1.1.5 Private, Public and communal Ownership.
Or "Who is managing whose possession?"
And why cars are, in nature, exclusive.

When talking about private, communal and public ownership, many questions arise regarding the conditions of possession, control and maintenance. The implementation of use cases only adds further complication and problems of individual consideration. To gain a better understanding of their definition the following section tries to define a framework of considerations that should aid in quickly assessing objects and their status.
In categorising a realm with one of the attributes found above, several criteria present themselves as relevant.
I.   Assessing its ownership status, it being attributed to either a specific person, a group of people or a nation. How opaque is the structure of ownership?
II.   The accessibility issue asks for its status of admission. Who is allowed "the right of use" or "the right of way" to a realm? To what amount are use cases regulated and is there an instance of control?
III.   The issue of government agency, closely connected to the ownership structure, executive power, and feedback loops are subject to the interaction of stakeholders. Who can propose and decide on use, development and adaption?
These questions might be originating in an encounter with reality. Some inherent exclusivity in a space drew attention to it. Through imagination, a vision in how the space could be improved, or used in a more inclusive fashion, might form. But when contemplating said imagination, all the hurdles in its realisation inevitably arise. How is legitimacy for action or the call to action gained? When and how does this individual concern become a common matter? – The answer might be hidden in the term «common». From several individuals with shared interest, a community might form that tries to realise their goal through activism. This might include advertising the Action and how the creation and distribution of value for a broader community is an act of empowerment that contains its own legitimation.
Diving deeper into the notion of the «public realm» we can observe a shift in its understanding. In its semantic origins, the public realm was understood as the ground for the political life of a citizen. Its contrary, the private realm was designated space for the "existential" life, where basic needs were to be handled and control and influence was not practised based on speech and thought, but based on necessity and hierarchy. It was not as much about the question of ownership but more about the questions of rule and governing principles.
Locating the two realms in the example of individual mobility, we are able to outline the conflict that has emerged between them. Infrastructure, as a communal good, is funded through the governmental institution. Its function is always founded in something we state as "public need". But when looking at contemporary jurisprudence, the car is seen as a private entity. A car, in its idea, is serving the individual need for mobility. Transporting to work, goods of provision, and to activities of self-fulfilment. These purposes, although sometimes intertwined with the public sphere, can be categorised as private in their nature.

This chapter dives into the underlying issues, reasons, statistics and argumentation ground for our concept. It discusses our stance in regard to cars and the infrastructure they consume, how this shift from the productive, public spaces we had to the unproductive spaces we know as streets happened historically. It tries to analyse the term "public space" and inquiries on its applicability for describing the street. From this broad overview regarding our issue, it draws conclusions regarding our work methodology, formulating a hypothesis that is reflected in our research questions and forms the basis for our process and the ambition to enact change.

1.1.5 Private, Public and communal Ownership.
Or "Who is managing whose possession?"
And why cars are, in nature, exclusive.

When talking about private, communal and public ownership, many questions arise regarding the conditions of possession, control and maintenance. The implementation of use cases only adds further complication and problems of individual consideration. To gain a better understanding of their definition the following section tries to define a framework of considerations that should aid in quickly assessing objects and their status.
In categorising a realm with one of the attributes found above, several criteria present themselves as relevant.
I.   Assessing its ownership status, it being attributed to either a specific person, a group of people or a nation. How opaque is the structure of ownership?
II.   The accessibility issue asks for its status of admission. Who is allowed "the right of use" or "the right of way" to a realm? To what amount are use cases regulated and is there an instance of control?
III.   The issue of government agency, closely connected to the ownership structure, executive power, and feedback loops are subject to the interaction of stakeholders. Who can propose and decide on use, development and adaption?
These questions might be originating in an encounter with reality. Some inherent exclusivity in a space drew attention to it. Through imagination, a vision in how the space could be improved, or used in a more inclusive fashion, might form. But when contemplating said imagination, all

the hurdles in its realisation inevitably arise. How is legitimacy for action or the call to action gained? When and how does this individual concern become a common matter? – The answer might be hidden in the term «common». From several individuals with shared interest, a community might form that tries to realise their goal through activism. This might include advertising the Action and how the creation and distribution of value for a broader community is an act of empowerment that contains its own legitimation.
Diving deeper into the notion of the «public realm» we can observe a shift in its understanding. In its semantic origins, the public realm was understood as the ground for the political life of a citizen. Its contrary, the private realm was designated space for the "existential" life, where basic needs were to be handled and control and influence was not practised based on speech and thought, but based on necessity and hierarchy. It was not as much about the question of ownership but more about the questions of rule and governing principles.
Locating the two realms in the example of individual mobility, we are able to outline the conflict that has emerged between them. Infrastructure, as a communal good, is funded through the governmental institution. Its function is always founded in something we state as "public need". But when looking at contemporary jurisprudence, the car is seen as a private entity. A car, in its idea, is serving the individual need for mobility. Transporting to work, goods of provision, and to activities of self-fulfilment. These purposes, although sometimes intertwined with the public sphere, can be categorised as private in their

This chapter dives into the underlying issues, reasons, statistics and argumentation ground for our concept. It discusses our stance in regard to cars and the infrastructure they consume, how this shift from the productive, public spaces we had to the unproductive spaces we know as streets happened historically. It tries to analyse the term "public space" and inquiries on its applicability for describing the street. From this broad overview regarding our issue, it draws conclusions regarding our work methodology, formulating a hypothesis that is reflected in our research questions and forms the basis for our process and the ambition to enact change.

1.1.5 Private, Public and communal Ownership.
Or "Who is managing whose possession?"
And why cars are, in nature, exclusive.

When talking about private, communal and public ownership, many questions arise regarding the conditions of possession, control and maintenance. The implementation of use cases only adds further complication and problems of individual consideration. To gain a better understanding of their definition the following section tries to define a framework of considerations that should aid in quickly assessing objects and their status.
In categorising a realm with one of the attributes found above, several criteria present themselves as relevant.
I.   Assessing its ownership status, it being attributed to either a specific person, a group of people or a nation. How opaque is the structure of ownership?
II.   The accessibility issue asks for its status of admission. Who is allowed "the right of use" or "the right of way" to a realm? To what amount are use cases regulated and is there an instance of control?
III.   The issue of government agency, closely connected to the ownership structure, executive power, and feedback loops are subject to the interaction of stakeholders. Who can propose and decide on use, development and adaption?
These questions might be originating in an encounter with reality. Some inherent exclusivity in a space drew attention to it. Through imagination, a vision in how the space could be improved, or used in a more inclusive fashion, might form. But when contemplating said imagination, all the hurdles in its realisation inevitably arise. How is legitimacy for action or the call to action gained? When and how does this individual concern become a common matter? – The answer might be hidden in the term «common». From several individuals with shared interest, a community might form that tries to realise their goal through activism. This might include advertising the Action and how the creation and distribution of value for a broader community is an act of empowerment that contains its own legitimation.
Diving deeper into the notion of the "public realm" we can observe a shift in its understanding. In its semantic origins, the public realm was understood as the ground for the political life of a citizen. Its contrary, the private realm was designated space for the "existential" life, where basic needs were to be handled and control and influence was not practised based on speech and thought, but based on necessity and hierarchy. It was not as much about the question of ownership but more about the questions of rule and governing principles.
Locating the two realms in the example of individual mobility, we are able to outline the conflict that has emerged between them. Infrastructure, as a communal good, is funded through the governmental institution. Its function is always founded in something we state as "public need". But when looking at contemporary jurisprudence, the car is seen as a private entity. A car, in its idea, is serving the individual need for mobility. Transporting to work, goods of provision, and to activities of self-fulfilment. These purposes, although sometimes intertwined with the public sphere, can be categorised as private in their nature.

When comparing the statistics of motorised individual mobility with others (as outlined in the former chapter), we get a grasp of its numerical absurdity. Is not, in every other system we developed, efficiency the most important evaluation metric? (...) The ability to take part in modes of individual motorised transport is dependent on financial means and comes with a huge ecological and spatial footprint. Car infrastructure, through its inherent danger and consumption of vast spaces is, in essence exclusive for all other shareholders of mobility.

1: Achtung: Die Schriften, Lucius Burckhardt, Max Frisch, 1955
2: Architektur auf gemeinsamem Boden, Universität Luxemburg, 2020
3: Green Visions: Greenspace Planning and Design in Nordic Cities, Stig L Andersson et al., 2021

1.1.5 Private, Public and communal Ownership.
Or "Who is managing whose possession?"
And why cars are, in nature, exclusive.

When talking about private, communal and public ownership, many questions arise regarding the conditions of possession, control and maintenance. The implementation of use cases only adds further complication and problems of individual consideration. To gain a better understanding of their definition the following section tries to define a framework of considerations that should aid in quickly assessing objects and their status.

In categorising a realm with one of the attributes found above, several criteria present themselves as relevant.

I.   Assessing its ownership status, it being attributed to either a specific person, a group of people or a nation. How opaque is the structure of ownership?

II.   The accessibility issue asks for its status of admission. Who is allowed "the right of use" or "the right of way" to a realm? To what amount are use cases regulated and is there an instance of control?

III.   The issue of government agency, closely connected to the ownership structure, executive power, and feedback loops are subject to the interaction of stakeholders. Who can propose and decide on use, development and adaption?

These questions might be originating in an encounter with reality. Some inherent exclusivity in a space drew attention to it. Through imagination, a vision in how the space could be improved, or used in a more inclusive fashion, might form. But when contemplating said imagination, all the hurdles in its realisation inevitably arise. How is legitimacy for action or the call to action gained? When and how does this individual concern become a common matter? – The answer might be hidden in the term «common». From several individuals with shared interest, a community might form that tries to realise their goal through activism. This might include advertising the Action and how the creation and distribution of value for a broader community is an act of empowerment that contains its own legitimation.

Diving deeper into the notion of the "public realm" we can observe a shift in its understanding. In its semantic origins, the public realm was understood as the ground for the political life of a citizen. Its contrary, the private realm was designated space for the "existential" life, where basic needs were to be handled and control and influence was not practised based on speech and thought, but based on necessity and hierarchy. It was not as much about the question of ownership but more about the questions of rule and governing principles.

Locating the two realms in the example of individual mobility, we are able to outline the conflict that has emerged between them. Infrastructure, as a communal good, is funded through the governmental institution. Its function is always founded in something we state as "public need". But when looking at contemporary jurisprudence, the car is seen as a private entity. A car, in its idea, is serving the individual need for mobility. Transporting to work, goods of provision, and to activities of self-fulfilment. These purposes, although sometimes intertwined with the public sphere, can be categorised as private in their nature.

When comparing the statistics of motorised individual mobility with others (as outlined in the former chapter), we get a grasp of its numerical absurdity. Is not, in every other system we developed, efficiency the most important evaluation metric? (...) The ability to take part in modes of individual motorised transport is dependent on financial means and comes with a huge ecological and spatial footprint. Car infrastructure, through its inherent danger and consumption of vast spaces is, in essence exclusive for all other shareholders of mobility.

When talking about private, communal and public ownership, many questions arise regarding the conditions of possession, control and maintenance. The implementation of use cases only adds further complication and problems of individual consideration. To gain a better understanding of their definition the following section tries to define a framework of considerations that should aid in quickly assessing objects and their status.

In categorising a realm with one of the attributes found above, several criteria present themselves as relevant.

I.   Assessing its ownership status, it being attributed to either a specific person, a group of people or a nation. How opaque is the structure of ownership?

II.   The accessibility issue asks for its status of admission. Who is allowed "the right of use" or "the right of way" to a realm? To what amount are use cases regulated and is there an instance of control?

III.   The issue of government agency, closely connected to the ownership structure, executive power, and feedback loops are subject to the interaction of stakeholders. Who can propose and decide on use, development and adaption?

1: Achtung: Die Schriften, Lucius Burckhardt, Max Frisch, 1955
2: Architektur auf gemeinsamem Boden, Universität Luxemburg, 2020
3: Green Visions: Greenspace Planning and Design in Nordic Cities, Stig L Andersson et al., 2021

1: Achtung: Die Schriften, Lucius Burckhardt, Max Frisch, 1955
2: Architektur auf gemeinsamem Boden, Universität Luxemburg, 2020
3: Green Visions: Greenspace Planning and Design in Nordic Cities, Stig L Andersson et al., 2021

1.1.5 Private, Public and communal Ownership.
Or "Who is managing whose possession?"
And why cars are, in nature, exclusive.

When talking about private, communal and public ownership, many questions arise regarding the conditions of possession, control and maintenance. The implementation of use cases only adds further complication and problems of individual consideration. To gain a better understanding of their definition the following section tries to define a framework of considerations that should aid in quickly assessing objects and their status.

In categorising a realm with one of the attributes found above, several criteria present themselves as relevant.

I.   Assessing its ownership status, it being attributed to either a specific person, a group of people or a nation. How opaque is the structure of ownership?

II.   The accessibility issue asks for its status of admission. Who is allowed "the right of use" or "the right of way" to a realm? To what amount are use cases regulated and is there an instance of control?

III.   The issue of government agency, closely connected to the ownership structure, executive power, and feedback loops are subject to the interaction of stakeholders. Who can propose and decide on use, development and adaption?

These questions might be originating in an encounter with reality. Some inherent exclusivity in a space drew attention to it. Through imagination, a vision in how the space could be improved, or used in a more inclusive fashion, might form. But when contemplating said imagination, all the hurdles in its realisation inevitably arise. How is legitimacy for action or the call to action gained? When and how does this individual concern become a common matter? – The answer might be hidden in the term «common». From several individuals with shared interest, a community might form that tries to realise their goal through activism. This might include advertising the Action and how the creation and distribution of value for a broader community is an act of empowerment that contains its own legitimation.

Diving deeper into the notion of the "public realm" we can observe a shift in its understanding. In its semantic origins, the public realm was understood as the ground for the political life of a citizen. Its contrary, the private realm was designated space for the "existential" life, where basic needs were to be handled and control and influence was not practised based on speech and thought, but based on necessity and hierarchy. It was not as much about the question of ownership but more about the questions of rule and governing principles.

Locating the two realms in the example of individual mobility, we are able to outline the conflict that has emerged between them. Infrastructure, as a communal good, is funded through the governmental institution. Its function is always founded in something we state as "public need". But when looking at contemporary jurisprudence, the car is seen as a private entity. A car, in its idea, is serving the individual need for mobility. Transporting to work, goods of provision, and to activities of self-fulfilment. These purposes, although sometimes intertwined with the public sphere, can be categorised as private in their nature.

When comparing the statistics of motorised individual mobility with others (as outlined in the former chapter), we get a grasp of its numerical absurdity. Is not, in every other system we developed, efficiency the most important evaluation metric? (...) The ability to take part in modes of individual motorised transport is dependent on financial means and comes with a huge ecological and spatial footprint. Car infrastructure, through its inherent danger and consumption of vast spaces is, in essence exclusive for all other shareholders of mobility.

1: Achtung: Die Schriften, Lucius Burckhardt, Max Frisch, 1955
2: Architektur auf gemeinsamem Boden, Universität Luxemburg, 2020
3: Green Visions: Greenspace Planning and Design in Nordic Cities, Stig L Andersson et al., 2021

1.1.5 Private, Public and communal Ownership.
Or "Who is managing whose possession?"
And why cars are, in nature, exclusive.

When talking about private, communal and public ownership, many questions arise regarding the conditions of possession, control and maintenance. The implementation of use cases only adds further complication and problems of individual consideration. To gain a better understanding of their definition the following section tries to define a framework of considerations that should aid in quickly assessing objects and their status.

In categorising a realm with one of the attributes found above, several criteria present themselves as relevant.

I.   Assessing its ownership status, it being attributed to either a specific person, a group of people or a nation. How opaque is the structure of ownership?

II.   The accessibility issue asks for its status of admission. Who is allowed "the right of use" or "the right of way" to a realm? To what amount are use cases regulated and is there an instance of control?

III.   The issue of government agency, closely connected to the ownership structure, executive power, and feedback loops are subject to the interaction of stakeholders. Who can propose and decide on use, development and adaption?

These questions might be originating in an encounter with reality. Some inherent exclusivity in a space drew attention to it. Through imagination, a vision in how the space could be improved, or used in a more inclusive fashion, might form. But when contemplating said imagination, all the hurdles in its realisation inevitably arise. How is legitimacy for action or the call to action gained? When and how does this individual concern become a common matter? – The answer might be hidden in the term «common». From several individuals with shared interest, a community might form that

tries to realise their goal through activism. This might include advertising the Action and how the creation and distribution of value for a broader community is an act of empowerment that contains its own legitimation.

Diving deeper into the notion of the "public realm" we can observe a shift in its understanding. In its semantic origins, the public realm was understood as the ground for the political life of a citizen. Its contrary, the private realm was designated space for the "existential" life, where basic needs were to be handled and control and influence was not practised based on speech and thought, but based on necessity and hierarchy. It was not as much about the question of ownership but more about the questions of rule and governing principles.

Locating the two realms in the example of individual mobility, we are able to outline the conflict that has emerged between them. Infrastructure, as a communal good, is funded through the governmental institution. Its function is always founded in something we state as "public need". But when looking at contemporary jurisprudence, the car is seen as a private entity. A car, in its idea, is serving the individual need for mobility. Transporting to work, goods of provision, and to activities of self-fulfilment. These purposes, although sometimes intertwined with the public sphere, can be categorised as private in their nature.

When comparing the statistics of motorised individual mobility with others (as outlined in the former chapter), we get a grasp of its numerical absurdity. Is not, in every other system we developed, efficiency the most important evaluation metric? (...) The ability to take part in modes of individual motorised transport is dependent on financial means and comes with a huge ecological and spatial footprint. Car infrastructure, through its inherent danger and consumption of vast spaces is, in essence exclusive for all other shareholders of mobility.

1: Achtung: Die Schriften, Lucius Burckhardt, Max Frisch, 1955
2: Architektur auf gemeinsamem Boden, Universität Luxemburg, 2020
3: Green Visions: Greenspace Planning and Design in Nordic Cities, Stig L Andersson et al., 2021

1.1.5 Private, Public and communal Ownership.
Or "Who is managing whose possession?"
And why cars are, in nature, exclusive.

When talking about private, communal and public ownership, many questions arise regarding the conditions of possession, control and maintenance. The implementation of use cases only adds further complication and problems of individual consideration. To gain a better understanding of their definition the following section tries to define a framework of considerations that should aid in quickly assessing objects and their status.

In categorising a realm with one of the attributes found above, several criteria present themselves as relevant.

I. Assessing its ownership status, it being attributed to either a specific person, a group of people or a nation. How opaque is the structure of ownership?

II. The accessibility issue asks for its status of admission. Who is allowed "the right of use" or "the right of way" to a realm? To what amount are use cases regulated and is there an instance of control?

III. The issue of government agency, closely connected to the ownership structure, executive power, and feedback loops are subject to the interaction of stakeholders. Who can propose and decide on use, development and adaption?

These questions might be originating in an encounter with reality. Some inherent exclusivity in a space drew attention to it. Through imagination, a vision in how the space could be improved, or used in a more inclusive fashion, might form. But when contemplating said imagination, all the hurdles in its realisation inevitably arise. How is legitimacy for action or the call to action gained? When and how does this individual concern become a common matter? – The answer might be hidden in the term «common». From several individuals with shared interest, a community might form that tries to realise their goal through activism. This might include advertising the Action and how the creation and distribution of value for a broader community is an act of empowerment that contains its own legitimation.

Diving deeper into the notion of the "public realm" we can observe a shift in its understanding. In its semantic origins, the public realm was understood as the ground for the political life of a citizen. Its contrary, the private realm was designated space for the "existential" life, where basic needs were to be handled and control and influence was not practised based on speech and thought, but based on necessity and hierarchy. It was not as much about the question of ownership but more about the questions of rule and governing principles.

Locating the two realms in the example of individual mobility, we are able to outline the conflict that has emerged between them. Infrastructure, as a communal good, is funded through the governmental institution. Its function is always founded in something we state as "public need". But when looking at contemporary jurisprudence, the car is seen as a private entity. A car, in its idea, is serving the individual need for mobility. Transporting to work, goods of provision, and to activities of self-fulfilment. These purposes, although sometimes intertwined with the public sphere, can be categorised as private in their nature.

When comparing the statistics of motorised individual mobility with others (as outlined in the former chapter), we get a grasp of its numerical absurdity. Is not, in every other system we developed, efficiency the most important evaluation metric? (...) The ability to take part in modes of individual motorised transport is dependent on financial means and comes with a huge ecological and spatial footprint. Car infrastructure, through its inherent danger and consumption of vast spaces is, in essence exclusive for all other shareholders of mobility.

1: Achtung: Die Schriften, Lucius Burckhardt, Max Frisch, 1955
2: Architektur auf gemeinsamem Boden, Universität Luxemburg, 2020
3: Green Visions: Greenspace Planning and Design in Nordic Cities, Stig L Andersson et al., 2021

1: Achtung: Die Schriften, Lucius Burckhardt, Max Frisch, 1955
2: Architektur auf gemeinsamem Boden, Universität Luxemburg, 2020
3: Green Visions: Greenspace Planning and Design in Nordic Cities, Stig L Andersson et al., 2021

1.1.5 Private, Public and communal Ownership.
Or "Who is managing whose possession?"
And why cars are, in nature, exclusive.

When talking about private, communal and public own-ership, many questions arise regarding the conditions of possession, control and maintenance. The implemen-tation of use cases only adds further complication and problems of individual consideration. To gain a better understanding of their definition the following section tries to define a framework of considerations that should aid in quickly assessing objects and their status.
In categorising a realm with one of the attributes found above, several criteria present themselves as relevant.
I.   Assessing its ownership status, it being attributed to either a specific person, a group of people or a nation. How opaque is the structure of ownership?
II.   The accessibility issue asks for its status of admis-sion. Who is allowed "the right of use" or "the right of way" to a realm? To what amount are use cases regulat-ed and is there an instance of control?
III.   The issue of government agency, closely connect-ed to the ownership structure, executive power, and feedback loops are subject to the interaction of stake-holders. Who can propose and decide on use, develop-ment and adaption?
These questions might be originating in an encounter with reality. Some inherent exclusivity in a space drew attention to it. Through imagination, a vision in how the space could be improved, or used in a more inclusive fashion, might form. But when contemplating said imag-ination, all the hurdles in its realisation inevitably arise. How is legitimacy for action or the call to action gained? When and how does this individual concern become a common matter? – The answer might be hidden in the term «common». From several individuals with shared interest, a community might form that tries to realise their goal through activism. This might include adver-tising the Action and how the creation and distribution

of value for a broader community is an act of empower-ment that contains its own legitimation.
Diving deeper into the notion of the «public realm» we can observe a shift in its understanding. In its semantic origins, the public realm was understood as the ground for the political life of a citizen. Its contrary, the pri-vate realm was designated space for the "existential" life, where basic needs were to be handled and control and influence was not practised based on speech and thought, but based on necessity and hierarchy. It was not as much about the question of ownership but more about the questions of rule and governing principles. Locating the two realms in the example of individu-al mobility, we are able to outline the conflict that has emerged between them. Infrastructure, as a communal good, is funded through the governmental institution. Its function is always founded in something we state as "public need". But when looking at contemporary juris-prudence, the car is seen as a private entity. A car, in its idea, is serving the individual need for mobility. Trans-porting to work, goods of provision, and to activities of self-fulfilment. These purposes, although sometimes intertwined with the public sphere, can be categorised as private in their nature.

When comparing the statistics of motorised individual mobility with others (as outlined in the former chapter), we get a grasp of its numerical absurdity. Is not, in every other system we developed, efficiency the most impor-tant evaluation metric? (...) The ability to take part in modes of individual motorised transport is dependent on financial means and comes with a huge ecological and spatial footprint. Car infrastructure, through its inherent danger and consumption of vast spaces is, in essence exclusive for all other shareholders of mobility.

1: Achtung: Die Schriften, Lucius Burckhardt, Max Frisch, 1955
2: Architektur auf gemeinsamem Boden, Universität Luxemburg, 2020
3: Green Visions: Greenspace Planning and Design in Nordic Cities, Stig L Andersson et al., 2021

1: Achtung: Die Schriften, Lucius Burckhardt, Max Frisch, 1955
2: Architektur auf gemeinsamem Boden, Universität Luxemburg, 2020
3: Green Visions: Greenspace Planning and Design in Nordic Cities, Stig L Andersson et al., 2021

1.1.5 Private, Public and communal Ownership.
Or "Who is managing whose possession?"
And why cars are, in nature, exclusive.

When talking about private, communal and public own-
ership, many questions arise regarding the conditions
of possession, control and maintenance. The implemen-
tation of use cases only adds further complication and
problems of individual consideration. To gain a better
understanding of their definition the following section
tries to define a framework of considerations that should
aid in quickly assessing objects and their status.
In categorising a realm with one of the attributes found
above, several criteria present themselves as relevant.
I.   Assessing its ownership status, it being attributed
to either a specific person, a group of people or a nation.
How opaque is the structure of ownership?
II.   The accessibility issue asks for its status of admis-
sion. Who is allowed "the right of use" or "the right of
way" to a realm? To what amount are use cases regulat-
ed and is there an instance of control?
III.   The issue of government agency, closely connect-
ed to the ownership structure, executive power, and
feedback loops are subject to the interaction of stake-
holders. Who can propose and decide on use, develop-
ment and adaption?
These questions might be originating in an encounter
with reality. Some inherent exclusivity in a space drew
attention to it. Through imagination, a vision in how the
space could be improved, or used in a more inclusive
fashion, might form. But when contemplating said imag-
ination, all the hurdles in its realisation inevitably arise.
How is legitimacy for action or the call to action gained?
When and how does this individual concern become a
common matter? – The answer might be hidden in the
term «common». From several individuals with shared
interest, a community might form that tries to realise
their goal through activism. This might include adver-
tising the Action and how the creation and distribution

of value for a broader community is an act of empower-
ment that contains its own legitimation.
Diving deeper into the notion of the «public realm» we
can observe a shift in its understanding. In its semantic
origins, the public realm was understood as the ground
for the political life of a citizen. Its contrary, the pri-
vate realm was designated space for the "existential"
life, where basic needs were to be handled and control
and influence was not practised based on speech and
thought, but based on necessity and hierarchy. It was
not as much about the question of ownership but more
about the questions of rule and governing principles.
Locating the two realms in the example of individu-
al mobility, we are able to outline the conflict that has
emerged between them. Infrastructure, as a communal
good, is funded through the governmental institution.
Its function is always founded in something we state as
"public need". But when looking at contemporary juris-
prudence, the car is seen as a private entity. A car, in its
idea, is serving the individual need for mobility. Trans-
porting to work, goods of provision, and to activities of
self-fulfilment. These purposes, although sometimes
intertwined with the public sphere, can be categorised
as private in their nature.

When comparing the statistics of motorised individual
mobility with others (as outlined in the former chapter),
we get a grasp of its numerical absurdity. Is not, in every
other system we developed, efficiency the most impor-
tant evaluation metric? (...) The ability to take part in
modes of individual motorised transport is dependent on
financial means and comes with a huge ecological and
spatial footprint. Car infrastructure, through its inherent
danger and consumption of vast spaces is, in essence
exclusive for all other shareholders of mobility.

1: Achtung: Die Schriften, Lucius Burckhardt, Max Frisch, 1955
2: Architektur auf gemeinsamem Boden, Universität Luxemburg, 2020
3: Green Visions: Greenspace Planning and Design in Nordic Cities, Stig L Andersson
et al., 2021

1: Achtung: Die Schriften, Lucius Burckhardt, Max Frisch, 1955
2: Architektur auf gemeinsamem Boden, Universität Luxemburg, 2020
3: Green Visions: Greenspace Planning and Design in Nordic Cities, Stig L Andersson
et al., 2021

1.1.5 Private, Public and communal Ownership.
Or "Who is managing whose possession?"
And why cars are, in nature, exclusive.

When talking about private, communal and public ownership, many questions arise regarding the conditions of possession, control and maintenance. The implementation of use cases only adds further complication and problems of individual consideration. To gain a better understanding of their definition the following section tries to define a framework of considerations that should aid in quickly assessing objects and their status. In categorising a realm with one of the attributes found above, several criteria present themselves as relevant.
I.   Assessing its ownership status, it being attributed to either a specific person, a group of people or a nation. How opaque is the structure of ownership?
II.   The accessibility issue asks for its status of admission. Who is allowed "the right of use" or "the right of way" to a realm? To what amount are use cases regulated and is there an instance of control?
III.   The issue of government agency, closely connected to the ownership structure, executive power, and feedback loops are subject to the interaction of stakeholders. Who can propose and decide on use, development and adaption?
These questions might be originating in an encounter with reality. Some inherent exclusivity in a space drew attention to it. Through imagination, a vision in how the space could be improved, or used in a more inclusive fashion, might form. But when contemplating said imagination, all the hurdles in its realisation inevitably arise. How is legitimacy for action or the call to action gained? When and how does this individual concern become a common matter? – The answer might be hidden in the term «common». From several individuals with shared interest, a community might form that tries to realise their goal through activism. This might include advertising the Action and how the creation and distribution of value for a broader community is an act of empowerment that contains its own legitimation.
Diving deeper into the notion of the «public realm» we can observe a shift in its understanding. In its semantic origins, the public realm was understood as the ground for the political life of a citizen. Its contrary, the private realm was designated space for the "existential" life, where basic needs were to be handled and control and influence was not practised based on speech and thought, but based on necessity and hierarchy. It was not as much about the question of ownership but more about the questions of rule and governing principles.
Locating the two realms in the example of individual mobility, we are able to outline the conflict that has emerged between them. Infrastructure, as a communal good, is funded through the governmental institution. Its function is always founded in something we state as "public need". But when looking at contemporary jurisprudence, the car is seen as a private entity. A car, in its idea, is serving the individual need for mobility. Transporting to work, goods of provision, and to activities of self-fulfilment. These purposes, although sometimes intertwined with the public sphere, can be categorised as private in their nature.

When comparing the statistics of motorised individual mobility with others (as outlined in the former chapter), we get a grasp of its numerical absurdity. Is not, in every other system we developed, efficiency the most important evaluation metric? (...) The ability to take part in modes of individual motorised transport is dependent on financial means and comes with a huge ecological and spatial footprint. Car infrastructure, through its inherent danger and consumption of vast spaces is, in essence exclusive for all other shareholders of mobility.