

MAKING SPACES FOR THE CREATIVE ECONOMY: SOME CHALLENGES TO OVERCOME

Manoel Rodrigues Alves
Universidade de São Paulo
Escola de Engenharia de São Carlos
Departamento de Arquitetura e Urbanismo
(address.): Avenida Trabalhador São-carlense, 400 – CEP 13560-970
Caixa Postal 359 – São Carlos / SP - BRASIL
(phones): (0xx16) 33739294
(fax): (0xx16) 33739310
(E-MAIL): MRA@SC.USP.BR

INTRODUCTION

The ideas presented in this paper investigate developments related to urbanization process of the contemporary city, in particular issues related to the public / private relationship. It is necessary to investigate parameters that conform the urban environment and its spatiality; aspects that, due to its public condition, diverse and hybrid morphology, and distinct landscape possibilities demand studies related to emerging urban forms and its referential universes culturally implemented.

Cities are social artifacts to be experienced, product of cultural phenomena of identity and diversity, not a reflection of consumerism and commercialization - fake objects of consumption. The idea of city, based on the sense of community - one that goes way back to ancient times – is consolidated by its collective spaces, public or private. Spaces that, at each time, are products of a particular combination of political, economical, social and cultural activities.

Considering a dialectic relation between public and private space, to produce the city is to provide public and private spaces as foundations of cultural forms. Urban quality is usually evaluated based on its public life – therefore, on the quality of public space. However, even considering that the notion of (public) space has never been exclusively associated to a geographically limited space, an open and indiscriminated one, in the contemporary society we are observing the transformation of the idea of (public) space¹. Changes that are related not only to the materiality of space (physical substratum), but also to its permanency, or ephemerality and de-territorialization (temporal substratum). If it is true that new forms of cultural expression and social communication open unexplored fields of investigation of urban and spatial structures, it is also true that they, simultaneously, threaten public life dimension and the idea of city.

In the contemporary heterotopic society, urban space of 'ageographical cities'² promotes new ambiguities. According to Sorkin, the urban space of the contemporary city can be identified as a thematic simulacrum concentrated in leisure and consumption zones. Artificial, pseudo public spaces characterized by increasing levels of manipulation and surveillance over citizenship, that results in new segregation methods – both technological and physical. Not only does it bring together what is ordinary and diverse, but it also creates new urban landscapes: material, political, economical and ethnical. These landscapes do not articulate

with each other, on the contrary, they may promote social and spatial segregation in a privatized and fragmentary space.

SOME CHALLENGES TO OVERCOME: URBAN SPATIALITY

In order to conceive a view of the contemporary city, we must understand the development of intervention strategies consistent with an attempt to generate a place³ in a scenario representative of the present urban phenomenological environment: where there is not only the chronological or linear sequencing, but also the simultaneity and the circumstantiality, in the same way that there is a dislocation from the bipolar notion of center/peripheral, to diffuse and undetermined territorialities. In this context, we understand it is more meaningful to search for new ways of producing urban structures- which recognize the nature of collective urban space as a space for experimenting, even if it proves wrong - than lead us through nostalgia and the brooding over conditions that no longer exist.

Auge⁴ qualifies the contemporary society as a super modern one, characterized by factual and spatial superabundance, and the individualization of the references⁴. The contemporary metropolis is subject to meaningful social and technological transformation processes of the multifaceted reality of a heterotopic, heterologic, and multireferencial society, probably to a greater extent than its own absorption ability. Also limited by a privatized neoliberal speech and by the media's leveling message it is constituting itself in an scenographical space – a city of 'constant renovated scenes'⁵.

The idea of city as a universal public asset, conformed by a public/private relationship, place of a heterogeneous conviviality, is being questioned. Transferring civic activities to private spaces, a different sense of urbanity transforms the public/private relationship and generates new spatialities and sociabilities in the so-called 'new public spaces' - in fact, they are atopic no-places of human alienation.

In this scenario, to investigate different approaches to promote new urban landscapes that reflect the creative economy is only possible if we also consider that the contemporary urban space results from a different sense of urbanity that transforms the public / private relationship. These landscapes, transferring civic activities to private space, promote new spatialities and sociabilities in a so-called 'new public spaces'.

New urbanization processes are present in the cities to produce new urban spatialities, caused by the trend to globalize the economy and information technology in societies. For example, strategies of the tertiary in a city of aesthetics and gentrification, associated to the private capital of great financial and industrial conglomerates lead to new urban structures of social segregation, which fosters a profound functional, cultural, and spatial reorganization. In an analysis of corporative urban megaprojects, Otilia Arantes identifies Potsdamer Platz intervention as an edge city. A particular one in which a new urbanity is based on a fake mixed public space (the promotional mix); a thematic park responsible for important changes in the social and architectural tissue of Berlin⁶.

As a rule, these structures incorporate the production of excluding collective, private, and privatized spaces, which are or are not spatially dissociated from the urban structure. They are characterized by privatization of public spaces and by different kinds of excluding spaces - scenografic images of the place⁷. Collective spaces of exclusion, simulacra of the authentic city. They create segregation through self-segregation, just like containers⁸. They provide distinct experiences of a hypothetical interior urbanity, longing for a progressive substitution of urban spaces from/of the social life.

Under the protective cover of modernity and globalization, these private collective spaces produce and lead to the impoverishment of the urban environment and a fake crisis of its

structures - from the point of view of the capital to the imaginary of ideological representations of the city -, through an increasing stratification and desertification of the city. In these spaces, there is no place for activities that have always been part of our urban experience: spontaneity, the illicit or indetermination. Pseudo public spaces for today's elite consumers, in fact collective spaces which disseminate the idea of a multifunctional use of the private space (distinct functionalities from a set of known functions) and sociability in selective and controlled spaces, which are closed or not, and which are full of visible and invisible signs of privatization of the public sphere in architecture. Therefore, a misinterpretation of the notion of public sphere, which must be understood as a political domain determined by a reciprocal dependence among collective physical and representational personification; a democratical domain where individuals become citizens and take part, as agents, on political life. As such, architectural place, independently from its scale or dimension, has political and ontological attributes (in the existential sense of Heidegger)⁹.

These simulacra of the city create a private city inside the public city through the production of artificial spaces for socialization: 'dissociated spaces of function-aggregation' (for instance, food courts), and not 'associative spaces of socialization'. In a time when individual experience is built up on displacement and detachment, urban space loses its social meaning allowing for an a-critical architecture – de-territorialized, reflect of consumerism and commercialization – that transforms the city in an aesthetic empty form. In fact, they are representative of something which is rarely taken into account: the knocking down of the private life, caused by the option of a culture of security and claustrophilia, which is the counterpart of the emptying of public life. Therefore, the equation of the former results form the latter.

Based, in theory, on the fact that technical means of communication free us from human contact, they question the need for conviviality of a urban place. However, individual mobility depends on a heterogeneous urban plot. In this plot, an ample gradient between public and private is present, characterizing a change of boundaries which many believe can offer possibilities of a new and richer social interaction. This interaction is the essence of the city and life in the city - to the detriment of experiencing, exchanging, meeting, strolling and so on. Simulacra of the city resulting from a presumed vanguard that is necessary to confront. Nevertheless, from the obsolescence of the classical notion of public space, the change in the relation between public and private, in a fragmented urban environment that does not correspond to a single city - but to micro cities defined by visible and invisible boundaries of social class, race, ethnicity, religion, etc - we observe the production of spaces of control, where architecture and urban design seem unable to promote anything but the development of radical changes, which replace the non contaminated magic of the obsolete through realism of the efficiency of strategies of the advanced tertiary, which lead to a selective consumption of time and space.

According to Boyer¹⁰, the urban representational model of the contemporary city envisages the city as an spetacle that corresponds to the global capital in constant flux. The image of the city of the spetacle, without territorials and physical specificities, represents the urbanity of urbanization processes more and more privatized. Representative of an increasingly stronger relationship between culture and capital, the contemporary urban model (related to a global economy and the eletronic communication world web) do not create representations of a social world. On the contrary, by means of image combination and recomposition, this urban model simulates and promotes urban environments that disregards any physical or social references. The model of the city as an spetacle has been constantly present in recent urban renewal proposals, mainly in central and historical areas. In these processes, the architectural role moves from a vehicle of modern urban reform utopies to the production of urban spetacles – ones that simulates images of urban landscapes in a fragmentary city. In

fact, we can say that these fragments, once reduced to the surface of urban appearances composed by isolate pictures, are cenographical spaces of visual consumerism¹¹.

Any investigation about 'making spaces for the creative economy', in an urbanistic sense, must come to terms with this and other issues of urban spatiality. The challenge to identify the main characteristics of urban space, new aspects of the configuration of the spatiality of the contemporary city, must also deal with some possible 'urban pitfalls'. For instance: that paradigms of urban morphology, in a time when individual experience is built up on displacement and detachment, when urban space loses its social meaning, may lead to an a-critical and de-territorialized architecture; that to consider the impact of information technologies on urban territorialities is quite different than arguing for an ephemeral architecture of scenographical urban spaces.

If we fail to deal with urban spaces in a way that is consistent with their real social importance, these approaches will weaken the urban identity and replace the tension individuality/community through homogenizing actions of technological means and business organizations. With their own codes of ethics and functional behavior, they limit activities that are part of the urban tissue of contemporary collective life of an 'ageographic' city – one of dissociated urban fragments, a stratified city with disconnected or immaterial parts, similar to a quilt of medieval ghettos and the 'electronic agora'.

In fact, when 'making' a city today, we observe a strong influence of urban interventions representative of gentrification processes, which generate social expelling and exclusion and reduce the complexity and heterogeneity of the urban environment to an aseptic vernacular landscape of security and civility. Actually, they materialize a polarized city that loses its identity and meaning, and it becomes ever time more difficult to perceive this city as a public object. Consequently, the conformation of the urban landscape, which results from the overlapping of socio-economic processes and historical times, is becoming increasingly threatened by projects with features of these so-called urban renovations. In these interventions, we observe determination strategies that not only hinder the possibility of wandering and choosing- since they do not present fruition forms exempt from intentionality - but also reduce this possibility¹² to a minimum. In this city, the urban space is defined through a logic of consuming goods and services, which privatizes the public space.

As a result, a city built by simulacra of urban spaces that disregards the importance of the place. Vectors of the creation of privatized fortresses ruled by isolation and claustrophobia they set aside the urban space, creating a fictional city ruled by the interiorization of functions of the 'old city'. In this 'ageographic' city of huge containers, of historical uniform gentrifications, of homogeneous gentrifications of urban renewal proposals of the private capital for the creative economy, we observe urban no-places. They are spaces of temporary occupation and anonymous confluence, flexible space-time contexts without identity, designed for the client, not for the citizen¹³.

Moreover, public debate elaboration cannot take place in no-places. If it does, it will mean the misinterpretation of the notion of public sphere. To think about the spatiality of the contemporary urban space - from the review of the notion of place as an existential space - we must take into account mediatic spaces and, eventually, the (i)mmateriality of the physical spaces (virtual space), in relation to other cultures of urban space. As well as, we must consider Augé's no-places, which are related to the counter-opposition between ephemerality and permanence in architecture, between cultural identity and the notion of place. The opposition between place and no-place shows that not only has the boundary between public and private changed - and has even been erased -, but it has also transformed the 'space of the public' into a space for consumption. Marc Augé has recently differentiated 'public space', as the institutional space where the public debate takes place - one that may have different forms, not always spatial ones, from 'space of the public', spaces

where people meet, experience, socialize and so on. Similarly, between 'private space', the space related to private matters and 'space of the private' – strictly related to spatial qualities, for instance, the hypermarket as a no-place of consumption¹⁴.

The production of space is eminently a social creation, since there is no space without human action, without activity by the society. It is from a civilizing process of human occupation that space is conceived, determined and configured as a product of organization and use of social forms.

Failing to consider this aspect will further human alienation in a time of estrangement before the world. An alienation based on the individual experience of dislocation and detachment, that becomes the common pattern of an architecture that easily transforms the city into an empty form. When it loses its social meaning, urban space loses its sense of belonging; as a result, dislocation takes place. The dislocation, which can only occur in relation to something that does not promote relations or identification, causes the loss of the sense of belonging. Consequently, it is the first stage of no-place; first stage because the absence of the sense of belonging does not necessarily mean absence of roots.

In the contemporary urban space different realities, products of different times, and people of different origins live together. In the urban space, heterogeneity, which is intrinsic and necessary, is at the same time fostered and crushed by the overlapping of coexistence. It results from a collage of urban forms, and is only possible in a society of mass production and communication, and where a kind of 'inflation' of products and information reigns.

Urbanization through consumption generates, or is generated by, a mass culture which is strong enough to control the popular culture, and which, in turn, reinterprets its role negatively many times. By creating spaces that deny the general context of the city, the users receive a urban space of a passive culture of alienation. For an architecture of the city that is not mainly concerned about the designing of a collective human space as physical support for citizenship, there is the corresponding failure of the public existence of the citizen.

From repeating to remembering, from historical to psychological, from collective to individual, the transformation of urban public space in private publicized spaces - representing an alienating architecture of mass culture - results in encapsulation of urban functions. This is the counter face of an architecture that denies public life.

SOME CHALLENGES TO OVERCOME: PUBLIC AND PRIVATE DOMAIN

The distinction between public and private¹⁵ has always been one of the main investigation aspects of the western urbanistic thought. The notion of public space appears in the utopist belief of a capitalist society of the XIX century, when the concept of private property and the institutional definition of collective rights (transformation into public rights) appeared. It means a space of inclusion that has free physical, intellectual and animical access, and that cannot be appropriated individually. Therefore, even not being able to absorb all the elements of collective life, every public space is, in essence, collective space. The concept of private space, however, is associated to the support of individual activities, individual or collective appropriation in an excluding way. It is related to the privacy of a certain space, occasionally segregated, which presents different degrees of collectivization.

However, this classic distinction between public and private became obsolete. This argument refers to the obsolescence of the classical distinction between public and private. In other words, we do not argue that the notion of public sphere is obsolete, the public *res* in the Roman Law, not even for the suppression of the distinction between public and private property. We argue that a different approach is necessary a different approach for the

comprehension of new social patterns in daily life spaces. Today, the distinction between public and private is anachronistic and restrictive, and does not respond anymore to the demands of the contemporary social plurality, for it limits the legitimate universe of contestation and promotes the appearance of pseudo public spaces of surveillance, control, and consumption. Such obsolescence results from extremely limited definitions of the concepts of space and public, which derive from insisting on the unity, the desire of fixed categories of space and time, or for having notions of public and private rigidly pre-conceived.

Arguing for the obsolescence of this distinction does not mean, absolutely, that it is necessary to agree with theoretical propositions about the death of the public space, but the need to reinterpret it. Arguments about abandon and deterioration of public space appear in the 60's, partially due to the bankruptcy of the modernist city functional model. However, the diverse factors that lead to the production of contemporary urban spatiality, which is conformed by physical structures that determine a sectarian and fragmentary city, are much more complex: for instance, what level of co-relation exists in the vicious circle established among social relations transformations (deterioration) and the production of an increasingly privatized city.

Far from assuming the failure of the public space, its degradation in a diversity of intermediate situations, we argue for the change, multiplicity and contestation that form its real nature: an understanding that is based not on loss, but on the possibility of constantly reinventing the urban place. If it is true that any investigation about the spatiality of the contemporary city must come to terms with new aspects of its configuration (to a certain extent result of new social and technical realities of a strongly mediatic society), it is also true that public spaces must be representative of public and social aspects - the urban locus of a new neo-existential approach.

To think about, aiming to conceive (design) spaces for the creative economy encompasses the investigation of the classic distinction between public and private. Based on the concepts of Augé about 'public space/space of the public/private space/space of the private', we propose the concept of collective spaces considering the notion of domain: both public and private and its limits, beyond the degree of collectivization of the private space.

According to Cerasi, collective space does not necessarily exist as a physical and recognizable fact. It is formed by a qualitative-evaluative factor (dimension and permanence), a cultural factor (historic and social question of meanings), and a spatial-geographical factor (urban and territorial insertion)¹⁶. Collective space, or its elements do not stand out if they fail to have a public function; besides, its totality is not a result of a specific cultural system that values meanings and hierarchies of the use of parts of the city. They belong to a complex sphere of inter-relations, strongly conditioned by aspects of collective memory, which should be part of any process of recovering urbanization patterns capable of providing heterogeneity to the city. In fact, as a system, it contemplates a combination of functions and elements, which characterize the possibility of overcoming the classic distinction between public and private.

In this process there are aspects regarding comprehension of a collective place and transmission of value of historical forms. Thinking about the past through the perception of a historical potential corresponds to the practical overcoming of the construction of a collective memory necessary to form urban places; memory (that is built from places full of meanings) and not history (which becomes concrete through events) - memory as a tool for conception of the present and history as a tool for understanding the past. Therefore, we underscore the public dimension of architecture both in the interiorization of collective memory and in conforming the boundaries to collective space.

In a scenario of a heterotopic society where: urban centralities are determined by great physical structures and/or by gentrification proposals of urban renewal; we observe a change in the monocentrality of the city and the bipolarity center/periphery of the model of industrial city; spatial redistribution follows dispersion patterns where monocentrality of the city opens the way to territorial pluricentrality; the phenomena of demographic explosion and customs implosion entail new patterns of urban morphology and force us to (re)think the city in light of today's multifaceted reality (associated to a new semantic of terms such as flows, dispersion, decentralization, and networks); to the synchronic space-time of the mnemonic landscape we also observe an asynchronous time, not serial, the time of pass-see-pass that mirrors the images of sporadic appearances and form a landscape in images of pass-time. In order to build collective space today we must take into account a variety of physical, emblematic, and iconic spaces; not just functional, programmatic and aesthetic ones. Places that do not only reflect a cultural order based on current social relations, but also enable its continuous (re)valorization, making way to aleatory space – space of undetermination, contestation - and not spatial forms of appropriation of public space, pretensely neutral. It is crucial that collective spaces be participatory, representing urban life and collective memory, and that they become elements of a multiform urban web: transfunctional spaces¹⁷, hybrid and multiple.

Collective spaces that correspond to the Heideggerian idea of 'making place' - 'making' as a compromise to a place, accordingly with Heidegger's thought that modern world, due to a new spatial mobility, has weakened the sense of "*being in place*". . Such idea has never been as important as it is now, for it has the notion that the building of a place means, undoubtedly, giving, not subtracting, and is associated to the need to establish a conceptual background. By investigating the neo-perception of a heterotopic and mutireferencial society, it (conceptual background) will be capable of exploring alternative answers to an increasingly private (and privatized) urban space - one where contemporary urban landscape transforms the symbolic public/private relationship.

The search for solutions that respond to the current spatial demands of urban and territorial reelaboration of the city requires an approach without any 'a priori', based on the diversity and singularity of a particular understanding of collective spaces structured on the notion of domain. A urban strategy that observe where and how to act. It is a matter of weaving places, conexions and interstices; revealing and highlighting contrasts, contradictions, and complexities of urban confrontation. Therefore, this heterogeneity opens the way for the richness of the city and its urban voids. It is necessary a notion of collective spaces, public or private, that may promote a better understanding of the osmotic and conflicting overlapping of domains, of territory demarcation and collectivization of the private space.

We understand that in architecture there are not 'semi' or 'almost' spaces. Spaces are and exist; they are concrete and ambiguous, not dubious. Therefore, we do not recognize any classification that uses the roots 'semi' or 'almost' - as, for example, semipublic or semiprivate - since this use leads to intentionally dubious concepts. We also understand that what is relevant is not an analysis of the functional specificity of collective spaces - since they are transfunctional - but an analysis of its modes of use. Urban spatial analysis should underscore the notions of domain and plurality, leaving aspects of hierarchy and dominance as secondary, and consider the notion of equipment inadequate (once dictated by a semantic fad reflects something functionally determined). The table that follows, based on the ideas presented, develops a conceptual framework of possibilities for the understanding (conception) of urban collective spaces.

COLLECTIVE SPACE ¹⁸	PROPERTY	DOMAIN	MODE OF USE	ACCESSIBILITY	SPATIAL CONTINUITY
	Private	Privatist	Individual	Nonexistent	Nonexistent
		Particular	Collectivized	Determined	Undetermined
		Publicized	Collectivized	Controlled	Variable
	Public	Particular	Privatist	Determined	Undesired
		Privatized	Collectivized	Controlled	Variable
		Public	Collective	Free	Existent

THE CONTEMPORARY CITY: STILL SOME REMARKS

In the a-topic and privatized city of no-places of human alienation - caused by an heterotopic, heterologic, and multireferential contemporary society, subjected to urban transformation processes determined by the global capital of the advanced tertiary- some questions remain, no matter the classification or posture. One of the questions refers to the need to change, from a commercial or institutional strategy - conceived to associate social value to private areas - to a cultural strategy geared at creating auxiliary structures of greater cultural and social importance: for instance, new extensions of museums (in fact, small shops) in malls, like the Museum of Modern Art (MAM) in São Paulo - Villa-Lobos and Paulista shopping centers. It is not a matter of questioning if we should, or should not, facilitate the access to works of art, or if the museums should be more democratic. It is a matter of what cultural policy we talk about, in fact, of a commercial culturalization of collective spaces that present a publicized domain and a collectivized mode of use. In reality, these MAM's areas respond to marketing strategies, half a way between consumerism and entertainment.

Another question refers to what extent new urban space of pluricentrality is characterized by a hierarchy – pluricentrality that should not consider pluriexpulsion or pluriexclusion processes. If it is, we ask what kind of hierarchy and relations we are talking about. Occasional resulting urban structures that recognize the urban environment as projectual content 'per se' may interact with the existing conditions, both supplementing and subverting aspects of architectural practice. From these structures, which are necessarily open and flexible, references may emerge, signs for the solution of an architecture more representative of the context.

Therefore, thinking about the contemporary city calls for projectual postures that enable construction, not of pathetic stylized elements overlapped to the urban space, but symbolic collective spaces applied to, or potentially defining urban places to avoid loss of meaning in architecture. Urban design (of porosity and connectivity, multiplicity and capillarity) and social program of collective spaces, not the mere production of commercial spaces resulting from privatization of public space must be the components of intervention strategies in the metropolis and its public animation.

This search, in a world that is not alone and which does not present only one truth, must aim at dissolving the non-contaminated magic of the obsolete and substituting it with the reality of urban life, and not the realism of an empty efficiency. Instead of rationalizing over reality, it values time and space experimentation, the rediscovery of sensitivity and poetic characteristics when redefining urban space.

Understanding urban experience as a multifaceted reality calls for a redefinition geared at the humanist rebirth of architectonic form in rebuilding the conception and perception of architecture, in case we are willing to overcome what was put in crisis by a global hyper-mediated society in the pos-industrial era. In this crisis, the loss of reality in urban life is the other side of the coin in an architecture that is unable to show anything but an image (void of

stimulus and knowledge), and vice-versa, in the conformation of the urban environment and its collective spaces.

A particular view of time as another dimension of space, as well as the task of qualifying them is in the very essence of architecture. As an instrument of organization, rationalization, and transformation, it is architecture's job to transform the organic in inorganic, the non-civilized in civilized, the empty in constructed. However, above all, it is architecture's job to 'make places'. It is necessary to search for other types of urban collective spaces not tried before, different from the ones representative financial dogmas - ambiguous spaces of invention as producers of knowledge of new spatialities -, which can offer new connections with the city and today's culture. Obviously it is necessary to consider economical issues and the impact of information technology on urban spatialization: however, to consider, not necessarily to accept, thus avoiding the development of a techno-aesthetic view of alienation from context. Only this way will it be possible to long for an architecture that is not transformed into a technocrat, technician and economicist product of a supposedly global technological vanguard, which believes in itself as a pretense innovative means- in fact, innovation as mere commercial (re) production.

In order to avoid building cities through simulacra of reality - globalized fac-similes of empty and aseptic forms -, it is mandatory to approach the construction of urban environment, on the basis of today's society, by means of creating social and political urban spaces. Collective transfunctional spaces based on the notion of domain, which can promote the exercise of citizenship in its full potential - not as one more label of a product - and allow for citizens practicing their civil and political rights.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALVES, M. R. *ESPAÇOS COLETIVOS: UM ENTENDIMENTO PARTICULAR*. in 'Anais-CD' 51^o Congresso Internacional de Americanistas, PAT-7 'A Cidade nas Américas. Perspectivas da Forma Urbanística no Século XXI'. Santiago: 2003.
ESPAÇOS COLETIVOS E A CIDADE CONTEMPORÂNEA. Doctoral Thesis, Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo, Universidade de São Paulo. São Paulo, 2001.
- ARANTES, A. *PAISAGENS PAULISTANAS: TRANSFORMAÇÕES DO ESPAÇO PÚBLICO*. Campinas: UNICAMP Editora, 2000.
- ARANTES, O. BERLIM RECONQUISTADA. FALSA MISTURA E OUTRAS MIRAGENS. in 'Espaço e Debates, num 43-44, pages 28-50. São Paulo, 2003.
URBANISMO EM FIM DE LINHA. São Paulo: EDUSP, 1998.
- ARGULLOL, R. *A CIDADE TURBILHÃO*. in 'Cidades. Revista do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional, num 34', pages 191-203. Rio de Janeiro: 2001.
- AUGÉ, M. *NO-LUGARES Y ESPACIO PÚBLICO*. in 'Quaderns, num 231', pages 6-15. Barcelona: 2001.
NÃO-LUGARES: UMA INTRODUÇÃO A UMA ANTROPOLOGIA DA SUPERMODERNIDADE. Campinas: Papyrus Editora, 1994.
- BONOMI, A. *IL DISTRETTO DEL PIACERE*. Turin: Bolatti Boringhieri, 2000.
- BOURDIER, M. *OPPURTUNISM OF THE SERVICE OF THE CITY. PUBLIC AND PRIVATE IN METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT*. in 'Casabella, num 608-609', pages 86-93. Milan, 1994.
- BOYER, M. C. *CITY OF COLLECTIVE MEMORY: ITS HISTORICAL IMAGERY AND ARCHITECTURE ENTERTAINMENTS*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996.
- CALHOUN, C. *HABERMAS AND THE PUBLIC SPHERE*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.
- CERASI, M. *EL ESPACIO COLECTIVO DE LA CIUDAD*. Barcelona: Oikos-Tau S.A., 1990.
- CRAWFORD, M. *EVERYDAY URBANISM*. New York: The Monacelli Press, 1999.
- DAVIS, M. *CIDADE DE QUARTZO: ESCAVANDO O FUTURO EM LOS ANGELES*. São Paulo: Scritta Editorial, 1993.
- DEUTSCHE, R. *AGORAPHOBIA*. in 'Evictions, art and spatial politics', pages 269-376. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996.
- DILNOT, C. *THE DECISIVE TEXT ON BEGINNING TO READ HEIDEGGER'S BUILDING, DWELLING AND THINKING*. in 'The Harvard Architectural Review', num. 8, pages 161-187. New York: 1992.

- FRAMPTON, K.** *ON READING HEIDEGGER.* in 'Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: an anthology of architectural theory 1965-1995', pages 440-446. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.
- GANDELSONAS, M.** *X-URBANISM.* New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999.
- JAMESON, F.** *POSTMODERNISM, OR, THE CULTURAL LOGIC OF LATE CAPITALISM.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.
- MONTANER, J.M.** *ESPACIO Y ANTIESPACIO, LUGAR Y NO LUGAR EN LA ARQUITECTURA MODERNA.* in 'La Modernidad Superada: arquitectura, arte y pensamiento del siglo XX', pages 25-58. Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, S.A., 1999.
- NORBERG-SCHULZ, C.** *HEIDEGGER'S THINKING ON ARCHITECTURE.* in 'Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: an anthology of architectural theory 1965-1995', pages 429-439. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.
- SANTOS, M.** *A NATUREZA DO ESPAÇO.* São Paulo: Hucitec, 1999.
- SOLÁ-MORALES, I.** *METROPOLIS.* Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, S.A., 2005.
TERRITORIOS. Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, S.A., 2002.
- SOLÁ-MORALES, M.** *EL ESPACIO DE LA CIUDAD.* in Seminário Internacional Centro XXI. Transcrição de Palestra. São Paulo: 1995.
- SORKIN, M.** *VARIATIONS ON A THEME PARK.* New York: Hill and Wang: 1992.
- UNGER, R.** *PUBLIC SPACE: FROM PUBLIC TO SOCIAL SPACE.* in 'GSD News, Winter-Spring', pages 3-14. Cambridge: 1995.
- YOUNG, I.** *CITY LIFE AND DIFFERENCE.* in 'Metropolis: center and symbol of our times', pages 250-270. New York: New York University Press, 1995.
- ZUKIN, S.** *APRENDENDO COM DISNEY WORLD.* in 'Espaço e Debates, num 43-44, pages 11-27. São Paulo, 2003.
THE CULTURE OF CITIES. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.
LANDSCAPES OF POWER. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

ENDNOTES

¹ After the second world war, the search for the public space in the city lace promoted by the CIAMs. Now, public space and urban landscape in terms of a sophisticated scenario of visual imagery, representative of a particular and privatized logic (of great financial conglomerates) of intervention strategies in spatial, social and cultural aspects of the contemporary metropolis.

² Sorkin, M. [2001]

³ Place as space with identity, one which meaning is given by the user; not as an abstract localization, or a geometric space, but as an existencial space. While space has mathematical properties and dimensions, place has existential ones; space has a tri-dimensional structure of its components, while place has a character related to memory, a particular and existencial atmpshere. Place is related to phenomenological processes of perception and living experience. Today, due to changes in the space-time-movement relationship, associated to a distinct neo-perception/. [Solá-Morales, I., 2002]

⁴ [Augé, M., 1994:42]

⁵ [Argullol, R., 1994:60]

⁶ [Arantes, O., 2003]; in Tokyo, Ark Hills of Mori Corporation, developed on the 80's, is another example of an urban renewal proposal that transformed a traditional area of the city [Bourdier, M., 1994]

⁷ [Arantes, A., 2000:12]

⁸ *Containers* understood as collective spaces designed as chain production processors of real state and mercantile capital, which would presumably enrich the city, but submit the social capital (cultural, commercial and leisure) to its accumulation needs; physical structures representative of contemporary mass culture – one whose central objective is consumption.

⁹ [Habermas, J. in Calhoun, C., 1996]. The notion of public sphere goes back to the greek state-city, in the greek polis the collective sphere of free citizens – *koiné* –, opposed to the private sphere (*oikos*) of each individual – *idia*.

¹⁰ [Boyer, M., 1996]

¹¹ Jameson argues that culture, aesthetics, space-time relationship and high technology euphoria are always part of experiences related to consumption societies, in such a way that the (urban) social space is nowadays completely saturated by a culture of images. [Jameson, F., 1991]

¹² Encounter and choice are existencial dimensions of the city; encounter is basically an act of orientation, while choice entails identification. In the production of excluding controlled spaces – such

as malls, shopping centers and closed residential condominiums, where public life has to conform with pre-determined rules -, these existential dimensions are strongly suppressed.

¹³ “If a place can be defined as *identitary, relational and historical*, a space that can not be defined as *identitary, relational or historical* defines a *no-place*.” [Augé, M., 1994:73]

¹⁴ [Augé, M., 2001:6]

¹⁵ The word public appears in Solon’s decree, not as a logical category, but related to sensitivity to the other. For Solon, the Greek common logic, *logon didonai* that comes from *legien*, (assembly), do not constitute a public – public that is basis for a logical activity only if there is consciousness of the other. In the contemporary heterologic and heterotopic society, this greek distinction must be reinterpreted under the notion of a public domain, one capable of answering not only to sensitivity to the other but also to plural differences.

¹⁶ [Cerasi, M., 1990:88]

¹⁷ Transfunctional space: polifunctional space where the physical structures, due to a certain degree of indetermination, allow for encounter and collective action. Once they are indetermined, they can deal with plurallism and diversity, transferring consensus, coherence and universality to multifunctional space. Polifuncional spaces, spaces that allow for a certain overlapping of known functions – as such, to a limited degree of indetermination. Multifuncional space: made of certain physical structures, that eventually present a certain level of overlapping and inter-relation, within a set of known functions, therefore leaving no room for indetermination.

¹⁸ The word individual does not refer to an individual, but to a group that controlling the access to a specific space transform it in a space of social exclusion; particular to a particular, specific group. It is also understood that the access to a collective private and publicized space, despite its mode of use, is variable due to land management. Also that spatial continuity refers to space articulation, without losing territorial definition between public and private urban space.