



Summary—Thank you for your presentation! I will use this occasion to summarise your theory-piece titled *What makes a city: urban experience as a performance*. I am using a course-standard to address your piece in 3 aspects: **1)** your field of inquiry; **2)** your discussion; **3)** your conclusions.

Specifically—You consider urbanisation in the light of its sudden booming, at a very high pace, in our time. All over the planet. You consider this development in its performative aspect of what appears to the observer as an auto-catalytic process. You aim at getting under the surface of this.

Your methods are not speculative in a metaphysical sense. Metaphysics lures with a false sense of depth, where there are a range of surface dynamics that extend with a logic similar to language. What is the language of cities you ask with Sudjic (2017)? Here you make your own proposition.

The reason why I am not calling this a ‘design proposition’ is because this term is not established in our milieu—for the time being—as is the ‘artistic proposition’: that is, a re-doubling of practice moving from artistic to epistemic claims. Taking knowledge of what is achieved through art.

Precision 1—Your essay features some interesting examples of nested references, by which I mean a quotation of Marx in your text that I recognised from Guy Debord’s *théorie de la dérive*. While the Baudelaire you present as the urban observer of new crowds I link to W. Benjamin.

But then, both the *Arcades Project* and psycho-geography is on your list of references. Will you then wonder why I read the Urban Elements Atlas the major synoptic output from your piece. Also because it relays an interesting inversion: *that systems are emergent properties of narratives*.

Baudelaire’s flâneur is the one to access such narratives through observation in a very specific mode. It is neither the external observer, nor the situated/positioned observer as the flâneur a connoisseur of *anonymity*. It is an observer present to the city and its affects. The narrative of modern times.

Precision 2—seeking the moment of the impression, like the impressionists at the pace of what an increasingly hasty city allows. Of Monet it was said that *he was only an eye* “...but what an eye!” Your list of references, be it Jean Attali (the architect) or Constant (the painter) appears accordingly.

That is, books discovered and assimilated in the mode of the *flâneur*, who is not just a reader of cities, but a reader of books in the mode of the modern city (of which Walter Benjamin is a case in point). Which is why I have been curious how your categories crop up at the edge of urban time, as it were.

Here, I have been particularly curious about your numbers: the Atlas of Urban Elements is introduced with an index counting 4 rows with 22 entries each. The atlas itself—or, the drawn atlas (I read the entire volume as an atlas)—contains 32 drawn elements/boards. I keep wondering why...