

# 17 Contested taming spatialities

## The micro-resistance of everyday life in Buenos Aires

*Jorge Sequera and Elvira Mateos*

### Introduction

Recent neoliberal urban policies and the containment of the excluded in Latin American cities create a paradox. This is apparent at Costanera Sur in the city of Buenos Aires, Argentina, a long walkway between two worlds. On one side is the Buenos Aires Ecological Reserve on the shore of the Rio de la Plata, which adjoins Rodrigo Bueno, a slum in danger of eviction due to political pressure from the city government and real estate developers. On the other side is Puerto Madero, the most expensive neighbourhood in the city, with skyscrapers, state-of-the-art security systems, exclusive shops, luxury hotels, international banking, opulent houses and so on.

The promenade that separates these two adjoining areas that exemplify a fragmented city, is radically transformed every weekend (Centner 2012). On those days, the Costanera is filled with activities (*parrillitas al paso* or street barbecues, informal markets, music and dance) that attract the working classes from throughout the city. In this chapter we contrast these practices with the symbolic construction of the 'right bourgeois use' of the public space by the upper class, and its recounting of the legitimate subject to enact a civilizing process. We argue that the encounter of these ways of being in the city confronts the everyday life practices of the working class but also slows down the production of hegemonic urban subjectivity (Sennet 2006; Wortman 2004, 2010; Lash and Urry 1994; Bourdieu 1979; Wright 1992, 1994).

In this regard, we examine popular informal activities as counter-hegemonic practices in opposition to urban neoliberalisation, constituting new actors that develop and produce alternative geographies of citizenship. Resistance through the intensive use of public space by different rituals from those planned by the creators of Puerto Madero somehow breaks certain government technologies (Foucault 1990) that respond to private interests, instead of being governed by the common use of public space (Stavrvides 2010). In this way, such practices are considered as 'anomalies' (or untamed practices) by the upper and middle classes and managed by urban policies that restrict socializing acts and the social relations that they embody.

In order to elaborate our central analytical purpose, we have chosen to examine an urban conflict that is unfolding in this area today and that is likely to continue in the future. A walk through the two antagonistic places, Puerto Madero and

the slum of Rodrigo Bueno, allows us to capture a polymorphic imaginary that includes a multiplicity and diversity of subjects as triggers of a spatial transformation in the use of the area.

The Rio de La Plata (or River Plate) bounds the city of Buenos Aires on the east. In the early twentieth century, a number of reforms that modernized the area made it a lively port, but those attempts were made obsolete years later, when the docks became unsuitable for foreign vessels that had typically increased in size. The area remained practically ignored by the public authorities for many years, which led to a gradual degradation of its appearance, complicating its original function as a place of public use. Nevertheless, Costanera Sur was never fully abandoned. Both low-income groups and the middle and upper classes gathered on the shore of the river during weekends to enjoy what was usually known as the Costanera Sur Riverside Resort (though the classes were always separated, in different spaces). Gradually parts of the route to the river became inaccessible, and this resulted in a decrease in the leisure activities performed in the area, although they never totally disappeared. However, at the end of last century, the area became the locus of ambitious interventions.

Everyday life contains resistance practices which are traversed by processes of both personal and collective subjectivities, as argued by Stavrides (2007: 119) 'molecular spatialities of otherness can be found scattered in the city'. Our case study takes us to explore a space understood as a common area which confronts the exception policies that residents and politicians try to implement in Puerto Madero. As Díaz and Ortiz (2003) have contended, the interaction between different social and ethnic groups is limited by the condition of fragmented and fragmentary spatial use, which weakens social cohesion. Public space can increasingly be read as a gap between buildings to be filled in accordance with the objectives of developers and governments: aseptic spaces to enforce the notions of utility, safety and control (Delgado 2011: 9). Following the same line of thought, Delgado (2004) highlights the fact that different prevention policies have institutionalized the new design of urban spaces and social control, as exemplified through the development of new forms of urban surveillance, such as those materialized through the expanded use of video cameras and closed-circuit television (CCTV).

The research informing this chapter was designed precisely by the interest that these images and radically different practices aroused in us, as visitors to the city, and it soon became the subject of scientific inquiry. The methodology adopted included participant observation in these public spaces, in-depth interviews with residents and users of Puerto Madero and the slum of Rodrigo Bueno, and various audiovisual techniques such as photography and video analysis, which were designed to nourish and supplement the analysis of discourse. We also used secondary sources, especially engaging with the analysis of the mass media (newspapers, websites and television).

### **Puerto Madero: the construction of a class taming discourse**

We have already mentioned that the city is a multiple concept that is configured through different subjectivities, which sometimes come into conflict. Naturally

this does not mean that the mixture of conception, realities and urban uses occurs in a space of freedom, as the influence of different agents in giving sense to space, and the results, are very unequal. Domínguez (2008: 8) stated that the city is a central node in the global economy, for there are usually very few areas where social spaces escape the logic of capitalist exploitation and domination. This dynamic facilitates the creation of devices to discipline the citizenship (Delgado 2007: 54). In the cases of gentrification and requalification these bring market players into connivance with the public authorities, a process that Harvey (2010) depicts as *urban entrepreneurialism*.

Puerto Madero is the paradigm of a planned urban project of this kind, which has been designed from the beginning to run as the perfect joint venture between business, political power and the needs of the middle and upper classes. We are referring to the relocation in the central areas of the city of these social sectors that could have chosen to live in gated communities. This formalized the transformation of the old harbour into an archipelago of privilege and the privileged, through strategies that were used to create an 'other space' (Foucault 1980), seemingly perfect, meticulous and orderly, which clashes sharply with the existing space; that is, a series of administrative policies managing this new civility, in which the middle and upper classes impose their hegemony on the inner city, as the only acceptable form of social behaviour.

One of the most significant issues in the Puerto Madero project was that it involved a public–private partnership. Large urban projects are widespread throughout Latin America. This dynamic can be encompassed within what was previously defined as 'the new entrepreneurship paradigm' or urban entrepreneurialism. The *Corporación Antiguo Puerto Madero SA* was conceived as a state development company, under the guise of a public limited company, governed by private law (Cuenya and Corral 2011), bringing together the state and the municipality along with private companies and architects through a clear example of public–private partnership.

This phenomenon exemplifies a new form of urban governance, which different local political parties have also adopted elsewhere (Harvey 1989, 2001; Borja and Castells 1997; Rodríguez *et al.* 2001; De Mattos 2009), and whose principal goal is to maximize private profit. As other authors have already highlighted, nowadays these large-scale urban projects create new economic areas with environments protected from violence and urban poverty, which encourage national and international private investment (Lungu and Smolka 2005).

Puerto Madero's design involved an intense dialogue with Catalanian planners, and it has been called the Argentine 'Catalonian project' (Corral 2009; González 2011; Jajamovich 2012). Initially land prices in this area were low, but the project's planners knew there would be an immense appreciation in value due to its strategic location. As a result this was considered an 'opportunity area' (Cuenya 2001). From a speculative viewpoint, Puerto Madero is nearly completed, and nowadays it is exhibited as a planning success. It is considered as a new symbol of the city of Buenos Aires, which pushes the city up to the same level as other

leading metropolises around the world, epitomizing power and money (Cuenya and Corral 2011).

Puerto Madero is exceptional mainly because many of its features are totally different from those characteristic of the contiguous neighbourhoods: it is an island of order and security. This has been achieved not only by providing an exclusive security force for this area, the Argentine Naval Prefecture (*Prefectura Naval Argentina* or PNA), a comprehensive security system and a morphology that makes it seem like a fortress (there are only four entrances by foot), but in a more subtle and effective way. The strong regulation of green areas, and the monopoly of high-class shops and buildings have led to segregation, hampering the use of this area by a large proportion of the population, and restricting alternative uses of the space. In this sense, concepts such as De Giorgi's 'punitive metropolis' (2006) and Smith's famous 'revanchist city' (1996) are fit to describe these surveillance strategies of recovery as a key process in the global city. Roughly, we can identify in Puerto Madero some of the most characteristic features of the privatization model of public space that have been emerging during the last few decades in many other cities in which neoliberal urban policies have been dominant, such as the commodification of public space, video surveillance and architectures of control (Sequera and Janoschka 2012).

Puerto Madero is physically a peninsula of Buenos Aires, separated from the main city by an arm of the river. There are only four bridges providing access, all with checkpoints staffed by the PNA. This public security force does not operate anywhere else in the city, and the proportion of security personnel to population is far higher here than elsewhere in Buenos Aires. According to field data, it is well known that the Prefecture operates more effectively against insecurity than the Federal Police. In addition, Puerto Madero is the only place in Buenos Aires with an integrated CCTV system. There is such a dense network of cameras that every square metre is monitored 24 hours a day, 365 days a year ([www.ntsadero.com.ar/servicios.html](http://www.ntsadero.com.ar/servicios.html)).

Public space in Puerto Madero is being increasingly regulated. The aim appears to be to avoid any 'alternative' or traditional (cultural) uses, by creating or designating exclusive spaces, which are in effect public 'private' spaces (Low and Smith 2006: 21) or semi-public spaces. Many references to Europe can be drawn from the discourses and practices in Puerto Madero, including those related to security, as well as the transnational promotion of an upper-class lifestyle. Often, parallels are established between this project and the architecture and aesthetics of the 'European urban model', with Barcelona seen as a paradigm of this. This is seen, too, as a security issue: a local bodyguard told us reassuringly (perhaps noticing that we had the look of residents of the global North): 'this is Europe'.

We are looking here at the concept of a citizen as a consumer of signs, constantly marked by new forms of exclusive consumption. Precisely because of their exclusive characteristics, these make this fragment of the city a commodified product. In this way we witness the materializing inequality in the everyday life of

major cities. Admittedly in Puerto Madero – mainly to the east, around Costanera Sur – some goods and services are offered at prices most people can afford, but the general trend is towards exclusive goods and services. Puerto Madero aims to become a new central example of the affluent lifestyle. In complete contrast to the daily practices that have developed in the periphery, in shopping malls, entertainment complexes, parks, major supermarkets and so on, the urban reconfiguration here has been redirected to commercialize public space. We see the proliferation of a similar aesthetic that converts certain urban places into specialized areas for consumption by casual tourists and suburban citizens.

In addition to the leisure model devoted to consumption (and mainly targeted at the middle and upper classes), there is hyper-regulation of the public space in this area of the city. Our analysis of this will focus on three aspects.

First, there is a new project to install parking meters throughout Puerto Madero.<sup>1</sup> Currently many cars are parked there without charge, apparently by people living in peripheral areas who come to work in the capital, as well as by families who come at weekends to enjoy the waterfront. This causes endless jams around the bridges. Parking meters would discourage these individuals, but it also implies the replacement of a public use of space with a paid private use. Many less affluent people would effectively not come, because they cannot afford to pay parking fees. Some residents also resent the ‘gorillas’ (people who work informally, finding parking spaces in return for a tip), and this would eliminate them. The area also lacks public transport, so whatever the arguments advocating the introduction of parking meters, the result would be further segregation, removing the less well-off from this area.

The second issue is surveillance, part of the securitization trend that we have found in Puerto Madero. According to Janoschka (2005), there are two fundamental criticisms of modern surveillance methods. One is the lack of ‘success’ of the strategies used, and the other is that they destroy anonymity as one of the bases of coexistence in modern urban life. Increased use of CCTV and similar techniques can be seen as a refinement of the knowledge-power strategies employed by governments. The new technologies used in Puerto Madero are radically different from those practised in the rest of Buenos Aires, and elsewhere in Argentina.

The third regulatory issue concerns crime prevention through environmental design. The current city government has made it clear that this is an objective, and to this end since late 2012 it has fenced off Centenario Park followed by another green area called Lezama Park. Many believe that Puerto Madero will be the next area to be ‘gated’, as was suggested by the city government at a meeting with local residents. Security here is seen as a multi-faceted concept: as a legal, regulatory, political and social value.

### **The Rodrigo Bueno slum: a history of resistance**

If Puerto Madero exemplifies the ‘first world’ vision of Buenos Aires, the developing-world vision is not far distant (Cuenya and Corral 2011). In fact, before

the new Puerto Madero was built there was a slum called Rodrigo Bueno in the same area, and its residents and stallholders are resisting eviction even today. Two areas of the natural reserve were initially encroached in the mid-1980s, and are now home to 1,795 families according to the last census, many of whom are Peruvian or Paraguayan. After a social and judicial struggle for the settlement to be acknowledged, which lasted ten years, in 2010 a group of legislators proposed the ‘redevelopment’ of the Rodrigo Bueno neighbourhood. They recognized that this informal neighbourhood existed, that the residents had a right to remain there, and that the local government had an obligation to intervene to ensure decent living conditions (Lekerman *et al.* 2012).

However, the rehabilitation proposal has still not been implemented. In Buenos Aires, the dangers are obvious when lower-income sectors occupy strategic areas where gentrification would make it possible to realize ‘surplus value’ (García and Sequera 2013; Herzer 2008). As happened in Puerto Madero, modernization and urban regeneration can displace the existing population, leading to social and spatial fragmentation, with very specific characteristics in the case of Latin America (Janoschka *et al.* 2013). This can be seen as a battle over the meanings of legitimacy and illegitimacy in the urban context. Those managing the urban project of Puerto Madero have tried acquiring the land occupied by Rodrigo Bueno’s slum through many means (including evictions, subsidies, police surveillance, soil walls built encircling the slum, power cuts). To date these strategies have had no more success in displacing the residents than the residents have had in obtaining a firm legal status.

Jurisdictionally, residents of the slum would come under *Comuna 1* of Puerto Madero for electoral purposes, but they have instead been regrouped with the neighbourhoods of Barracas and La Boca to the south of Buenos Aires city, which are predominantly inhabited by the working classes. However, the links with Puerto Madero are much more evident. Most residents of Rodrigo Bueno not only live near the Costanera Sur, but also make a living in the neighbourhood: in construction, maintenance and care work, at the Retiro fair, in the food stalls along the promenade, collecting cardboard (Rodríguez 2010), or working in restaurants.

The history of Rodrigo Bueno is a history of grassroots resistance and challenge to government policies, which have changed over the last few decades. At first the government’s approach seemed to be apathy or disregard, but later it turned into harassment. Several strategies of subordination and intimidation and coercive mechanisms have come into play in recent years (Carman and Yacovino 2008). Among other actions, the settlement has been enclosed by a 30-foot-high wall, built with the earth excavated for the construction of Puerto Madero. We have already mentioned the use of security personnel to guard the entrances to Puerto Madero. Residents of Rodrigo Bueno also had to contend with the suspension of cleaning cesspools, garbage collection and pest control, power outages and so on (Carman and Yacovino 2008).

On top of that, there is now a new urbanization project in the area. The Santa María del Plata proposal from the IRSA<sup>2</sup> development company proposes a hotel

resort and residential towers, as well as the opening of internal channels and lakes, creating public and private parks and boulevards. The total estimated cost of this project is US\$500 million. Once more we find in this intersection a conflict between two approaches and sectoral interests. On the one hand, the profitability of this new project is threatened by the presence of the nearby slum (Szajnberg, Sorda and Pesce 2006), and on the other hand, the invasion of bulldozers threatens the slum's residents.

### **The promenade of Costanera Sur: discourses and practices disputing public space**

Public space is both a physical concept – the configuration of streets, squares and parks in the city – and a political concept. In the public sphere it is also a site of democratic deliberation (Aramburu 2008). The liberal sense of public space as somewhere for everyone equally avoids a palpable reality: that there are differences in allowed uses and restrictions on certain social groups. Social relations are conditioned by the kinds of access to and use of public squares and streets, as well as social gatherings in private or privatized places. However, this theoretical model does not necessarily fit easily onto a city bustling with life. The aseptic nature of the model becomes a reality of noise, colour and bustle, in a mixture of informal work and partying, at weekends around the Costanera Sur. Through discursive and non-discursive practices, there is a fight for the territory involving a variety of actors, such as the promoters of Puerto Madero, its inhabitants, the municipality, and the inhabitants of Rodrigo Bueno, users and sellers of the Costanera Sur promenade and the mass media.

These practices constitute the heart of a conflict whose dominions extend to the symbolic, and where we can see the materiality of a dispute between meanings. It is in the articulation of the different discourses and practices, which have different points of view of the space, that the conflict of interests acquires full meaning. A study of the recent history of this dispute should help us better understand two discourses. On one side, conceptions and justifications of the present are based on certain versions of the history of Puerto Madero. On the other side, memories are continually shaped by the present conditions.

A first narrative to be considered is that articulated by one of the most influential players in the urban conflict: CAPMSA,<sup>3</sup> the company in a public–private partnership that is responsible for fulfilling the megaproject of Puerto Madero. Since its inception, the company has maintained a discourse concerning social policies that some regard as fake. We can find three basic themes. First, it has always focused on the value of public and green space as one of its main targets. However behind these arguments in defence of the ‘public space’, urban dynamics of a business nature prevail, in a context where urban requalification processes generate an even greater need to expel certain people from certain areas of the city (Rodríguez 2010).

The second strand concerns the pursuit of zero cost to the state. This discourse was necessary for a fundamental reason: the land on which Puerto Madero was

built was public. Some authors have argued that this too is a false discourse from a political standpoint: private investors and high-income consumers were subsidized by public funds (Cuenya and Corral 2011). Some critics of the project have complained that the land was provided without any promised return. The corporation passes the profits from the operation to its partners, the municipality and the national government. The original promise that benefits would accrue to other social areas was never fulfilled (Cuenya and Corral 2011).

Third, we find a narrative that describes the area as one of ‘social mix’, used as a legitimization in response to those voices that warned Puerto Madero would operate as a gated community (in ways more symbolic than physical) and lead to exclusion. There is no mix of classes in Puerto Madero: it is an island of exclusivity. The working-class activities during the weekends along Costanera Sur are usually cited as refutation of this claim. What we observed is a subtle urban segregation, where different social classes have different uses for the area on different days of the week.

In short, the promoter’s discourse tries to suggest that there have been urban improvements for Puerto Madero’s neighbours, offering a model that contrasts with what seems to be happening in Costanera Sur. This latter model includes both the social periphery (Zibechi 2007) and the city centre, which is the social complex construction of the working classes, where the following concepts can be found: *dirty*, *dangerous*, *slum dweller* (these are terms taken from recorded interviews and the media) and *invasive* (Carman 2011).

In many cases, the symbolic frontiers are held to impose or maintain social frontiers. In accordance with this, social differences materialize in the unequal and different access to the material and immaterial resources in the urban space (Rodríguez 2010). In Puerto Madero, most of the characteristics of the neighbourhood relate to a quite exclusive use: poor access by public transport, very expensive restaurants and cultural activities, luxury housing supply, absence of public schools and so on (Pico and Yacovino 2010). These are some of the remarkable characteristics of the neighbourhood, which additionally has the PNA and a kind of security system never seen before in the city of Buenos Aires.

Today, Puerto Madero has the tacit support of the city government, plus it is reinforced by the mainstream media, which continue to reproduce its symbolic frontiers. In contrast, the government continues to question the permanence of Rodrigo Bueno, representing its inhabitants as enemies or even usurpers of a public space, while the media in many cases sensationalize the slums, criminalizing and stigmatizing their inhabitants. The segregation policy of the public authorities is expressed mainly in a set of discourses and practices that strengthen the physical and symbolic distance of the urban settlement from its immediate neighbours (Yacovino 2010). Puerto Madero builds its own notion of exclusivity based on this contrast, which is linked to security and differences in lifestyle. Although not all residents of Puerto Madero are rich, the lifestyle promoted is that of the upper classes. Moreover, as stated by Svampa (2001), the *structural weakness* of the Argentinean middle classes is based on the middle place they occupy. They are characterized politically by a conservative and reactionary mentality, and

culturally by a mimetic culture and ostentatious consumption. From another perspective, we can appreciate the contrast of tastes and its imposition by the upper classes using Bourdieu's concept of *habitus* (Bourdieu 1988). Among the features of Costanera Sur is the contrast between the habits of different classes (Bourdieu 1979), exemplified for instance by fancy expensive restaurants, and street stalls selling cheap food.

Additionally, the neighbours of Puerto Madero have an important role in the imposition of the rules which aim to 'order' public space (Pico and Yacovino 2010). We were able to verify this in several political meetings with neighbourhood associations. Although the original plan for the neighbourhood proposed to restructure the public space as 'modern', the rules – both explicit and implicit – that regulate the use of these areas, and the expectations of residents enforce a specific kind of public space, structured as a contemplative space, with enjoyment 'regulated' under certain parameters. At the same time the council has reinforced the importance of surveillance and official control in these areas (Pico and Yacovino 2010). Therefore we witness here an unequal dispute that confronts different visions of what public space should be.

As we have seen, the discourse defending the public space by developers and supporters of Puerto Madero in many cases ends up stigmatizing the merchants and users of the Costanera Sur as well as the population of Rodrigo Bueno. They cite public order, care of the environment, cleaning and security as if these were threatened by non-residents of Puerto Madero, who have even been described as 'invaders'. When the use of public space is so tightly regulated, activities that are outside the norm can constitute a counter-hegemonic articulation, a symbolic struggle for the reappropriation of the area. This leads us to argue that in the Costanera Sur, there is a 'spatiality of emancipation' (Stavrides 2007: 119), which is constructed by a series of appropriation practices, new meanings and the responses of daily life to ongoing processes of gentrification.

We refer to a discontinuous space strongly marked by the extreme situational dimension of class. This is very apparent in the contrast between services for the working classes and for the upper classes along Costanera Sur. Hence, 'the space identifies and is identified through its use' (Stavrides 2007: 121). Stavrides developed the concept of a city composed of *thresholds* (2010), or gaps. At weekends the Costanera Sur loses its planned legibility, while *vanishing points* allow the working-class practices to reclaim a different urban sense of the area. These informal practices have correlations in social movements (Zibechi 2012), in contentious fights and in the construction of new citizenship paradigms (Isin 2009). Therefore, these political and social subjects have the ability to raise up urban life models that are non-hegemonic. The main merit of these individual and collective actions is to unmask government technology models imposed on citizens which are rooted in individualism and precariousness. There is a clear intention to depoliticize the measures taken by managing urban appearance from the standpoint of 'technical, non-ideological solutions' (Stavrides 2010; Ong 2006). Hence, everyday life along Costanera Sur, populated by street *chacare-ras* (Argentinean folk musicians) and street vendors of all kinds, can be read as

attempts to counter the effects of neoliberalism, reclaiming new social conditions in contested neighbourhoods.

## Conclusions

Through this chapter we have studied the use of public spaces that are constructed in an unequal and conflictive manner, generated by a specific appropriation by some social groups with different types of capital (cultural, economic and symbolic). We have not only reconsidered the way in which a commoditized logic produces and reproduces hegemonic social structures and positions, but also explored a social tension between antagonistic class representations within the neighbourhood, rather than just between the capitalist management of urban space in Puerto Madero and Costanera Sur.

Consequently, the management of contested areas, such as the Costanera Sur which is shared by Puerto Madero and Rodrigo Bueno, in a Foucauldian (1990: 48) sense, reveals the use of true public power ‘technologies’. Policies that attack the most vulnerable individuals of the societies are adopted, prioritizing hegemonic social practices and socially cleaning ‘undesirable’ individuals from defined areas. Through prevention strategies, some practices are legislated as misdemeanours in an attempt to regulate and naturalize this reconstruction of ‘the public’ as the ‘civic’. This explains some of the consequences of neoliberal spatiality for the (re)construction of the city through public space. Through the processes of subjectification of citizenship, urban power discourses are materialized and we see the emergence and consolidation of classic policies of ‘Hausmannization’ (Low and Smith 2006: 25; Harvey 2008). These are responsible for reorganizing the public space to promote the free movement of capital, goods and population around areas of the city. These policies are not casual, and they turn shops, bars and other enterprises into defining elements of the public and private space as well as ways of controlling it.

This type of ideological urban practice legitimizes tough actions against certain types of behaviour, including punitive (legal), deterrent (CCTV) and preventive (urban planning) measures (Galdón Clavell 2010: 5), while also facilitating the processes of gentrification and urban segregation. In all these policies we find a bias towards an economic view of public space, making each parcel a commoditized object, and finally making the city a class project. It is precisely in these areas where actors express their position in the social system, or in other words, where we see classification and declassification (*classement-déclassement* in Bourdieu’s terms – Bourdieu 2000), or what is the same, social stratification materialized in a strong urban segregation.

To conclude, we face two models of citizenship and other social stratification in the evolving city. The city is never a finished territory in consensus, but it is always shaped by different representations of the same, different subjectivities that co-produce what ultimately is spatially and socially. These disputes that generate the urban can be observed through the practices, discursive or otherwise, that different groups use to defend their territory. The conflict that occurs here is

the result of a symbolic process in search of discursive legitimacy, and beyond that, of social and political legitimacy. Thresholds can become urban porosities that allow the existence of the untamed ‘in-between zones’, supplying permeable flows of a community defined through its practices in the urban space.

## Acknowledgement

The research outlined in this chapter was part of the research project ‘Contested Cities: Contested Spatialities of Urban Neoliberalism: Dialogues between Emerging Spaces of Citizenship in Europe and Latin America’, financed by the European Commission (Grant Agreement: PIRSES-GA-2012-318944).

## Notes

- 1 Source: [www.puertomadero.com/not1.php?id=331](http://www.puertomadero.com/not1.php?id=331)
- 2 Inversiones y Representaciones Sociedad Anónima: [http://www.irsa.com.ar/irsa/index\\_eni.htm](http://www.irsa.com.ar/irsa/index_eni.htm)
- 3 Corporación Antiguo Puerto Madero Sociedad Anónima: see [www.corporacionpuertomadero.com/](http://www.corporacionpuertomadero.com/)

## References

- Aramburu, M. 2008. Usos y Significados del Espacio Público. *Arquitectura, Ciudad y Entorno*, 3(8): 143–50.
- Borja, J. and Castells, M. 1997. *Local y global, La gestión de las ciudades en la era global*. Madrid: Taurus.
- Bourdieu, P. 1988. *La distinción. Criterio y bases sociales del gusto*. Madrid: Taurus.
- 2000. *Esquisse d’une théorie de la pratique*. París: Seuil/Points.
- Carman, M. 2011. *Las trampas de la naturaleza: medio ambiente y segregación en Buenos Aires*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de la Cultura Económica.
- Carman, M. and Yacovino, M. P. 2008. Los ‘usos intolerables’ de la tierra en la ciudad de Buenos Aires. El caso del asentamiento Rodrigo Bueno. In *II Congreso de la Asociación Latinoamericana de Antropología*.
- Centner, R. 2012. Microcitizenships: fractious forms of urban belonging after Argentine neoliberalism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 36(2): 336–62.
- Corporación Antiguo Puerto Madero. *Memoria y Estados Contables al 31 de diciembre de 2009 presentados en forma comparativa*. Available at: [www.puertomadero.com](http://www.puertomadero.com)
- Corral, M. 2009. Grandes Proyectos urbanos. Actores públicos y privados en el emprendimiento Puerto Madero (1989–2009). Available at: [webiigg.sociales.uba.ar](http://webiigg.sociales.uba.ar)
- Cuenya, B. 2001. Las cuestiones centrales de la investigación urbana en cada época. <http://www.mundourbano.unq.edu.ar/index.php/ano-2001/61-numero-11/110-1-las-cuestiones-centrales-de-la-investigacion-urbana-en-cada-epoca>
- Cuenya, B. and Corral, M. 2011. Empresarialismo, economía del suelo y grandes proyectos urbanos: El modelo de Puerto Madero en Buenos Aires. *Revista Eure*, vol. 37, May.
- De Giorgi, A. 2006. *El gobierno de la excedencia: postfordismo y control de la multitud*. Madrid: Traficantes de sueños.
- De Mattos, C. 2009. *Modernización capitalista, Metamorfosis Urbana y Competitividad en América Latina*. Presentation for Seminario Internacional La Investigación Urbana:

- Perspectivas y Desafíos, Lima, Perú. Available at: [www.uarm.edu.pe/Docs/investigacion/.../competitividad\\_mattos.pdf](http://www.uarm.edu.pe/Docs/investigacion/.../competitividad_mattos.pdf)
- Delgado, M. 2004. De la ciudad concebida a la ciudad practicada, en Crisis y Reinención de la Ciudad contemporánea. *Revista Archipiélago*, no. 62. Available at: <http://es.scribd.com/doc/57990419/Manuel-Delgado-articulo-de-Internet-sobre-espacio-publico>.
- 2007. *La ciudad mentirosa. Fraude y miseria del 'Modelo Barcelona'*. Madrid: La Catarata.
- 2011. *El espacio público como ideología*. Madrid: La Catarata.
- Delgado, M. Díaz Orueta, F. and Ortiz, A. 2003. Ciudad e inmigración: uso y apropiación del espacio público en Barcelona. In L. López, C. E. Relea and J. Somoza (eds), *La Ciudad: Nuevos Procesos, Nuevas Respuestas*, pp. 399–407. León, Spain: Universidad de León.
- Domínguez, M. 2008. Trabajo material e inmaterial. Polémicas y conceptos inestables, marco teórico y estado de la cuestión, Youkali, *Revista Crítica de las Artes y el Pensamiento*, Madrid. Available at: [www.youkali.net/5a1-YOUKALI-Dominguez-Sanchez-Pinilla.pdf](http://www.youkali.net/5a1-YOUKALI-Dominguez-Sanchez-Pinilla.pdf)
- Foucault, M. 1980. *El ojo del poder*. Available at: [www.elortiba.org/panop.html](http://www.elortiba.org/panop.html)
- 1990. *Tecnologías del yo y otros textos afines*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Galdón Clavell, G. 2010. La pulsioseguritaria a la ciudad contemporánea. In *Políticas Públicas y Modelos de Ciudadanía*. Barcelona, Spain: CIDOB y Diputació de Barcelona.
- García, E., and Sequera, J. 2013. Gentrificación en centros urbanos: Aproximación comparada a las dinámicas de Madrid y Buenos Aires. *Quid 16: Revista de Área de Estudios Urbanos*, (3), 49–66.
- González, S. 2011. Bilbao and Barcelona 'in motion': how urban regeneration 'models' travel and mutate in the global flows of policy tourism. *Urban Studies*, 48(7): 1397–418.
- Harvey, D. 1989. From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 71(1): 3–17.
- 2001. *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*. London: Routledge.
- 2008. The right to the city. *New Left Review*, 53(5): 23–40.
- 2010. *A Companion to Marx's Capital*. London: Verso.
- Herzer, H. 2008. Acerca de la gentrificación. In H. Herzer et al. (eds), *Con el corazón mirando al sur. Transformaciones en el sur de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires*. Buenos Aires: Ed. Espacio.
- Insin, E. F. 2009. Citizenship in flux: the figure of the activist citizen. *Subjectivity*, 29(1): 367–88.
- Jajamovich, G. 2012. Del Parque España a Puerto Madero: circulación del 'urbanismo de los arquitectos' y la planificación estratégica entre Argentina y España (1979–93). *Cuaderno urbano*, 12(12): 7–25.
- Janoschka, M. 2005. Discursos de inseguridad y la ciudad cerrada: mitos, realidades, barreras y fronteras de un producto inmobiliario 'perfecto'. *Revista de Investigación Social*, (2): 11–35.
- Janoschka, M., Sequera, J. and Salinas, L. 2013. Gentrification in Spain and Latin America: a critical dialogue. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. Available at: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2427.12030/abstract>
- Lash, S. and Urry, J. 1994. *Economies of signs and space* (vol. 26). London: Sage.
- Lekerman, V., Yacovino, M. P. and Carman, M. 2012. Una mirada antropológica del caso 'Urbanización de la villa Rodrigo Bueno'. Available at: [www.adaciudad.org.ar/docs/](http://www.adaciudad.org.ar/docs/)

- Congreso\_derecho\_administrativo\_Lekerman\_y\_Yacovino\_final1-final.ppt (accessed 20 May 2014).
- Low, S. and Smith, N. 2006, *The Politics of Public Space*. London: Routledge.
- Lungo, M. and Smolka, M. 2005. Suelo y grandes proyectos urbanos: La experiencia latinoamericana. *Land Lines*, 17(1).
- Ong, A. 2006. *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Pico, M. and Yacovino, M. 2010. Orden y caos en el espacio público: planificación, expectativas y usos del espacio en Puerto Madero y Costanera Sur'. Presentation for the 6th Jornadas de Investigación en Antropología Social. FFyL, UBA, 3–6 August 2010.
- Rodríguez, A., Moulart, F. and Swyngedouw, E. 2001. Nuevas políticas urbanas para la revitalización de las ciudades en Europa. *Ciudad y Territorio, Estudios territoriales*, 33(129): 409–24.
- Rodríguez, M. F. 2010. ¿Espacio público vs. Asentamiento? La Costanera Sur Rodrigo Bueno. *Intersticios, Revista sociológica de pensamiento crítico*, 4(1).
- Sennet, R. 2006. *La cultura en el nuevo capitalismo*. Barcelona, Spain: Anagrama.
- Sequera, J and Janoschka, M. 2012. Ciudadanía y espacio público en la era de la globalización neoliberal. *ARBOR Ciencia, Pensamiento y Cultura*, 188(755): 515–27.
- Smith, N. 1996. *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. London: Routledge.
- Stavrides, S. 2007. Espacialidades de emancipación y la 'ciudad de umbrales'. *Bajo el Volcán*, 7(11), 117–24.
- 2010. *Towards the City of Thresholds*. Trento, Italy: Professional dreamers.
- Swampa, M. 2001. *Los que ganaron: La vida en los countries y barrios privados*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Biblos.
- Szajnborg, D., Sorda, G. and Pesce, L. 2006. Privatización desuelo público y especulación inmobiliaria en Buenos Aires: Crónica sobre el pasado, presente y futuro de los pobladores de la Villa Rodrigo Bueno, ciudad de Buenos Aires. Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Wortman, A. 2004. *Comp Imágenes publicitarias, nuevos burgueses*. Buenos Aires: Prometeo Editoria.
- 2010. Las clases medias argentinas, 1960–2008. In R. Franco, M. Hopenhayn and A. de León (eds), *Las clases medias en América Latina*. México: Siglo XXI.
- Wright, E. O. 1992. Reflexionando, una vez más, sobre el concepto de estructura de clases. *Revista, Zona Abierta* (59–60).
- 1994. *Clases*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Yacovino, M. P. 2010. Alcances y limitaciones del derecho a la vivienda: Los asentamientos Rodrigo Bueno y la Aldea Gay y los programas de recuperación de terrenos. *Intersecciones en antropología*, 11(1): 3–13.
- Zibechi, R. 2007. *Autonomías y emancipaciones – América Latina en movimiento*. Lima: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.
- Zibechi, Raúl. 2012. *Territories in Resistance: A Cartography of Latin American Social Movements*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.