



Some remarks on the features submitted as part of the IVM student journalist competition

Niels Albertsen
Aarhus School of Architecture

1. The 12 contributions, taken together, paint a fine picture of the multiplicity and diversity of the problems, solutions and actors involved in urban mobility. The problems include children getting to school, the different ways the disabled are handicapped in the city, 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 futuristic technologies 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. The primary actors may be technical experts on transport technologies, professional planners, politicians, community activists, upper class executives or the low-class/underclass unemployed. The best contributions show how urban mobility is embedded in broader social relations and networks, including both vertical relations of domination and more horizontal organisations of systems and divisions of labour or community associations and family relations.

2. The quality of the contributions is very diverse. At one end is the purely descriptive, disengaged study with no central theme and no attention to the social embeddedness of urban mobility. At the other extreme is the highly focused and pertinent, engaging and engaged, study that shows the broader social background and implications of the chosen urban mobility issues. The best contributions were of a very high journalistic standard, some of them almost good enough for immediate publication.

3. The jury's work was well organised, both in preparation and in terms of the process of assigning the 1st prize and special prize. The contributions were thoroughly scrutinised, both on substance and journalistic presentation and layout, text as well as pictures. The contributions were discussed seriously and competently, drawing on all the skills of the jury as regards journalism, photography and urban design and planning.

4. The jury's conclusion, unanimous for the 1st prize and unanimous save for one dissenting voice for the special prize, closely corresponded to my personal opinion before the jury deliberations. I therefore consider the jury's conclusions to be entirely satisfactory.

5. The first prize winner on the Mototaxis is in my opinion undoubtedly the best of the contributions, an excellent, exciting and highly readable demonstration of 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. The mototaxi emerges from below as an informal and inexpensive means of public transport, which nevertheless creates new problems of regulation for the city, additional competition for ordinary taxi drivers, and stigma for the mototaxi drivers themselves because of the association with drug dealing. This is sociological journalism at its very best, showing how people act, for better or worse, to *make* mobility in the city.

6. The winning submission for the special prize is different. It provides a highly accessible and instructive window on the diversity of urban mobility problems and solutions: lowtech, down to earth, pedestrian mapping of the quality of the urban environment to provide accessibility for the disabled; smart 'futuristic' transport technologies in the form of the Cybercar; the importance of advice in politics through an interview with the blind advisor to the Mayor of Paris; and a very instructive description of the city of Paris as an enemy of the disabled, imposing on them an isolated non-urban existence right in the heart of the most urban of urbanities. Here, one kind of citizen's right to the city is hugely undermined by the material structure of the urban fabric as well as by the behaviour of other citizens.

7. As regards further prospects for the contributions, I am sure that the ones that were ranked A and B by the jury can be rewritten and edited to form a high-quality magazine on urban mobility, on how to "*make* mobility in the city". The layout of the submission that won the special prize can perhaps be reworked for such a publication. The jury discussions on publication generated many good ideas, which will nevertheless need further elaboration by an editor.