

CONSIDERAÇÕES SOBRE A EXPERIÊNCIA URBANA DOS LOTEAMENTOS RESIDENCIAIS MURADOS

CONSIDERACIONES SOBRE LA EXPERIENCIA URBANA DE CONJUNTOS RESIDENCIALES CON MUROS

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE URBAN EXPERIENCE OF WALLED RESIDENTIAL ALLOTMENTS

Murilo Petito CAVALCANTI¹

RESUMO: Condomínios fechados e demais loteamentos residenciais murados têm se destacado nas últimas décadas como produto rentável para o setor imobiliário, sobretudo quando direcionados as camadas mais abastadas da sociedade. O presente trabalho tem por objetivo abordar esses empreendimentos do ponto de vista de seu impacto sobre a morfologia urbana das cidades e das formas de uso e apropriação dos espaços que se originam a partir da imposição da barreira física dos muros.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Loteamentos residenciais murados. Condomínios fechados. Morfologia urbana. Espaço público.

RESUMEN: Conjuntos residenciales cerrados y demás lotes residenciales con muros se han destacado en las últimas décadas como un producto rentable para el sector inmobiliario, sobretudo cuando estos son direccionados a las clases sociales más ricas de la sociedad. El trabajo a seguir tiene por objetivo abordar estos emprendimientos del punto de vista de su impacto sobre la morfología urbana de las ciudades y de las formas de uso y apropiación de los espacios que se originan a partir de la imposición de la barrera física de los muros.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Lotes residenciales con muros. Conjuntos residenciales cerrados. Morfología urbana. Espacio publico.

ABSTRACT: Gated communities and other walled residential allotments have been highlighted in recent decades as a rewarding product for the real estate sector, especially when directed to the richer social groups. This paper aims to approach these enterprises from the point of view of their impact on the urban morphology of cities and the forms of use and appropriation of spaces that originate from the imposition of the physical barrier of the walls.

KEYWORDS: Walled residential allotments. Private condominiums. Urban morphology. Public space.

¹ São Paulo State University (UNESP), Araraquara – SP – Brazil. Master's Degree student in Social Sciences. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4326-5872>. E-mail: murilocavalcanti10@gmail.com

Introduction

The modern experience of cities, which included the principles of social interaction and communication, has also become a concentrated depository of insecurities and fears of life in cities. Capitalist urbanization, in these terms, originated the production of a new public space, as well as private spaces for socialization, to the same extent that it instituted new dangers for the ways of inhabiting this space.

The establishment of a contradiction that we can define between “living in the city” and “fearing the city” points to the emergence of mechanisms of segregation and isolation, already possible to be observed in the course of the 19th century bourgeois modernization, as demonstrated in the following. The inequalities present in the differences in position in the production process translated into inequalities in the occupation of space. Therefore, tensions are established regarding the condition of living in space and its resulting (im)possibilities of appropriation.

Currently, we see new structures of segregation and socio-spatial isolation emerging. Accompanied by innovations in capitalist accumulation methods and the emergence of new markets, a new type of urban residential development stands out as a real estate product. This type of enterprise, referred to here as walled residential subdivisions, will be explored in the course of this work.

In the last decades of the twentieth century, a *habitat* model diversified and globalized became known as gated communities (CFs), or what I name in this work of walled residential allotments. I call walled residential subdivisions trying to avoid inconsistencies regarding the condominium shape, which, according to the Law², does not extend to the totality of urban developments adapted to the structure of enclosed houses that I will address. This expression aims to cover exclusively the horizontal form of this type of urban enterprise, due to the particular interest in the way these spaces promote socio-spatial fragmentation.

Walled residential subdivisions are understood as a socio-spatial formation that is based on: 1) the privatization of security; 2) controlled, supervised and restricted accessibility; 3) in a perimeter surrounded by walls and security cameras; 4) in privatized internal equipment for collective use by residents. In this way, walled residential subdivisions are what Sposito and

² There are two laws in Brazil that aim to establish the parameters for the parceling of new land plots in the urban space, namely: Law 4,591, promulgated in 1964, and Law 6,766, of 1979. The condominium legal regime is restricted to Law 4,591. The 1979 Law establishes other guidelines for urban subdivision. Federal Law 13,465/17 adds to Article 2 of Law 6,766/79, which defines controlled access allotment to the form of allotment whose access control of which will be regulated by the Municipal Government, and the impediment of access to pedestrians or drivers is prohibited of non-resident vehicles, duly registered or registered.

Góes (2013) sought to define by new urban *habitats*³ and are part of what Caldeira (2011) took as fortified enclaves⁴.

The present work considers the origin of the current walled residential subdivisions and the changes in the sense of the modern public space for the understanding of the urban dilemmas posed from these enterprises. The hypothesis presented is that the walled residential subdivisions are a substantial change in the sense of modifying the morphology of cities and the (re)production of socio-spatial inequalities.

The modern city and the new public space:

In 1845, **The Condition of the Working Class in England**, Engels narrates the construction of the industrial city, describing the degradation of the working-class neighborhoods as opposed to the spaces of wide streets and beautiful facades inhabited by the bourgeoisie. While the working class had dark, fetid environments in which all kinds of illnesses proliferated and circulated, the bourgeoisie had facilities of all kinds, in addition to being far from all the degradation that industrial workers faced daily.

The text elucidates the way in which the inequality of living/inhabiting conditions was present to a large extent in the socio-spatial construction of the industrial city, in the course of bourgeois modernization. We can see from Engels' descriptions how socio-spatial segregation has become a hallmark of cities built by the bourgeois mode of production. About Manchester, Engels writes:

The upper bourgeoisie inhabits luxury villas, landscaped, farther away, in Chorlton and Ardwick or else on the hills of Cheetham Hill, Broughton and Pendleton, where the healthy country air flows, in large and comfortable houses, served, every fifteen or thirty minutes by bus to the city center. The middle bourgeoisie lives on good streets, closer to the working class neighborhoods, especially in Chorlton and in the lower areas of Cheetham Hill (ENGELS, 2008, p. 89).⁵

The paradox of the modern city exposed by Engels is related to the way in which capitalist material progress has been unable to translate into improvements in the housing

³ They are new urban habitats since "they represent not only a new way of living, but new ways of living and understanding the city and the urban" (SPOSITO; GÓES, 2013, p. 42).

⁴ "Privatized, closed and monitored spaces for home, consumption, leisure or work" (CALDEIRA, 2011, p. 13).

⁵ A alta burguesia habita viviendas de luxo, ajardinadas, mais longe, em Chorlton e Ardwick ou então nas colinas de Cheetham Hill, Broughton e Pendleton, por onde corre o sadio ar do campo, em grandes e confortáveis casas, servidas, a cada quinze ou trinta minutos, por ônibus que se dirigem ao centro da cidade. A média burguesia vive em ruas boas, mais próximas dos bairros operários, sobretudo em Chorlton e nas áreas mais baixas de Cheetham Hill (ENGELS, 2008, p. 89).

conditions of the dispossessed layers. On the contrary, what was found was an enormous expansion of the spaces of misery present throughout England, where was evident the contrasts between a “population” of low population density, which had conditions worthy of existence from its urban structures, and of a “city” in which workers were huddled together and lived with homogeneity, unhealthiness, with poorly ventilated spaces and inhospitable streets.

The return to Engels' essay is a way of observing how the process of housing construction and urbanization itself has been driven by bourgeois activity since the beginning of the industrial city. From this reading, it can be said that socio-spatial segregation has always been a characteristic of the capitalist city. The distance between the bourgeois neighborhoods and the working-class neighborhoods was already evident in Engels' time. Taking the case of Manchester as an example, there is a gradation between the classes, clearly translated into the urban space: from the degrading working-class neighborhoods, to the slightly closer neighborhoods of the middle bourgeoisie and to the far more sumptuous spaces of the upper bourgeoisie.

The theme of security, the search for protection and distinction in the space of cities, therefore, had received attention since the construction of the modern city. The modern world, on the one hand, was a symbol of overwhelming progress that rose the production of goods to levels never imagined, on the other, it was a producer of acute social inequalities and an exponential increase in crime and the insecurities of urban life. However, despite the production of urban dilemmas related to violence and insecurities, the modern city provided the construction of a new public space where exchanges and contact between different social groups were possible, immersed in large urban agglomerations, in which individuals were faced with new conditions of being affected by the unprecedented possibilities of life in the urban.

As Jacobs (2000) observed, the modern city remodeled our notions of public space, bringing to human life a dimension of breadth in relation to exchanges and contact with different social groups. This process is the result of a transition from community to urban life, in which the old characteristics that made up communal life had already disintegrated with the modern experience of cities, which were increasingly constituted as spaces of strangeness and contact between the various social groups.

Baudelaire's poetry is also a rich source for understanding the sensations aroused by the modern city. Disenchantment with the contradictions of technological development inhabited the poet, who sought through the “flâneur” to capture the transformations of his historical time through the spaces of the city. Benjamin (2015), inspired by this heroic figure of modernity immortalized by Baudelaire, the “flanêur”, describes 19th century Paris as a vibrant

environment, a territory teeming with the birth of a concept of urban modernity. The “flanêur” revives in the imaginary the idea of a passerby citizen, who manages to take the city artistically in a kind of distance from the chaos and insecurity of modern cities, even without completely moving from the space in which it is inserted. The idea of this being that roams the city goes back to values based on the experience of the modern city of accessibility, free movement and mobility.

In Benjamin, the “flâneur” represents precisely the spirit of mobility present in modernity. When walking through the “boulevards”, the streets and bars in a kind of permanent leisure, a feeling of curiosity aroused by the modern experience of cities is revealed, in a yearning to understand what their new spaces could mean for human life, in addition to latent inequality and the hassles of metropolization.

In the nineteenth century, therefore, it was possible to observe the existence of an urban environment that produced socio-spatial inequalities on an expanded scale in concomitance with the extension of capitalist social relations of production, as well as, when producing space, created conditions for its appropriation. To appropriate the space, in this context, was to be in relationship with a new public space and with the possibilities of urban life that emerged. Bohemia, leisure devoid of a bucolic character, the new forms of socialization produced by leisure and agglomeration spaces are all integral parts of the life that animated this nascent urban scene.

The twentieth century and the new divisions of modernity: the remodeling of urban geographies

The 20th century will be the stage for profound changes in the historical role of cities and in their forms of appropriation by human life. As I try to demonstrate below, the traumas of war and the destruction of the “certainties” of solid modernity⁶, in the terms of Bauman (2001), they also meant a break with the values of the modern experience of cities, which will start to be structured based on the constitutive effects of liquid modernity⁷, especially in relation to fear, which will mark the resurgence of confinement and socio-spatial isolation mechanisms.

⁶ Bauman defines solid modernity as a time of high balance between social structures, where people lived according to a series of stable norms, traditions and institutions. In this context, most members of the working class had relative job security, which contributed to a sense of direction and progression in life. In short, solid modernity can be characterized as a self-assured, rational, bureaucratically organized, relatively predictable and stable scenario.

⁷ The term “liquid” is used by Bauman as a metaphor for human life, characterized by being mobile, amorphous, difficult to contain and predict. Liquid modernity is a time when individual certainties regarding employment, health and well-being no longer exist. The notion of “a job for life” is no longer a reality. The structuring factors

The expansion of modern industry and the consequent scarcity of raw materials resulting from the unbridled exploitation of the natural environment by European industry caused the bourgeoisies of industrial nations to start looking for new sources of resources for the continuity of their production, which involved the developed nations in two great world wars in the 20th century and the overdeveloped portion of the globe subjugated the underdeveloped portion to excessive exploitation, population genocide and the extermination of the culture and traditions of these peoples.

After World War II, in the context of the Cold War, a new state model emerged in response to the disrepute in Western living standards. The so-called Welfare State provided the basis for a life that would seek to structure itself around an welfare state, which would play a role in the provision of employment, health and well-being. Although it was not immune from contradictions, the Welfare State, as a decisive historical agent in times of solid modernity, provided levels of relative security and well-being in European and US life, places where it can be said that, in fact, that the Social State has existed for a period.

The contradictions between capital and labor already in the 1970s and the new requirements for the accumulation and reproduction of capital, however, would mean that the Social State did not have a long life. The pressures for the wage squeeze, deregulation and liberalization of economies around the globe would cause a radical change in the roles of the State, which would strip itself of its obligations in relation to the provision of the dignity of the lives of its citizens. This passage, which marks the rise of the neoliberal state, was accompanied by an ideology of the self-made man, that hardworking individual who does not depend on outside assistance for professional success and guarantees a comfortable and safe life.

The hypermobility of capital movements (related to deindustrialization and financialization), deregulation, the weakening of the bargaining power of labor in relation to capital, also resulting from a wasting of unions, the new forms of contracting in the expansion of outsourced work, the withdrawal of the State from the provision of social assistance in the form of jobs, basic health and well-being services and a new ideological package of attack on collective movements and encouragement of individual effort, summarizes, briefly, the founding characteristics of this new model of capitalist accumulation what was conventionally called neoliberalism.

According to Harvey (2011), capital was re-empowered in relation to work due to the production of unemployment and deindustrialization, immigration, relocation and all sorts of

of solid modernity that also underpinned the identities of individuals dissipate, causing the members of society to be in a state of permanent indeterminacy and fluid identities.

technological and organizational changes such as subcontracting. Beginning in the 1970s, the world was reorganized according to new neoliberal principles:

The mental conceptions of the world have been reformulated, as far as possible, with the use of neoliberal principles of individual freedom, necessarily incorporated in the free market and free trade. This required the regression of the welfare state and the progressive scrapping of the regulatory framework that had been built in the early 1970s (such as environmental protection). New forms of consumer niche and individualized lifestyles also suddenly appeared, built around a postmodern urbanization style (Disneyfication of city centers and gentrification), in addition to the emergence of social movements around a mixture of egocentric individualism, identity politics, multiculturalism and sexual preference (HARVEY, 2011, p. 110).⁸

These grouped factors are part of what this and other authors⁹ read as a reshaping of urban geographies. Globally, capital has less and less ties to the local. At the site, mechanisms of confinement and socio-spatial isolation are reappearing in response to a new order that has turned out to be chaotic, violent and troubled. Enclaves of all kinds appear, which contribute to a massive privatization of the urban space. The structuring values of the modern experience of cities related to free circulation, accessibility and mobility are dispersed in an environment of restricted, controlled and supervised spaces, with the presence of private security guards and cameras scattered in all corners.

As an addition to segregation, the urban now witnesses large-scale fragmentation, which means that, in environments where this phenomenon is radicalized, some cities resemble true mosaics. As we tried to demonstrate at the beginning of this work, socio-spatial segregation is a phenomenon prior to fragmentation, something also highlighted by Sposito and Góes (2013). In the course of bourgeois modernization, it was already possible to observe the dissonance between the working-class neighborhoods with terrible conditions of existence and the sumptuous bourgeois neighborhoods. In the countries of late modernization there was also the segregation that accompanied the incipient processes of urbanization. In the Brazilian case, the rise of irregular housing in the form of tenements and favelas was the refuge of freed workers

⁸ As concepções mentais do mundo foram reformuladas, na medida do possível, com o recurso aos princípios neoliberais da liberdade individual, necessariamente incorporados no livre-mercado e no livre-comércio. Isso exigiu a regressão do Estado de bem-estar social e o sucateamento progressivo do quadro regulatório que tinha sido construído no início dos anos 1970 (como a proteção ambiental). Novas formas de nicho de consumo e estilos de vida individualizados também apareceram de repente, construídos em torno de um estilo pós-moderno de urbanização (a Disneyficação dos centros das cidades e a gentrificação), além do surgimento de movimentos sociais em torno de uma mistura de individualismo egocêntrico, política de identidade, multiculturalismo e preferência sexual (HARVEY, 2011, p. 110).

⁹ See: Davis (2006); Sassen (2016).

and immigrants who did not have any conditions to take shelter in the midst of emerging urbanity.

With the advancement of neoliberalism and the resulting changes in the patterns of human life, new affects begin to guide the actions of individuals. The “self-entrepreneur” individual, as described by Ehrenberg (2010), is deeply unprotected from social structures that could provide a feeling of security for existence. In this context, fear becomes the primary affect of liquid modernity (BAUMAN, 2001).

The new relations of this globalized and fragmented world and the opportunities to accumulate capital for a highly speculative market, such as real estate, are the opportunity for walled fortresses to proliferate where it would be possible to rescue a safe and comfortable lifestyle that was no longer present in the space of cities.

The origin of the current walled residential subdivisions

Regarding the origin of walled residential subdivisions, two theses are presented below. The first is about the inspiration made possible by the Garden City model¹⁰ of Ebenezer Howard (1850 – 1928), as a kind of ideological origin of this contemporary socio-spatial formation. The second is linked to an approach from a historical perspective, which points out that pre-modern European fortified cities are embryonic of the current walled residential subdivisions.

Using the Howard model, it is possible to ascertain the existence of more incompatibilities than similarities with the current form of walled residential subdivisions. Howard's work was inspired by an attempt to respond to the collateral urban effects of industrialization, such as the increase in population density, the rural exodus and the precarious sanitary and housing conditions in the neighborhoods of salaried workers. The Howardian idea was to redistribute the population while preserving the values of community in a new social organization characterized by a center occupied by public buildings and a garden, crossed by “boulevards” of houses suited to the preference and taste of each resident. The surroundings would be composed of industries and businesses.

Despite the possible associations, two factors can be observed that discredit Garden City as the ideological origin of today's walled residential subdivisions. The first concerns land ownership, which is related to the failure of the Howard model in the USA¹¹. Howard

¹⁰ **Tomorrow a Peaceful Path to Real Reform** (1898); edited as **Garden Cities of Tomorrow** (1902).

¹¹ Mckenzie (*apud* RAPOSO, 2012) highlights the failure of Radburn's North American experience, which housed approximately 500 families. The promoter City Housing Corporation went bankrupt in 1934. Radburn's physical

maintained that Garden City's land should be private, but that this privatization should remain collective, making it impossible for residents to be particularly owners of plots and housing units. The residents would conform to the condition of tenants. Especially from the investors' point of view, this model would be difficult to apply in North American lands.

The second factor is linked to the context in which Howard's work was conceived, guided by the belief in progress and enlightenment reason as a way to end society's conflicts. Raposo (2012) states that Howard's thought contained the essentials of the Enlightenment ideas, as well as values from other ideological currents such as industrialism, the romantic appeal to nature and universalism. These purposes contrast with the conservative form of walled residential allotments, which do not intend to solve the problems of the city, but are configured as places of refuge and distinction for the wealthier strata.

The other thesis in question places pre-modern European fortified cities as the first historical example of what is currently shaped in the form of walled residential allotments. The mention of the walls and gates that protected the traditional cities from foreign threats does not seem sufficient to mark them as embryos of the residential walled subdivisions fundamentally because this current socio-spatial formation stands out as one of the developments of the socio-spatial segregation of the bourgeois cities. The modern city has few relations with its traditional formation, mainly due to the new correlation of forces and forms of conflict between the social classes in question. Modern society inaugurates an era in which strangeness and contact between different social groups is exacerbated and tensioned due to the new social division of labor, which inspires fears and doubts that did not exist before.

Raposo (2012) points out that the traditional social order did not need physical distance to guarantee its enormous social distances. In fact, modernity, with the advent of industrialization and urbanization, brings with it the assumptions of socio-spatial segregation. The parallels between the new bourgeois world and the intensification of social tensions, which reflects in the search for socio-spatial distance between social classes, has a clear historical example in Haussmann's operation in Paris, which aimed at a hygienist opening in the city center, a reserved place to elites, pushing the subordinate classes to the periphery of the city.

In this sense, the statement by Raposo (2012) seems to us to be true for those who cannot reach the middle of the 18th century in relation to the existence of gated communities. During this period, in London, a residential square was privatized by a collective of residents. This phenomenon was seen as “a representation of one of the first expressions of the desire for class

shape ended up signifying yet another suburban division not consistent with the effective population redistribution sought by Howard.

segregation, domestic isolation and privatized open space that would later form the basis of suburban life” (LAWRENCE *apud* RAPOSO, 2012, p. 180). The Anglo-American suburbs followed the English residential squares, containing houses isolated from each other by collective bucolic spaces, walls that isolated the surroundings and from which the entrance and exit access was controlled. The author also points out that it is significant that this suburban model has emerged, in the English case, in a pioneering way in industrial cities such as Manchester and Liverpool.

Notably, the suburbs represent an alternative bourgeois habitat that offers homogeneity and social exclusion. In addition, this housing model emerges precisely from specific urban conditions arising from the processes of bourgeois modernization, which can be summarized, briefly, in England and the USA. It is recognized, therefore, that the suburbs are the real historical precursors of what I take here for walled residential allotments since their similarities with the current model are linked both to the morphology of the walled residential allotments, and to aspects related to socio-spatial segregation between Social classes.

In global terms, in the 1970s, residential projects closed by walls resurfaced. The first specimens were located in tourist areas, especially in the state of California, in the United States. In the context of the 1970s, these developments were mostly apartment buildings. This remains until the 1980s, when the horizontal shape became effective, aimed at the suburbs.

Since the 1980s, there has already been a diversification and globalization of walled residential subdivisions, which are also expanding beyond the metropolitan areas and increasingly moving towards the edges of the city. In some cases, these houses started to have commercial and business centers inside them, in the model of American news towns and edge cities.

With few exceptions, it can be said that from the 1990s onwards, the shape of walled residential subdivisions had already spread to practically every corner of the globe. In the European continent, the phenomenon is prevalent in the south and east and in England, with absence in the north and west (RAPOSO, 2012). Since then, this form of socio-spatial confinement and fragmentation is booming as a prominent product in the real estate market and as a palliative solution to problems related to insecurity and fear in cities.

History of walled residential subdivisions in Brazil:

We have that the first closed urban developments date back to 1928 in São Paulo. However, it is only in the 1970s that apartments will become widespread, in the course of the

explosion in the construction sector and the financing facilities found in the period. The walled residential subdivisions, in turn, would take place in a consolidated manner in the 1980s, at least in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro¹².

In the 1970s, residential buildings were still located in the central portion of the city, and in the 1990s the form of walled residential allotments was already grouped in more distant areas. Also in 1990 the concentration of a much wider range of social areas and equipment for collective use, no longer restricted to playgrounds, but now having gyms, multisport courts, swimming pools and, in some cases, such as Alphaville, shopping centers and business¹³.

Caldeira (2011) highlights how enclosure became a dominant marketing strategy after a period in which the search for description and isolation was motivated by the political persecution of the military dictatorship:

Ilha do Sul, built in 1973, is a middle class complex of six buildings, each with 80 three-bedroom apartments, located in the west of the city (Alto de Pinheiros). Its main innovations were, on the one hand, to offer amenities such as a club of more than 10,000 m² including sports facilities, a restaurant and a theater and, on the other, security: it is walled and access is controlled by private security. At the time, crime was not the main concern of the city, and the practice of controlling circulation was actually feared by several groups: 1973 was the height of the military dictatorship and for many any identity investigation was seen as threatening. This fact indicates how enclosure was a real estate and marketing strategy that became dominant in the following decades: today, security procedures are a requirement in all types of buildings that aspire to have prestige (CALDEIRA, 2011, p. 261).¹⁴

In addition, I highlight some differences between the walled residential allotments we know and the North American model of gated communities, traditionally referred to as an equivalent of these new urban habitats. First, in Brazil, houses are generally built by the owners themselves, and not by the developers, as in the case of the United States. The uniformity of houses is a reason for refusal in Brazil not only by the elite, but also by the less affluent sections of the population, for whom this model of standardization exists in social housing and seeks to

¹² Destaca-se o estudo de Caldeira (2011) acerca de São Paulo e de Ribeiro (1996) sobre o Rio de Janeiro.

¹³ Sobre essa forma de empreendimentos urbanos murados do tipo de Alphaville, Aldeia da Serra e Tamboré, ver Teresa Caldeira (2011).

¹⁴ O Ilha do Sul, construído em 1973, é um conjunto de classe média de seis edifícios, cada um com 80 apartamentos de três dormitórios, localizado na zona oeste da cidade (Alto de Pinheiros). Suas principais inovações eram, de um lado, oferecer comodidades como um clube de mais de 10 mil m² incluindo instalações esportivas, um restaurante e um teatro e, de outro, a segurança: ele é murado e o acesso é controlado por segurança privada. Na época, o crime não era a principal preocupação da cidade, e a prática de controlar a circulação era na verdade temida por vários grupos: 1973 era o auge da ditadura militar e para muitos qualquer investigação de identidade era vista como ameaçadora. Esse fato indica como o enclausuramento foi uma estratégia imobiliária e de marketing que se tornou dominante nas décadas seguinte: hoje, os procedimentos de segurança são requisito em todos os tipos de prédios que aspirem a ter prestígio (CALDEIRA, 2011, p. 261).

be circumvented through efforts to modify the facade of their homes and give some sense of “personality” to the home. Second, walled residential allotments in Brazil are not highlighted as community spaces, as in the case of gated communities. It is possible to say that the idea of rescuing community life is less seductive, in Brazil, than the search for security through self-regulation.

The phenomenon of walled residential allotments and its analytical bias:

Gated communities and other walled residential subdivisions have been described by advertisements as a “new way of living”. This was what Caldeira (2011) observed in his study of this type of enterprise and its corresponding marketing strategies, with the city of São Paulo as a field. The author also identified that the advertisements bet on offering an environment in proximity to the rest of the city, but that was free from the inconveniences of urban life, such as the noise of traffic from very busy streets and avenues, or the risks of criminality.

In this work, we explore the impacts of walled residential allotments from the perspective of the daily life of the city as a whole, considering the directions of the realization of forms of living/living integrated into the wider space of the city and understanding that walled residential subdivisions configure different conditions of appropriation from the perspective of the most varied types of ordinary practitioners in the city¹⁵. Therefore, the problem of the theoretical interpretation of this phenomenon is posed.

Bauman refers to this “new way of living” as “voluntary ghettos”, in contrast to the “involuntary ghettos” of the lower classes of the population:

The fence separates the “voluntary ghetto” from the rich and powerful from the many forced ghettos from the poor and excluded. For the members of the voluntary ghetto, the other ghettos are spaces that “we are not going to”. For members of involuntary ghettos, the area in which they are confined (as they are excluded from others) is the space “from which we are not allowed to leave” (BAUMAN, 2007, p. 82).¹⁶

The self-segregation exposed in the quote above also elucidates its inexorable counterpart: the spaces enclosed by walls also represent the imposition of social distance in the urban. Socio-spatial fragmentation is a consequence of this takeover of the urban space where

¹⁵ See: Certeau, Giard e Mayol (2013).

¹⁶ A cerca separa o “gueto voluntário” dos ricos e poderosos dos muitos guetos forçados dos pobres e excluídos. Para os integrantes do gueto voluntário, os outros guetos são espaços aos quais “nós não vamos”. Para integrantes dos guetos involuntários, a área na qual estão confinados (por serem excluídos de outras) é o espaço “do qual não temos permissão de sair” (BAUMAN, 2007, p. 82).

extensive strips of land are surrounded and reserved for a select group of residents. Thus, I understand as appropriate the definition of Sposito and Góes for socio-spatial fragmentation as “[...] the existence of a polycentrality and the formation of discontinuous territories, generating morphologies that are less territorially integrated”¹⁷ (SPOSITO; GÓES, 2013, p. 295).

The imposition of walls, more than segregating, leads to different conditions of appropriation of the city and its uses, since those from "inside" have the possibility to enjoy the interior of their walled residential subdivisions and the open city. Those “outside” are left with the denial of large portions of land, previously integrated into the public space, and now reserved for those who can pay for it through the form of gated communities and walled residential allotments.

The problem of walled residential allotments points to multiple directions that can be discussed. This is due to the way in which these enterprises appropriate the urban space, modifying the morphology of cities, producing socio-spatial fragmentation in the sense stated above, as well as creating exclusive and restricted microcosms - the intramural space - where sociability takes place in a reasonably independent way and, to some extent, even antagonistic to the *modus operandi* of sociability in the open city space¹⁸.

Therefore, there is another place of tension between the private spectrum of the house and the scope of the immediate public, which is the neighborhood (CERTEAU; GIARD; MAYOL, 2013). The physical barrier of the wall prevents the traffic of others, “from outside”, which give heterogeneity to spaces. In this way, sociability and the relationship between the private and the immediate public, which is also an intimate private, is modified in the sense of producing intramural homogeneity. The elimination of otherness, in this sense, reduces the possibility of crossing with the unexpected and the unexpected of the open city; therefore, it also diminishes one of the constituent elements of the modern experience of cities and their resulting notion of public space.

Daily life, in this light, ceases, in an approximate coexistence axis, to be an integrating unit of differences (SEABRA, 2004), at least to the extent that such differences are attenuated by exclusivity and social homogeneity. Although the scope of the lived is not constituted only in the intramural spectrum, the existence of this space produces different conditions for the

¹⁷ “[...] a existência de uma policentralidade e a conformação de territórios descontínuos, gerando morfologias menos integradas territorialmente”

¹⁸ I call the open space the public space and the private spaces of common coexistence where there is the possibility of contact between different social groups, strangeness, exchanges, free movement, mobility and interactions between physical objects and human life. Place of realization of material and symbolic appropriations of individuals on the scale of the concreteness of everyday life.

appropriation of the urban both for those who are "inside" and need to go outside, as for those who are "outside" and they only access intramurals through an "invitation" from a resident, which circumscribes them in a relationship of non-belonging and rigidly conditioned and controlled appropriation.

Other considerations are possible regarding these types of closed residential developments. Objectively, it is worth noting that the existence of walled residential allotments only has significance in the midst of an urban scenario where social distinction and the acquisition of security as a luxury commodity are produced from economic inequality and social marginality. The unpredictability of everyday life in the imminence of contact with the other, in the presence of urban otherness in the scale of the spaces in which everyday life is carried out, becomes a problem to be solved only insofar as the danger represented by the other and the feeling of vulnerability that derives from this exposure are weighed. Thus, as shown below, the origin and consolidation of walled residential allotments as merchandise to be explored by a segment of the real estate sector is only done in the midst of an unstable and dangerous social order, where fear is generalized and acquired a logic of its own development (BAUMAN, 2007), which tensions our current development model from the point of view of life in relation to space, since it exposes its contradictions about the conditions of appropriation of spaces in the ordinary practice of life and in symbolic dimension of these experiences.

Thus, the reinforcement of the need for an analytical look at the phenomenon of the proliferation of walled residential allotments involves the perception: (a) of how they change the urban morphology of the city, in the sense of producing sub-centers less integrated to the fabric of the city, producing new territorial discontinuities and; (b) the impact on the forms of appropriation of space, both from the point of view of the residents of these ventures, and those who are "outside" this context.

In (a) it is objectively considered the permanence of the (re)production of socio-spatial inequalities through this housing model. In (b) it is necessary to consider, above all, that the conditions of appropriation of space are closely related to the question of sociability, which, since Simmel (2005; 2006), is where the links between the most macro-structural structures of society and inescapable agency of social actors in the materiality of everyday life are established (MAIA, 2001).

Final considerations

The search for the interpretation and understanding of the urban space production processes is a transversal theme to sociology, anthropology, geography and urbanism. To Lefebvre is attributed the insertion of the spatial theme in critical social theory (LIMONAD, 1999). The Lefebvrian theory linked the articulated reflection between the space-time dynamics and the social relations of production. The urban, in this way, assumes a totalizing aspect, as the production relations are also filled by its spatial character (2016).

Carlos (2018) highlights space as a category of thought and practical reality, a reference for human beings as their condition of existence. This definition derives its definition of space as a condition-mean-product. It is a condition already bequeathed by history, an inescapable means of reproducing the lived life and, at the same time, the product of the movements associated between the reproduction of life and the circuits of capitalist accumulation. The production of space takes place in the very process of constituting human history, in the reproduction of social relations of production.

Attention is drawn to the spatial theme in the observation that the text that has followed so far problematizes a phenomenon intimately inscribed in the definitions of condition-mean-product. The walled residential subdivisions represent, in this sense, a change in the point of view of the reproduction of lived life. From the residents' perspective, there is an internal segregated microcosm where part of everyday life takes place. For those who are “outside”, it is the possible effects of real estate speculation and a new urban morphology that presents itself from new isolated spaces¹⁹.

The objective, therefore, was to establish a nexus of analysis that points to the relevance of associating an element of real estate production with its resulting forms of daily life and appropriation of space. Determinations of all kinds or attempts to accurately describe the way in which the reproduction of the life lived from these undertakings takes place are not the purpose of this work. What was done was to highlight the most immediate implications of this phenomenon, articulated to critical social reflection, in the contribution to studies aimed at the unfolding of this theme.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: I am grateful to Professor Dr. Rafael Alves Orsi, who guided the research in which this work is part and to CNPq, the agency that fosters the master's dissertation in process.

¹⁹ Again, we refer to the idea of socio-spatial fragmentation by Sposito and Góes (2013), for which fragmentation occurs through the conformation of spaces less integrated to the fabric of the city.

REFERENCES

- BAUMAN, Zygmunt. **Modernidade líquida**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2001.
- BAUMAN, Zygmunt. **Tempos líquidos**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2007.
- BENJAMIN, Walter. **Baudelaire e a modernidade**. São Paulo: Autentica, 2015.
- BONDUKI, Nabil Georges. **Os pioneiros da habitação social**. Volume 1. São Paulo: Editora UNESP; Edições Sesc SP, 2014.
- CALDEIRA, Teresa. **Cidade de Muros: crime, segregação e cidadania em São Paulo**. São Paulo: Edusp, 2011.
- CARLOS, Ana Fani Alessandri. **A Condição Espacial**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2018.
- CERTEAU, Michel; GIARD, Luce; MAYOL, Pierre. **Invenção do Cotidiano**. Volume 2. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 2013.
- DAVIS, Mike. **Planeta Favela**. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial, 2006.
- EHRENBERG, Alain. **O Culto da Performance**. São Paulo: Ideias e Letras, 2010.
- ENGELS, Friedrich. **A situação da classe trabalhadora na Inglaterra**. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial, 2008.
- HARVEY, David. **O enigma do capital e as crises do capitalismo**. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial, 2011.
- JACOBS, Jane. **Morte e vida nas grandes cidades**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2000.
- LEFEBVRE, Henri. **O direito à cidade**. São Paulo: Centauro Editora, 2016.
- LIMONAD, Ester. Reflexões sobre o espaço, o urbano e a urbanização. **GEOgrafia**, Ano 1, n. 1, 1999. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303895969_Reflexoes_sobre_o_Espaco_o_Urbano_e_a_Urbanizacao. Access: 23 out. 2019.
- MAIA, R. C. M. Sociabilidade: apenas um conceito? **GERAES – Revista de Comunicação Social**, n. 53, 2001. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Rousiley_Maia/publication/317051024_Sociabilidade_a_penas_um_conceito/links/5923241caca27295a8a7e774/Sociabilidade- apenas-um-conceito.pdf. Access: 23 out. 2019.
- RAPOSO, Rita. Condomínios fechados, tempo, espaço e sociedade: uma perspectiva histórica. **Cadernos Metrópole**, v. 14, n. 27, p. 171-196, 2012.
- RIBEIRO, L. C. de Q. **Dos cortiços aos condomínios fechados**. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1996.

RODRIGUES, Arlete Moysés. Propriedade fundiária urbana e controle socioespacial urbano. *In: COLOQUIO INTERNACIONAL DE GEOCRÍTICA. EL CONTROL DEL ESPACIO Y LOS ESPACIOS DE CONTROL BARCELONA*, 13., 2014, Barcelona. **Anais** [...]. Barcelona, maio 2014. p. 5-10. Available at: <http://www.ub.edu/geocrit/coloquio2014/Arlete%20Moyses%20Rodrigues.pdf>. Access: 23 out. 2019.

SASSEN, Saskia. **Expulsões: Brutalidade e complexidade na economia global**. Rio de Janeiro/ São Paulo: Paz & Terra, 2016.

SEABRA, Odette. Territórios do uso: cotidiano e modo de vida. **Cidades**. v. 1, n. 2, p. 181-206, 2004.

SIMMEL, Georg. As grandes cidades e a vida do espírito. **Mana**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 11, n. 2, p. 557-591, 2005.

SIMMEL, Georg. **Questões fundamentais de sociologia: indivíduo e sociedade**. Trad. Pedro Caldas. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2006.

SPOSITO, M. E. B; GÓES, E. M. **Espaços fechados e cidades: insegurança urbana e fragmentação socioespacial**. São Paulo: Editora Unesp, 2013.

How to quote this article

CAVALCANTI, Murilo Petito. Considerações sobre a experiência urbana dos loteamentos residenciais murados. **Rev. Sem Aspas**, Araraquara, v. 8, n. 2, p. 240-257, jul./dez., 2019. e-ISSN: 2358-4238. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29373/sas.v8i2.13085>

Submitted: 01/11/2019

Approved: 19/12/2020

Published: 30/12/2019