens happy? That is one of the main questions this work will attempt to elaborate and discuss. In idealized circumstances, a city should strive to protect its citizens by regarding their interests, providing care and ensuring equality. Such goals can only be

met by creating specific and effective policies which would improve the citizens' quality of life and well-being. The creation of such policies must necessarily integrate several different segments, including culture, marketing, social services, media, sustainability, transportation and urban planning. The different approaches to public policies observable in the conduct of happier and less happy cities are the subject of institutional and philosophical research, while architecture and politics can provide possible suggestions for future development. Finally, this work will argue that policy making needs to include the engagement of all relevant entities in a manner congruent with the citizens' interests in order to ensure maximum livability.

10.45 – 11.30 Mišo Kapetanović / Informal construction in post-Yugoslav space

Informal construction in post-Yugoslav space is widely present, yet a largely under-researched phenomenon. The lack of interest is partially understandable as informal houses are not a result of architectural practice. Informal construction traces back to the class relations of socialism and strata movements that affected housing distribution, however, both local architecture and urban planning treated it with harsh criticism. Most local researchers refer to the informal construction strictly as illegal, fixated on the facts that the informal houses are not following construction regulations, in-authenticity of their form and ignorance of existing architectural conventions. The result of this knowledge was a deep bias towards any kind of non-professional forms contemporary construction. In exploring proliferation of informality, the theoretical framework needs to employ other disciplines that engage with material culture, understandings of space and post-socialist transformation. The spread of informality is a distinct shift in the ways how the process of creating and providing shelter is imagined and regulated. Engaging the informal houses through culture studies has a primary purpose of opening houses' representative level, to consider them as media, interactive texts. Houses are substantial evidence of material culture, a product of human endeavour to provide shelter and organise livelihood. They are also powerful, even though not always successful mean of engaging the market, fuelling social mobility and communicating class aspirations.

11.30 – 11.45 Break

11.45 – 12.30 Miloš Ničić/ The Life Of The Memorial: Ideological Discourse In 1990-2002 Memorial Architecture In Serbia

Memorial sculpture, alongside civic and landscape architecture, forms a specific set of markers in public space and reflects complex links between art and culture/power matrix. More than being just a focal point in public dialog among the major social stakeholders, memorial sculpture is of paramount importance in critical understanding of the circumstances and conditions in which its artefacts were erected and articulated in both official narratives and everyday lives. By looking through multilayered ideological framework of transitional Serbian society, this presentation will shed light on the ways public monuments in Serbia were envisioned, erected, utilized and/or demolished during the last years of 20th and at the beginning of the 21st century.

12.30 – 13.00 Concluding Remarks and Certificate Awarding