



Reflections on the contributions to the IVM-competition

Niels Albertsen

Aarhus School of Architecture

15.06.04

1. The 12 contributions, taken all together, give a fine picture of the multiplicity and diversity of the problems, solutions and actors involved in urban mobility. Problems may relate to children's ways of getting to school, to the different ways the handicapped are handicapped in the city, to questions of pollution, lack of infrastructure and public transport, questions of unemployment and poverty, questions of security and crime, questions of public regulation and control. Solutions may be low-tech or high-tech, may involve smart technologies of the future, or be focused on social organization and community action, may involve informal action from below or formal control from above, may require the establishment of complex systems of control or simple everyday rules and schemes. Main actors may be the technical experts on transport technologies, professional public planners, politicians, community activists, upper class executives or low-class/underclass unemployed people. The best contributions are able to show how urban mobility is embedded in broader social relations and networks, including vertical relations of domination as well as more horizontal organisations of systems and divisions of labour or community associations and family relations.

2. The quality of the contributions is very diversified. On one pole is found the purely descriptive, disengaged reportage without a main point and lacking consideration of the social embeddedness of urban mobility. On the other extreme is found the highly focused and well-pointed, engaging and engaged reportage showing the broader social background for and implications of the chosen urban mobility issues. The best contributions showed a very high journalistic standard, some of them almost at the level of being ready to print immediately.

3. The work of the jury was organized in an excellent way, both in regard to the preparation of the jury and to the work-process of finding the 1st prize and the special prize. The scrutiny of the contributions was thorough and related to substance as well as journalistic presentation and layout, to text as well as pictures. The contributions were discussed seriously and competently, drawing on all the competencies in the jury in regard to journalism, photography and urban studies and planning.
4. The result of the work of the jury, unanimous for the 1st prize and unanimous except for one for the special prize, closely corresponded to the opinion I had made myself before the jury meeting. I thus consider the decisions of the jury to be as appropriate as can be.
5. The first prize winner on the Mototaxis is in my opinion without any doubt the best of the contributions, showing in an excellent, exciting and highly readable way the complexity of the urban mobility problem in a Brazilian city burdened by unemployment, poverty, lack of infrastructure and public transport and problems of security, crime and drugs. From below emerges in an informal way the mototaxi as a cheap means of public transport, creating new problems of regulation for the municipality, new competition for the ordinary taxi drivers, and stigmatization for the mototaxi drivers themselves due to drug-dealer transport. This is sociological journalism at its very best showing how actors act, for better or worse, to *make* mobility in the city.
6. The quality of the special prize winner is of another kind. Here is shown in a highly accessible and instructive way the diversity of urban mobility problems and solutions: low-tech, down to earth, pedestrian mapping of the quality of the urban environment in view of accessibility for the handicapped, the smart ‘futuristic’ transport technologies in the form of the Cybercar, the importance of advice in politics by interviewing the blind adviser to the mayor of Paris, and a very instructive description of the city of Paris as an enemy of the handicapped, forcing an isolated non-urban living on him right in the middle of the most urban of urbanities. Here the right to the city also for this citizen is suppressed enormously by the material structure of the urban fabric as well as by the behaviour of other citizens.
7. In regard to the further treatment of the contributions I am sure that the ones that were ranked as A and B by the jury can be rewritten and edited to form a high-quality magazine on urban mobility, on how to “*faire la mobilité en ville*”. The layout of the special prize winning contribution perhaps can be used in a reworked way for such a publication. The discussion of the jury in regard to publication resulted in many good ideas, which, however, need further elaboration by an editor.