We come to our practice – more deeply, our praxis – from our own experience of place, from our own ‘making’ of it – literally and figuratively. We may try to cast it objectively, abstractly, impersonally – but in our heart and soul it is anything but. Indeed, it is very personal, and inter-personal, and trans-personal – if we might care to admit such perspectives.

Placemaking has been a formative human practice from time immemorial (Schneekloth and Shibley, 1994). There is no escaping it – and in integral terms it is much more than a mere ‘it’ and more an exquisite integration of I and We and It/Its; ‘it’ spans form and consciousness, interior and exterior, individual and collective (Wight, 2005). But the integration is always, ultimately, in our selves (ideally in our larger Selves). It is where we make common sense of Nature and Culture; it is where we experience our evolutionary trajectory… our ever-more-whole-making. The placemakers are us, whole-persons, whole-making, as a matter of our life-course.

I present as an integral practitioner at work in this primal and potent field. My integral ‘turn’ began around 20 years ago, the latest in a series of ‘ever-more-all-encompassings’ – geographical, environmental, and ecological in their turn. ‘Place’ had a place in each, a grounding place, a home-base of sorts, that I keep ‘coming home’ to. But it has evolved, and I expect it to continue to evolve; ‘integral’ may best place me at present, but I sense a meta-integral at work out around my leading edge, my know(ing)-ledge. It is my emerging ‘territory beyond’ (Zander, 2017, p. 189).

I have a ‘primal place’ from my early youth that is still very much ‘in’ me – local, physical, visceral. It is a gift that keeps on giving, that keeps place alive for me, that grounds and centres me. My academic sense of place emerged in my geography studies, at a time when place was being eclipsed by space, with geography aspiring to be a spatial science. But the place seed was well planted and informed my early work as a planner. It came through again as a city planning and environmental design educator, anchoring my ‘professing,’ validating space-place transformation, and advocating planning as placemaking – initially as a form of applied ecology (Wight, 2005). And my placemaking has continued to evolve under integral influences, first as ‘wellbeing by design’ (Wight, 2012) and most recently as ‘a poiesis of sophrosynes’ (Wight, 2017).
What is your own over-standing of your operating environment?
How might you personally ‘place’ your Self?

Framing place – integrally

What set me off on what became my integral placemaking journey? I recall noticing some provocative Australian practice on ‘place not space’ (Winnikoff, 1995) and began to wonder about giving place more space in a course I was teaching at the time. Ideally, I sought to align them and mobilize them, together: how might a mere ‘space’ become transformed into a meaningful ‘place’? There was an intriguing integration challenge here – that became an opening into the possibility of a more integral approach. Serendipitously, an architect friend introduced me to a book he had just read, that seemed to address this challenge, effectively setting me on my integral path. The book was *A Brief History of Everything*, by Ken Wilber (1996).

‘Integral’ has been my default ‘operating system’ ever since, bequeathing an integral view of place and placemaking – *integral* place and *integral* placemaking – with a particular concern for the placemaker, the person/s in/of the place in question. There is an audacity to integral approaches that can be difficult to countenance; it goes against the grain of much mainstream academic practice, and calls for extraordinary overview capacity – an over-standing as much as an under-standing, and an unflinching commitment to integration – as a necessary complement to differentiation, and the often associated reductionism. An integral perspective has been summed up by Wilber (1996) as ‘comprehensive, inclusive and balanced – not leaving anything out.’ It aspires to be comprehensive in the extreme, always alert to what might be missing, what might be being downplayed. In particular it values ‘wholistic’ perspectives that honour whole persons at work in whole systems in whole-making endeavours. Integration is the underlying intent. It aspires to be inclusive in the extreme, to be wide open to development, to deeply honour an evolutionary trajectory. One of its key tenets is an impulse to ‘transcend and include,’ to acknowledge the at-least-partial truths in earlier formulations, and the dignities adhering to past practices. Integration is the underlying intent. It aspires to be balanced in the extreme – between exterior form and interior consciousness; between individual and collective contexts; between objective and subjective, inter-objective and inter-subjective; among different levels and lines of development; across different moral perspectives and worldviews. Integration is the underlying intent.

Another short-hand representation of ‘integral’ is the integration of Body, Mind, Soul, and Spirit in Self, Culture, and Nature (Figure 28.1). There is much in play where integral is concerned, and much to be made when it is mobilized, when it represents the underlying awareness – especially self/Self-awareness. There is no escaping the dimensions of one’s self – the source of the making is in ‘You,’ in your body, mind, soul, and spirit. And the integral quadrants help ‘place’ Self, Nature, and Culture.

An integral framing of place seeks to reflect these integrations (Figure 28.2). The quadrants represent four primordial perspectives – captured in the pronouns: I, We, It, and Its. I have come to *integ rally* render place as an integration of physicality, functionality, conviviality, and spiritual-ity. As such, we should strive not to reduce place to any one dimension; it is essentially an *integration of all four* – the integration constituting the ‘making.’

1 Note to readers: these italicized prompts, at the end of each section, are possible ‘pause and reflect’ occasions, to sense into any potential arising for yourself. Consider them my attempt to prime, in you, some of the interior conditioning that I have come to believe as essential for authentic placemaking. They may help take you beyond ‘hand-book’ territory into ‘heart-book,’ or even ‘soul-book,’ territory. They are my own constructions, influenced by various experiential workshop efforts and experiences. I hope they might constitute some welcome cause for pause, to go inside, to balance ourselves.
The qualities of place do not exist independently; rather, they co-exist interdependently – they co-relate. There is obviously some differentiation at work – different place personas depending on the reference quadrant. But the aimed-for disposition needs to be ‘honouring all while privileging none.’ Biases/preferences are to be expected outwith an integral frame – limiting, qualifying what might be made of place, and especially the associated placemaking. It often seems easy, in academia and professional policy circles especially, to fetishize place, but it is its making, and its makers – the placemaking and the placemakers – that merit prime regard in practice contexts.

Reflect on your own integrated-ness – on your inside, and your integration-ability – on the outside.

Place – through an integral lens: a making, by makers

My exposure to an integral perspective was transformative for my own practice – professionally, educationally, and personally. My outlook became ‘through an integral lens’ (Wight, 2006), and increasingly my persona became an aspiring ‘integral@work.’ Inevitably my foundational
frames of reference were reworked, with integral in mind (and in heart, and in soul). This naturally included place, my enduring anchor, from my formative geography days. I began with some working hypotheses, based on my emerging integral perspective, rooted at the time in a curiosity about possible ties to a post-modern perspective: integral as post-modern; integral placemaking as a post-modernity project – as a post-modernized form of planning (Wight, 2005). Place, it occurred to me, had too often too easily been dehumanized as simply an ‘it’, as an objective – often spatial – identifier (in what Wilber (ibid.) termed ‘Flatland’). I sensed the possibility of a broader Wilberian all-quadrants/all-levels (AQAL) perspective on place, considering the proposition of the actual making of place as a form of the integral practice advocated by Wilber. I hypothesized integrally conceived placemaking as a serviceable bridge between past (basically spiritually bereft) professional and academic agendas and the projected necessary spirit-embracing (constructive) post-modern practice. Place became much more than a simple matter of geography or locality, but a place of makings, by makers – whole persons – sense-making and meaning-making together, hearts and souls and spirit at work.

In terms of the integral quadrants, place may be conceived as spanning exterior and interior, communal/collective and individual. It is always at least multiple-quadrant; ideally place is an ‘all-quadrants’ affair. It is a key venue for the integration of the worlds of it or its (the physical, functional, geographical, social) and the worlds of I and We (the makers, making, convivially – their spirit-at-

Figure 28.2 Integral place: an all-quadrants affair (Wight, 2018; and supplemented by ‘place as’ distinctions, from Dekay, 2011.)
work); i.e. material form conjoined with non-material consciousness. Levels, as well as quadrants, are prominent in an integral framing. For example, the levels associated with what Wilber terms the ‘Great Nest (or Chain) of Being’ are Matter, Body, Mind, Soul, and Spirit. Thus, an integral view of place would embrace all such levels; place is multi-level as well as multi-quadrant, having both primacy and potency, integrating past, present, and future. Place may be regarded as submergent and emergent, a common thread through the ‘nestwork.’ It is always in flux, in development, being made and re-made, to better ground the development of individuals and collectivities.

Spiral Dynamics (Beck and Cowan, 1996) offers another example of integral levels that can be informative of the evolution of planning – of different ‘plannings,’ including planning as placemaking. When I encountered this particular framing (see Wight, 2012, for more background) I hypothesized that it might be a potential major bridge between Wilber’s thought and the contemporary planning ‘mix’ that was my world at the time. I began to see an evolution of ‘plannings’ (as collective culture-specific action) in a developmental progression of integral ‘transcending and including’: command-and-control, to master-planning and zoning, to strategic planning, to communicative action, collaboration and consensus-building, to ecological/holistic ‘second-tier’ placemaking. With this framing I began to sense a context for a more integral, constructively post-modern, second-tier planning with placemaking in mind, literally and figuratively, individually and collectively. Planning could be considered to be developing/evolving, occupying new worlds, as integrally informed post-modern placemaking.

While planning – conventionally – might be abstractly conceived as a linking of thinking and acting, and as forward-thinking and intervention-oriented, it might be less easily conceived as always evolving in terms of the level/state of consciousness being manifested. However, I began to sense that we may now be advancing on a period of post-conventional ‘vision-logic’ planning (as distinct from a planning rooted in more concrete or formal ways of thinking) with a consequential requisite rethinking of place and placemaking. My integral exposure thus emboldened me to suggest that modern(ity) planning has been essentially a linking of first-tier thought with a differentiating agenda, dictated by concern for the ‘it/s’-world: i.e. anything but integral. Instead, planning needs to more consciously become part of a post-modernity project, linking second-tier thought with an integrating action agenda, embodying the practice of an AQAL/integral approach (what Wilber would term ‘Spirit-in-Action’). Such a planning (integrating the worlds of I, We, and It/its) would clearly be well-served by a renewed consideration of the central place of place – in all-quadrants/all-levels (AQUAL) terms – but an explicitly post-conventional notion of place, rooted in a world-centric vision-logic, transcending while including earlier (lower tier in Spiral Dynamics terms) notions of place.

‘Integral’ came to represent for myself the new ‘comprehensiveness’ in planning terms, orienting to transcending while including earlier formulations, with a ‘balancing’ agenda, balancing the interior and exterior, form and consciousness, the practical and the spiritual (integrally defined). Place became an integral production, inclusively interrelating physicality, functionality, conviviality, and spirituality, the latter being a particularly key entrée for planners, and other professionals, to bring spirit into their planning, as a venue for personal and collective self-actualization, honouring interior consciousness as much as material form. I came to profess that ‘being professional in a post-modern world is being integral’ (Wight, 2005).

What if your practice, and place-conception, were integral?
What would change for you, in you?
What if you could be part of the making of place, of the raising and broadening of collective consciousness, for integrating It and We with the I of the beholder, tapping soul and spirit?
Placemaking as wellbeing by design: mesh-working and whole-making

When place/placemaking is hitched to wellbeing, within an integral framing of both, a whole new vision opens up (Wight, 2012). Their integral ‘meshing’ merits a commitment to mesh-working – a notable advance on networking, and the integral common ground becomes whole-making, with an ‘ever-more-whole-making’ aspiration. What is so special, so uncommon, about wellbeing and place/placemaking, not only on their own terms but – perhaps especially – in combination? The two have in common an essential wholeness, goodness and togetherness – resisting easy deconstruction, abhorring insensitive reduction, and confounding simplistic quantification. They transcend individual disciplines and professions; they are – above all – integrations of pretty much all we hold dear – the good, the true, and the beautiful. They range wide and deep; they implicate our whole being – body, mind, soul, and spirit. One, placemaking, is perhaps more means than end, the other, wellbeing, more end than means – but they are indubitably linked. We know this at our core, from everyday – and extraordinary – experience. But it does seem to require a shift in perspective to fully see, and feel, and validate all this. The concern needs to be with the enacting that is placemaking and with the enacting of wellbeing – as ongoing whole-making productions both.

My emerging sense of the place–wellbeing nexus is one that happens to still privilege place (especially its making), but in a way that I feel embodies, ensouls, and inspires wellbeing; I hypothesize wellbeing as a manifestation of implacement (Schneekloth and Shibley, 2000). But the place I have in mind is much more than simply geographical or locational; it is integral, in the sense of including while transcending the pre-modern, modern, and post-modern notions, or ‘senses,’ of place. It is also emerging – developing and evolving – with an inherent dynamic; a verb as much as a noun, always in the process of being made and remade, in pursuit of an ever-greater sense of the good (and the true, and the beautiful). Together, in combination, placemaking and wellbeing involve a full engagement of body, mind, soul, and spirit, potentially manifesting a palpable poiesis. Wellbeing may be conceptualized as, at the very least, a by-product – if not direct product – of the kind of integrally informed placemaking articulated earlier. If planning can be enacted as integral placemaking, it cannot but play a more significant role in engendering greater wellbeing. But what if wellbeing itself is considered more directly through an integral lens? An integral wellbeing perspective may prove as generative as an integral placemaking perspective, with large dividends (compound interest?) for related planning, policy, and design.

Reaching for a more ‘wholistic’ view, wellbeing evokes a highly generative interpretation through an integral lens. Conventional etymology needs to be bypassed – ‘the state of being comfortable, healthy or happy’ (encountered in many dictionaries) falls far short of the meaning being reached for. The more appropriate root word from an integral perspective is ‘whole,’ which can be seen to encompass ‘well’ – and much more besides. This reframing more easily invokes whole-system conceptualizations; it also suggests a basic living, life-affirming, orientation in favour of ‘wholing,’ of seeking ever-greater, ever-more-exquisite, wholeness – in ourselves, in our relationships, and in our environments. Think of ‘wholing’ as a deeper and wider form of ‘healing’; it is the action verb to the wellbeing noun. Its enacting becomes a form of ‘wholing,’ of making more whole, of ‘whole-making’ – seeking always to conduce, extend, and embed wholeness as wellness, or thriving as flourishing – the ‘wholing’ practice yielding wellbeing. This notion of wellbeing as ‘wholing’ or ‘whole-making’ engages our need for deep meaning, beyond everyday life. It also encompasses the sense of being part of something bigger, more transcendent, mysterious, but loving – the spiritual dimension of wellbeing (Vernon, 2008). Within an integral perspective there is room for the magical and mythical, as well as the rational
and the mystical. The focus is on wellbeing, not ill-being; the framing as ‘wholing’ recognizes the developmental and evolutionary dynamic, in ever-seeking to become ever-more whole.

Combining placemaking and wellbeing, in integral terms, invokes meshworking – a very new notion, partly a product of the early integral wave, but with its roots in brain science (Hamilton, 2008, Ch. 10). It is built on the more familiar ground of networking, but meshworking takes networking to an almost unrecognizable new level. The attraction here is its response to the challenge at the heart of an integral approach – achieving uncommon ‘integrated-ness’ in real-time. It provides the context for operationalizing any trans-disciplinary, trans-professional, trans-sectoral endeavour – for those so inclined to seek such communion. Truly an integral-age approach, it is inherently ecological, as well as being highly participatory (Torbert and Reason, 2001), solidly biased in favour of conducing collective action, following the raising of the collective consciousness of all the players in an issue. Think of meshworking as ecological interconnectedness ‘inter-personified,’ in a complex collective collaborative context. To the extent that all of this can be contained, the associated integral container would have the appearance of a primarily horizontal placemaking (rooted in the quadrants, valuing the balancing of interior and exterior) and a primarily vertical wellbeing (rooted in the levels/lines, valuing the interaction of individual agency and collective communion.) Wellbeing feels like its origins are in the perennial philosophy, the Great Chain of Being (Wilber, 1996); placemaking helps to reframe the ‘Chain’ as a ‘Nest.’ The meshworking is the integral interaction, the integrated enaction – a catalyzing agent on a grand scale.

The underlying challenge may therefore be expressed in terms of meshing placemaking and wellbeing (as whole-making.) An explicitly integrally informed ‘meshing’ may be characterized as meshworking, a form of (in Spiral Dynamics terms) second-tier integral collaboration – well beyond mere cooperation or first-tier networking. This will take many – scientists, professionals, citizens – well outside their normal comfort zone, in part because it also necessitates them consciously going well inside themselves. An integral engagement of wellbeing and placemaking entails engaging the ineffable, within the realms of consciousness, as much as it entails engaging exterior concrete form. It is an inner work project, engaging not just the mind, but body, soul, and spirit. The ‘well’ in wellbeing goes back to the original notion of ‘whole,’ when whole very much referenced body, mind, soul, and spirit. Here is some dignified pre-modernity that deserves to be very much preserved, and sensitively integrated into today’s thinking and acting. The coupling with placemaking, and an integral perspective, helps to render wellbeing as a form of ‘whole-making,’ and it is in this combination that we might all find our post-post-modern calling, our co-mission-ing. Paraphrasing Martin Luther King:

> I have a dream, of professions – and an academy – of servant-leaders, as a community of wellbeings, striving above all for the wellbeing of all, in well-loved places: whole beings, in whole places, tending not just to inanimate matter, but to all that matters – in body, mind, soul and spirit.

> When do you know you are well, and are – in fact – a well being?

> When do you know you are in your place – your prime, thick place?

**A poiesis of sophrosynes – the placemaking to come?**

Those picking up this Handbook will be at different points on their placemaking journey; they will have to gauge where to engage. I have laid out here some of the main staging points in my own journey – an ever-evolving one, but one rooted in an integral framing, which may
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not be for everyone – at least not yet perhaps. My operating domain has been professional and academic, often seeking to ‘bridge’ the two, in the context of planning and design – these being professional fields and academic disciplines. As I began to engage with integral framings, I began to notice an increasing underlying curiosity around ‘what I profess’ – regardless of professional or academic affiliation. My journey began in geography – still fundamental in the sense of foundational – where my operative sense of place was established. The placemaking I profess took root when my worldview was ecological, which overlapped with my encounter with integral; applied integral ecology became my play-place. As a planner in design-land (in a multi-discipline Faculty of Architecture) I was helped to add design to my planning bow, and my professing became more concerned with my own integration of the design focus on perception, intention, and making. Planning as placemaking became my IOS, my Integral Operating System, and from there it became natural to contemplate more trans-disciplinary, trans-professional, trans-personal dimensions of my professing. Placemaking as wellbeing by design was part of that natural evolution – transcending while including all that had gone before. So where is my journey now taking me? Might you credit ‘a poiesis of sophrosynes’? (Wight, 2017).

My placemaking journey has been part and parcel of a larger long-standing concern with evolving what passes for professionalism these days – for evolving professionalism beyond the status quo, and for contemplating the education of the agents of the next enlightenment. The design focus has become one’s professional-self, involving three particular arenas of ‘making’ – praxis (personal), ethos (interpersonal), and poiesis (transpersonal.) Praxis (Wight, 2015) is particularly associated with sense-making, foundational inner-work; ethos (Wight, 2013) involves meaning-making, in the company of others – a form of inter-work. Poiesis may be regarded as a form of placemaking writ large – Placemaking – intrinsically integral, akin to the ‘intersubjective according in the noosphere’ addressed by Wilber in his 1997 book (and elaborated in Wight, 2020). It is the highest form of making that any true, good, and beautiful professional might profess – an over-standing@work. Those who might achieve such heights of professional-self design may be considered to manifest a quality or status that the ancient Greeks termed sophrosyne. Those ancient Greeks often paired sophrosyne with their sense of poiesis (Sennett, 1992, p. xiii). I am sensing that the continuing evolution of my placemaking will be in the realms of ‘a poiesis of sophrosynes’, and this is the placemaking I now seek to advocate.

What this might entail emerged in some recent reflections on the nexus of Art, Place, and Nature (Wight, 2017), when I was moved to consider: might this triad constitute a congenial canvas for a larger integration (a poiesis), of particularly enlightened, evolved, and integrated wellbeings (as sophrosynes) – engaged in a poiesis of sophrosynes? This intriguing trialectic was being set in the context of an explicit interest in ‘spiritual and integral ecology perspectives.’ It became a rather generative inquiry for myself, and an opportunity for expressing some learning and intuiting, as I explored seemingly relevant ‘perspective-taking’ – from my own experience. It helps to place where I am currently at – on my ongoing placemaking journey. Art~Place~Nature became perceivable as an integration, aiming for an expression that was: not only ecological, but also integral, in a larger sense, including – especially – the spiritual; an expression full of aspiration – for embodying, enacting, and ensouling the ‘integrating’; as a form of ‘ever-more-whole-making’, integrating truth, goodness, and beauty through love – a living/loving, loving/living expression; an integration grounded in love, for an Earth, beloved and loving. The integration of Art~Place~Nature emerged as ‘the poiesis of sophrosynes’ – an integration of Self (Art), Culture (Place), and Nature, in Body, Mind, Soul, and Spirit.

One important side-effect of this inquiry has been a rising awareness of the importance of shifting beyond an ‘individual’ focus towards more explicitly privileging ‘the personal’ – and the inter-personal, and the trans-personal. The personal is a place of praxis, integrating not only my
knowing and doing, but also my being and becoming – my essence, my pro-essence (Wight, 2015). The inter-personal scales this up and out, engaging the realm of common-meaning-making – of ethos-making and culturing, while the trans-personal most openly engages the spiritual, calling for poiesis. I am fundamentally curious about ‘enacting integral’ – in this case – in our artistry, our place-making, and our naturing.

Art, Place, and Nature represent fundamental differentiations within an integral framing – articulations of the elemental ‘quadrants’, the worlds of I, We, and It/Its that simultaneously demand integration. And the ultimate agent in such integration is the Self, implicating considerations of our integrity as in our integrated-ness on our insides, in our inner work; and as in our integration-ability in relation to our outsides, and our outer work in the world. This is the domain of ‘integrals@work,’ enacting integral, in one’s person, as a whole person – Body, Mind, Soul, and Spirit – well beyond comporting oneself as simply ‘an individual,’ but fully honouring the nexus of Self, Culture and Nature. For guidance, think of ‘Art’ as an ‘outing’ of one’s Self, of ‘Culture’ as our collective ‘Place’ (manifesting the combination of all our sense-making and meaning-making), and of ‘Nature’ as the definitive ‘co-relate’ – the ultimate grounding. At this juncture, in our collective minding, hearting, and soulung, it is suggested that we need to privilege: the ‘in-siding’ and its ‘in-sighting’ and ‘in-tuiting’… (and in their expression through our artistry); the in-personal (rather than impersonal) and the related inter-personal, and trans-personal – (in our artful making, and synthesizing, of Art~Place~Nature); and the ‘placing’ of our selves ‘alongside, inside, and as’ nature personified (getting personal about ‘our’ operative nature, our ‘naturing’ agency).

The journey from individual to person may help those challenged by the journey from place to poiesis. As Cynthia Bourgeault (2017) has observed, building on the work of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, these reflect ‘distinctly different, progressive evolutionary stages.’ Bourgeault defines an individual as ‘living as an autonomous unit, subject to the old-order laws of “survival of the fittest” and planetary indifference.’ By contrast, Bourgeault identifies a person as having come to understand themselves as ‘belonging to a greater relational field.’ Bourgeault expands on the implications:

They (persons) now sense their identity from a sense of wholeness in an entirely different order of coherence: a whole greater than the sum of its parts…the universe is no longer random, but a system of relationships to which we all belong and are participating in!

What might we therefore attend to, by our intending, in our person so conceived, in any efforts to enact integral? I would nominate for consideration certain aspects of our own artistry, place-making, and naturing: enacting our artistry of possibility (Art); coming home to our Selves (Place); and, naturally realizing our ‘third’ nature, or ‘thirding,’ as ever-more-complex nature/Nature/NATURE. And doing so potentially with the necessary integration being pursued by reflecting deeply on the ‘eco’ in ecology; not simply by problematizing ‘ego’ but by integrally advancing a transcending, while including, sense of ‘eco,’ uniting multiple perspectives, transformatively, by design. Such integral enacting begins to capture some of the endeavour that might be distilled in a poiesis of sophrosynes. This framing builds on Richard Sennett’s conceptions, discussed in the book foreword (1992, xiii). Sophrosyne, for the ancient Greeks, was a quality of being ‘balanced and centred, in face of difficulty and diversity, acting with grace and poise, balancing inner and outer life exposure.’ Poiesis, for the Greeks, associated balancing oneself with acting (perhaps – more accurately – enacting) as well as looking: ‘The result of caring about what one sees is the desire to make something – poiesis (poetry – but their word was broader
than one art in scope).’ The balanced person would want all their makings to engage the same
qualities of grace and poise. Sennett concludes: ‘As a result of his or her own engagement in
making or doing things carefully, sophrosyne and poiesis were intimately related.’

I am suggesting a synchrony between this notion of sophrosynes (in the plural) and what I
might allude to as ‘integrals’ (which may in turn be regarded as an advance on what we currently
regard as ‘professionals’). I posit the makings of such ‘integrals’ as a triptych – as a product of some
dedicated artistry of possibility – of: praxis (personal) – sense-making; ethos (inter-personal) –
meaning-making; and poiesis (trans-personal) – Placemaking. Hence my sensing of integral
placemaking as, ultimately, a poiesis of sophrosynes – grounded in a practice as praxis, and ethics
as ethos. Makings of makers, grounded in place, integrally conceived.

What do you profess, in the academy or in your profession, in relation to placemaking?
What placemaking – elevated, evolved, embodied – might you seek to profess?

References


Further reading in this volume

Chapter 11: Free State Boulevard and the story of the East 9th Street Placekeepers
Dave Lowenstein

Chapter 13: Sensing our streets: involving children in making people-centred smart cities
Sean Peacock, Aare Puussaar, and Clara Crivellaro

Preface: The problem with placemaking
Louise Platt

Chapter 14: Experts in their own tomorrows: placemaking for participatory climate future
Paul Graham Raven

Chapter 15: Un/safety as placemaking: disabled people’s socio-spatial negotiation of fear of violent crime
Claire Edwards

Chapter 16: More than a mural: participatory placemaking on Gija Country
Samantha Edwards-Vandenhoek

Martin Zebracki

Preface: The radical potential of placemaking
Cara Courage

Chapter 22: Embedded Artist Project: Epistemic Disobedience + Place
Frances Whitehead

Chapter 24: Artists, creativity, and the heart of city planning
Tom Borrup

Preface: The only thing constant is change
Kylie Legge

Chapter 34: Reconnecting cité and ville
Philip Graus

Chapter 35: Planning governance – lessons for the integration of placemaking
Nigel Smith

Chapter 36: Facilitator skills for effective collaborative placemaking
Husam AlWaer and Ian Cooper

Chapter 37: The Neighbourhood Project: a case study on community-led placemaking by CoDesign Studio
Lucinda Hartley, Eliza Charley, Sama Choudhury, and Harriet McKindlay

Chapter 38: Public seating – a small but important place in the city
Kylie Legge

Preface: Evaluating creative placemaking: a collection of observations, reflections, findings and recommendations
Maria Rosario Jackson

Chapter 41: Rituals of regard: on festivals, folks, and findings of social impact
Maribel Alvarez

Chapter 42: Creative Placemaking and Placekeeping evaluation challenges from the practitioner perspective: an interview with Roy Chan
Maria Rosario Jackson

Chapter 45: How the city speaks to us and how we speak back: rewriting the relationship between people and place
Rosanna Vitiello and Marcus Wilcocks