



Making an urban human? The digital order and its curious human-centrism

Myria Georgiou

To cite this article: Myria Georgiou (2021) Making an urban human? The digital order and its curious human-centrism, *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 18:4, 395-403, DOI: [10.1080/14791420.2021.1995615](https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420.2021.1995615)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420.2021.1995615>



© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 04 Dec 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

RESEARCH ARTICLE



Making an urban human? The digital order and its curious human-centrism

Myria Georgiou 

Department of Media and Communications, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

This article's point of departure is the observed retreat of techno-centric conceptions of optimal cities and their replacement by a curious human-centrism in media, corporate, and policy discursive constructions of cities. This human-centrism hides an emerging urban order: the digital order. The digital order is realised through discourses and practices that promote controlled cities, not through coercion and visible policing, but instead through a technologized promise of seemingly progressive values. The multiple and contradictory claims to urban humans revealed in the digital order, the article concludes, demand renewed attention to the human – a critical humanist perspective to cities and technology.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 15 October 2021
Accepted 15 October 2021

KEYWORDS

Digital city; critical humanism; order; urban difference; smart city

Introduction

What if we start from the human rather than technology when we study digital cities? Empirically, we would be blind to ignore the growing convergence of urban everyday practices and human-centric popular discourses of infrastructural innovation. “Of the people, for the people, by the people” is the title of an article praising smart cities in the major British daily *The Telegraph*.¹ “[I]nsight, imagination, and a healthy disregard for the impossible” are the key qualities that *Google Berlin* lists in its job ads for “future Googlers.”² “A new shared vision for London with Londoners” is the promise of the Centre for London, a major thinktank.³ Increasingly, we see this curious human-centrism driving media, corporate, and policy narratives of digital urbanism. Such narrations of the digital city gain transurban resonance and remind us that the concept of a city driven by technology is already outdated. What digital cities are about, we are now told, are cities made for and by people.

In response to the introductory question, the present discussion starts its exploration of the digital city through its discursive construction through the human. This could be read as simply a marketing trope. However, this article argues that the rhetorics, such as those introduced above, provide a glimpse into much deeper and wider processes of change in the relational constitution of cities, technologies, and humans. The core

CONTACT Myria Georgiou  m.a.georgiou@lse.ac.uk

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

claim of this article, as it unfolds below, is that human-centric conceptions of technology are at the heart of an emerging urban order, what I refer to as the digital order. The digital order, I will illustrate, is realised through discourses and practices that promote controlled cities, not through coercion and visible policing but instead through the promise of seemingly progressive values, such as connectivity for all, urban openness, and environmental sustainability.

Here, I briefly reflect on the rise and appeal of the digital order – an order that advances controlled, datafied, and surveilled cities, by incorporating humanist values and mapping governmental and corporate interests into the performative practice of urban life. This order is situated within the temporality of twenty-first century perpetual crises and the consequent mistrust towards economic, political, and digital institutions; in many ways this is an order of and for post-neoliberal times, reflecting and responding to the multiple and contradictory claims made upon and on behalf of urban humanity through technology. This order is also spatially situated within a relational geography that does not “neatly” divide cities of the global north and south, but instead represents a transurban, but unequal geography of digital urbanism.

Within this relational geography and temporality of crises for neoliberal data capitalism, I have observed, urban humanity has paradoxically gained new prominence: discursively claimed by powerful actors, who speak of infrastructural change in the name of the people; performatively enacted in the digital and material street within, and sometimes against, increasingly mediated structures that order and divide humanity on the basis of class, race, gender, sexuality, ability, and geography. Below, I attempt to briefly outline this argument, first by situating it in the socio-temporality of digital urbanism; then by illustrating in some detail the digital order’s human-centric manifestations and consequences; and finally, by reflecting on the critical humanist epistemological and conceptual tools that I employ to understand why contradictory claims to and for the human in the context of digitization matter.

Digital cities and humans in the making

This article draws on my observations of urban humans’ hypervisibility in the discursive and performative constitution of the digital city. I refer to the “digital city” rather than the “smart city” to recognise both the symbolic and the infrastructural dimension of change (as the concept of the “smart city” has mostly been associated with the latter). This city is shaped through infrastructural planning and governance, as debated in smart city and platform urbanism scholarship, but also through imaginaries promising better, sustainable, but also profitable cities.⁴ One among the many expressions of this multi-modal vision is seen in Smart Berlin’s declaration: “The idea is to use ICT to develop concrete solutions to make our city more efficient, healthier, more sustainable, more livable and cleaner ... The objectives of the smart city strategy include expanding the international competitiveness of the Berlin-Brandenburg metropolitan region.”⁵ Such promises imply governmental, corporate, and of course human commitment for transformation of cities beyond and above infrastructural and spatial order: this is a project of a human-led city.

The European capital cities I focus on here are deeply connected, with more than 92% of their people online.⁶ Here, promises of technologised betterment co-exist with the multiple crises of their liberal democracies and neoliberal economies post-2008, a

health pandemic, and growing mistrust towards digital industries' power. In cities like London, Berlin, and Athens that I primarily study, urban landscapes' visuality constantly reveals the always connected, digital savvy urban humans as the drivers of digital change who also reap its benefits. These humans are seen in social media (self-)representations and billboard advertising, all the way to technologies that promise better lives: smart homes and haptics. At the same time, intimate and public urban spaces are being redesigned to accommodate these same humans: those always connected (through public wi-fi and charging stations everywhere), those who "care" (with shared working spaces, cafés and restaurants that promise state-of-the-art connectivity with low carbon emissions and humane green and mindful environments), and the ones who thrive through the city's openness (with apps that speak to the gendered, ethnic, and sexual diversity of the city, not just homogenous categories of consumers).

Taking these observations as a starting point, the present approach rethinks the centre of gravity in critiques of digital urbanism often placed on algorithmic data and AI infrastructures and less so on humans; questions on how urban humans are both constituted through the digital city but also how they constitute it are less often addressed. My aim here is to reflect on the empirically observed enhancement of the role of the human; that is, to understand how and why urban humans become subjected to an order of datafication, surveillance, and algorithmic control, but, at the same time, are (selectively) recognised as agents who drive digital change. In examining the digital order and its curious human-centrism, I learn from phenomenological, empirically-informed analyses of digital urbanism, but specifically focus on the claims made to and on behalf of urban humans.⁷ Paradoxically, I have observed in my own research that, while the digital order is advanced through technologies of control, surveillance, and data extraction, it is represented and performed as a human project, partly replacing, and partly disguising established and now mistrusted ordering structures and agents.

Ordering the digital city

At the heart of my proposition is the rise of the digital order—an order that puts technological progress at the heart of the city's discourse and practices. By elevating technology to a powerful force that humans need to better their city, this order becomes a symbolic and material system of knowledge that enlists agentive and affective human capabilities to normalise and legitimise controlled cities. With the concept of the digital order, I aim to understand emerging formulations of social order in contexts of intense mediation, crisis, and advanced infrastructural change. In doing so, I learn from debates across social sciences on the power intricacies of digitization and its spatial, temporal, cultural, and infrastructural situatedness. Three such approaches in particular have offered important insights to conceptions of symbolic order, spatial order, and infrastructural order, respectively.

A first set of studies, rooted in media and communications, examines the digital city's *symbolic order*, and specifically the generation and regulation of urban imaginaries by its different actors.⁸ Emphasising the multiple and competing urban imaginaries and possibilities for communicative conformism and subversion, this literature situates discourse and experience within broader enquiries on the concentration or contestation of symbolic power held by cultural industries and urban governance. This literature contests

the functional, technocentric conception of digitization that drives corporate and planning visions of transformed cities and instead analyses the urban as a cultural and communicative space.

Spatial order, rooted in geographical imagination, focuses on the digital production of space and technological innovation's impact on urban governance and the right to the city, or, in Halegoua's words, the process of "re-placing the city."⁹ In this scholarship, the city is a fundamentally spatial formation and technology becomes implicated in this spatiality by enhancing governmental processes of surveillance and monetization of networked cities,¹⁰ and experiences of surveilled, collective, and sometimes subversive urban action.¹¹ This scholarship has drawn attention to the "conjunctural geographies"¹² that reconfigure power relations in the city but also produce multiple geographies, imaginaries and "forms of value,"¹³ especially as experience and meanings of technology are differentially shaped in the "actually existing smart city."¹⁴ Such approaches capture the diversity and situatedness of spatialised politics and experiences of digitization that are implicated in histories of placemaking and urban governance.

The third, and perhaps most influential, set of arguments focuses on the city's *infrastructural order*, drawing on and contributing to the interdisciplinary concerns of Science and Technology Studies (STS) and political economy. Infrastructural transformation is understood as fundamentally reconfiguring the dynamics of social life, especially through the overconcentration of economic and infrastructural power in the hands of platforms, the reorientation of choice and information through algorithms and the extraction of data as appropriation of human life for profit.¹⁵ Scholars thinking at the juncture of geography and infrastructural change, emphasise the "co-generative dynamics between platforms and the urban,"¹⁶ but also concerns with data-driven decision-making involved in "algorithmic violence" and the entrenchment of inequalities through discourses and practices of digital solutionism.¹⁷ Extractivist economies of technology-driven urbanism, Mosco adds, intensify "surveillance, shift urban governance to private companies, shrink democracy."¹⁸ In dialogue with critical data studies, this scholarship analyses data-driven urbanism and how "cities are being instrumented and captured as big urban data"¹⁹ and how infrastructures (including platforms and datafication of urban life) are used by corporate and state actors as technologies of oppression to reproduce and congeal gendered, class, and racial inequalities, especially through algorithmic bias and datafication of everyday life.²⁰

While this brief overview far from captures the nuances and crosscurrents in these three diverse approaches to mediated ordering, it highlights key conceptions and concerns with the shifting performativity of power in the context of digital urbanism: together, these approaches recognise assemblages of power emerging and strengthened through technological innovation. Invaluable as they are, however, their focus on technology privileges conceptions of the human as subjected to systemic domination, and less so as engaged in processes of subjectivation, that is, what becoming human means in contexts of intense digitization and differential urbanisation.

The digital order, I argue, reflects the intertwining of human subjection to inhumane conditions of control via surveillance and data extraction, and subjectivation within and against those same conditions. This entanglement is an increasingly seamless and imperceptible process of co-constitution of cities, people, and technologies. Specifically, infrastructural change is advanced in the name of the progressive realisation of

cities and humans: this process is observable across cities, as seen for example in the numerous public-private partnerships across Europe promising connection for all, thus advancement of democratic and transparent cities; in digital corporations such as Berlin's M&C Saatchi anti-racist declarations; and in state and corporate commitments to sustainability, as seen for example in Paris' France Digitale's "manifesto."²¹ What all these "commitments" share is the discourse of innovation, best captured in the Digital City Index as "digital infrastructural, entrepreneurial culture and market conditions."²²

As a new, seductive system of knowledge, the digital order promotes a normative digital life that becomes difficult to contest, even if it divides the city anew. Like any other temporal and spatial expression of social order, the order of the contemporary city that state, corporate, and media agents advance is a system for organising life, for example, for prosperity, functioning services, and for avoiding urban chaos. In social theory, as seen for example in Couldry and Hepp, social order represents "a relatively stable pattern of interdependences" between individuals, groups, institutions, and relations that "depend on larger stabilities of resource and infrastructure."²³ For them, order does not preclude the competition of values, but it implies "the higher-dimensional 'settlement' that enables a minimal level of stability."²⁴ Order, according to these same trajectories of social theory, is not imposed from above, but through everyday discourses and practices, and becomes embedded in human "endowments and capacities" and dispositions that motivate and materialise urban life.²⁵ Thus, order is not coercive but distributed and open-ended, leaning on established norms and values. Digitization makes order particularly seamless, as it is embedded in every element of urban life: from everyday communication on social media and use of digital technologies to navigate the city via Uber, Googlemaps, and Airbnb, all the way to invisible but ubiquitous datafication taking place through algorithmic profiling of CCTV and data-sharing employment and leisure networks.²⁶ Embedding order in the ordinary makes it both invisible but at the same time controlling, or, in Couldry and Hepp's words: "an authoritarian structure of compulsion."²⁷

This contradictory force of the digital order is played out at the level of the subject. On the one hand, opportunities for human creativity and freedom are constricted to the contained sociality and imagination of platforms and social media through which knowing of the city happens; on the other, progressive narratives and voices of dissent are incorporated in discourses of progress and appear as driving a new open-ended urbanism (as seen for example in digital corporations' incorporation of feminist and anti-racist symbolisms). Thus, this order's appeal lies in its ability to not *other* difference, not merely by integrating it into aesthetic and non-political forms of representation and practice, but more importantly still, by suggesting that difference drives digital order. For example, it has become ordinary to see the image of a start-up's Black female executive (or the model who poses as one) circulated on social media campaigns as the leading face of change; the graffitied and ever-so-slightly seedy street is more often than not chosen for trendy shared workspaces implying the dependence of innovation upon urban difference; even direct symbols of urban dissent, such as those associated with Black power, are regularly integrated in cutting-edge designer urban fashion; and activists of urban movements are invited to gallery openings and urban government events, to then loudly be celebrated as leading figures in these institutions' hashtag activism.

The digital order's assertive convergence with urban diversity narratives and its appropriation of progressive values makes power more difficult to perceive, with inhumane conditions of datafied and securitised lives less apparent. As order materialises in distributed values that celebrate individualism and entrepreneurship, but also openness associated with popular feminism, post-racialism, and environmentalism, the city appears as inclusive of all different urban actors and their histories and trajectories. Within it, a subject capable of achieving success and happiness through digital opportunities for work, education, and socialisation, is conceived as existing beyond and outside inequalities. For, the urban human is imagined and constructed as the primary urban agent, potentially successful through digital "empowerment," "resilience," but also progressive openness.

For a renewed critical humanism

With contradictory claims to life and agency on the rise, the category of the human demands new attention. As the human as actor and as representation is reconfigured in twenty-first century urban ordering/othering, we need to understand the discursive and performative potential entailed in her/him/they becoming invaluable assets for order, albeit a fragile one. This complex position of the human demands a renewed critical humanist perspective, I argue. This critical humanism is not a conviction, i.e. the elevation of a unified, singular human, but a critical process, i.e. the analysis and questioning of discourses and practices of dehumanisation and rehumanisation within conditions of data capitalism.

While posthumanism and critical data studies have been engrossed in the power and agency of the machine, the human's entanglement in digitally generated power and knowledge has been either ignored or relegated to a mere outcome of digitization. Yet, challenging "the death of the human" and its overwhelming subjection to data power is necessary, so to understand not only the technological footing of the digital order, but also, and importantly, the normative frames that legitimise it, and the experiential grounding that both normalise and contest it. I side with Benjamin who contests technocentric and posthuman conceptions of digitization, as, in her words: "posthumanist visions assume that we have all had the chance to be human."²⁸ In fact, being and becoming human remains situated to the multi-modality of mediated systems of power, and the intersubjective claims to the city's resources, rights, and freedom.

As the human becomes a yet more ambivalent figure, both for control and for freedom, a critical humanism becomes yet more necessary. Epistemologically this means recognising urban humans as neither essential nor fully determined, but instead as pluralised, speaking agent constituted through discourse and practice, to be studied within historicised, spatialised contexts.²⁹ Theoretically, critical humanism situates urban humanity within histories of oppression but also collective struggle through which individuals and collectivities are relationally constituted; both trajectories of oppression and struggle are increasingly mediated in digital narratives and infrastructures but in non-determinate, contested ways. Finally, critical humanism opens up the digital city to both a critical and normative analysis: it recognises human capabilities to use technologies for advancing freedom and social justice,³⁰ and it critiques the socio-technical threats to justice when these demarcate recognition of one kind of human alone

—the digitally savvy one. Importantly then, this perspective also allows us to understand what a human-centric order does not account for: disorder as dissent and disobedience, otherwise put, the human capabilities for political agency and collective action. The organic disorder of the city, the collective opposition to pressing inequalities, and suspicion to surveillance technologies can never be fully contained and controlled.³¹ Thus, and while the digital order is obscured and seductive, it remains unfinished and fragile.

Conclusions

In this article, I aimed to show that the digital order emerges as a hegemonic system of knowledge that mobilises digital sociality and narratives of urban connectivity to organise, discipline, and divide cities. This order becomes ordinary, diffused, and unseen, as, paradoxically, it mobilises a selective set of humanist values, only to enhance divisive but imperceptible technologies of control in the city. With the human at its core, I showed, urban inequalities become obscured, especially as digital pedagogies deny visibility to recognisable classifications of exclusion, by instead dividing urban humanity on the basis of have or have-nots of digital skills and entrepreneurial openness. In this way, the digital order reforms and retrains the human to fulfil individual needs and desires under the condition that these needs and desires are detached from collectively mobilising capabilities to equitably share the city.

I proposed re-centering the human in the analysis of technology and cities, not as a naïve claim of academic human-centrism. Instead, this is a call for the renewed critical humanism that, first, understands the digital order as a process, thus as always incomplete and contested; secondly, as a process constituted through discourse and practice of everyday life that makes certain norms appear as ordinary; and thirdly, as a situated one shaped at the juncture of technological change, systemic inequalities, and the racialised, gendered, and classed trajectories of urban life and their contestation. This is a perspective, I argued, that tackles the reconfiguration of urban and digital inequalities by bringing humans at its core; humans subjected to surveillance, control, and monetization of urban life, but also the ones whose creative and cognitive capabilities make demands to the individual and collective right to the digital city. This perspective recognises urban humans as actors integral to the digital order's making – and perhaps in its un-making – and opens a research outlook for understanding different axes of oppression, but also a politics of hope.³²

Notes

1. “Of the people, by the people, for the people,” The Telegraph, November 18, 2019. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/business/business-reporter/smart-cities-for-people/>.
2. “Berlin,” Google Careers, Google, accessed September 7, 2021. <https://careers.google.com/locations/berlin/>.
3. “London Futures: Building a new vision for London to 2050 and beyond,” Centre for London, accessed September 7, 2021. <https://www.centreforlondon.org/project/london-futures/>.
4. For example, Sarah Barns, *Platform Urbanism: Negotiating Platform Ecosystems in Connected Cities*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019; Alison Powell, *Undoing Optimization*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2021; Gillian Rose, Parvati Raghuram,

- Sophie Watson and Edward Wigley, "Platform Urbanism, Smartphone Applications and Valuing Data in a Smart City," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 46, no. 1 (2020): 59–72.
5. Beate Albert, "Berlin is Smart," Smart City Berlin, Berlin Partner, last updated 2020. <https://www.berlin-partner.de/en/the-berlin-location/smart-city-berlin/>.
 6. "Digital Economy and Society Statistics- Households and Individuals, Eurostat Statistics," Explained, data extracted September, 2020. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Digital_economy_and_society_statistics_-_households_and_individuals.
 7. Among many, Paolo Cardullo, Cesare Di Feliciano and Rob Kitchin, eds. *The Right to the Smart City*. Bingley: Emerald, 2019; Scott Rodgers and Suzanne Moore, "Platform Urbanism: An Introduction," *Mediapolis: A Journal of Cities and Culture* 3, no.4 (2018). <https://www.mediapolisjournal.com/2018/10/platform-urbanism-an-introduction/>; Gillian Rose, "Posthuman Agency in the Digitally Mediated City: Exteriorization, Individuation, Reinvention," *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 4, no. 107 (2017): 779–793, <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2016.1270195>
 8. See for example, Giorgia Aiello, "Communicating the 'World-class' City: A Visual-Material Approach" *Social Semiotics* 31, no. 1 (2021): 136–154; Giota Alevizou, "Civic Media and Technologies of Belonging: Where Digital Citizenship and 'the Right to the City' Converge," *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics* 16, no. 3 (2020): 269–290; Myria Georgiou, *Media and the City: Cosmopolitanism and Difference*. Cambridge: Polity, 2013; Zlatan Krajina *Negotiating the Mediated City: Everyday Encounters with Public Screens*. London and New York: Routledge, 2013; Scott McQuire, *The Media City: Media, Architecture and Urban Space*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2008.
 9. Germaine R. Halegoua, *The Digital City: Media and the Social Production of Place*. New York: New York University Press, 2019, 5.
 10. Rob Kitchin, "Data-driven Urbanism" in *Data and the City*, ed. Rob Kitchin, Tracey P. Lauriault and Gavin McArdle. London: Routledge, 2017, 44–56; Maroš Krivý, "Towards a Critique of Cybernetic Urbanism: The Smart City and the Society of Control," *Planning Theory*, 17, no. 1 (2018): 8–30
 11. Ayona Datta, "The 'Smart Safe City': Gendered Time, Speed, and Violence in the Margins of India's Urban Age," *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* (2020) 110, no. 5 (2020): 1318–1334; Scott McQuire, *Geomedial: Networked Cities and the Future of Public Space*. Cambridge: Polity, 2016
 12. Mark Graham, "Regulate, Replicate, and Resist – The Conjunctural Geographies of Platform Urbanism," *Urban Geography* 41, no. 3 (2020): 453–457, 453
 13. Rose et al., *Platform Urbanism*, 59
 14. Taylor Shelton, Matthew Zook and Alan Wiig "The 'Actually Existing Smart City,'" *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* 8, no. 1 (2015): 13–25
 15. Nick Couldry and Ulises Mejias, *The Cost of Connection*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2019; Tarleton Gillespie, "The Politics of 'Platforms,'" *New Media & Society* 12, no. 3 (2010): 347–364; Jose van Dijck, Thomas Poell, and Martijn de Waal, *The Platform Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013; Tarleton Gillespie, "The Politics of 'Platforms,'" *New Media & Society* 12, no. 3 (2010): 347–364
 16. Rodgers and Moore, "Platform Urbanism: An Introduction." *Mediapolis: A Journal of Cities and Culture*. <https://www.mediapolisjournal.com/2018/10/platform-urbanism-an-introduction/>
 17. Sara Safransky, "Geographies of Algorithmic Violence: Reading the Smart City." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 44, no. 2 (2019): 200–218, 200
 18. Vincent Mosco, *The Smart City in a Digital World*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing, 2019, 1
 19. Kitchin, "Data-Driven Urbanism," 45.
 20. Ruha Benjamin, *Race after Technology*. Cambridge: Polity, 2019; Virginia Eubanks, *Automating Inequality: How High-tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor*. New York: St

- Martin's Press, 2017; Sofia U. Noble, *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. New York: New York University Press, 2018.
21. M&C Saatchi Berlin, "Black Lives Matter." *Twitter*, June 2, 2020, https://twitter.com/mcsaatchise_de/status/1267740887464972290; "About Us," France Digitale, 2021, <https://francedigitale.org/en/association/>.
 22. "European Digital City Index 2016," EDCI, 2020 <https://digitalcityindex.eu>
 23. Nick Couldry and Andreass Hepp, *The Mediated Construction of Reality*. Cambridge: Polity, 2017, 190.
 24. Ibid. 191
 25. Dennis Wrong, *The Problem of Order: What Unites and Divides Society*. London: Free Press, 1994, 5
 26. Kitchin, "Data-Driven Urbanism"; Shelton et al. "The 'Actually Existing Smart City.'"
 27. Couldry and Hepp, *The Mediated Construction of Reality*, 191
 28. Benjamin, *Race after Technology*, 32
 29. Jeff Noonan, "Critical Humanism," in *The Sage Encyclopaedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, ed. Lisa M. Given. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2002; Frantz Fanon, "Algeria Unveiled" in *Decolonization: Perspectives from Now and Then*, ed. Prasenjit Duara. London: Routledge, 2004, 42–55.
 30. Noonan, "Critical Humanism;" Ken Plummer, *A Manifesto for a Critical Humanism in Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2021
 31. Gerry Mooney "Urban 'disorders'" in *Unruly Cities? Order/Disorder*, eds. Chris Brook, Gerry Mooney, and Steve Pile. London and New York: Routledge, 2000, 49–95; Richard Sennett, *The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity and City Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970
 32. Achille Mbembe and Deborah Posel, "A Critical Humanism," *Interventions* 7, no.3, (2006): 283–286

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

ORCID

Myria Georgiou  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8771-8469>