The spatial relations that have since emerged as a result of neoliberal policies have been harshly criticized in the first decades of the 21st century, the outcome of an ideological crisis, which escalated especially after the burst of the Internet bubble in 2000, the terrorist attacks on the Twin Towers on September 11, 2001, and the housing crash of 2008. Currently, the toughest challenge amidst this crisis has been the COVID-19 pandemic, whose consequences remain uncertain. While some predict chaos in light of a general system collapse, others wage on a reorganization of the world order towards solutions for pressing global problems, such as the environmental issue, political systems, and social inequality. In this regard, architecture and urbanism seem to regain a critical meaning which had been subdued in the heydays of the economic, political, and cultural program that defined late capitalism. This recovery is far from a nostalgic return to 19th-century utopias or to the vanguards of the first decades of the 20th century, but rather the pursuit of a disciplinary stance capable of resisting dominant orders and, as much as possible, proposing better alternatives. Taking as a starting point the rise and crisis of the neoliberal model developed since the 1970s, this chapter promotes a dialogue between the theoretical-critical issues related to the spatial realities of the so-called peripheral countries and the topics under debate in core countries. To this end, we seek evidence within the realities of the largest metropolis in South America that the crisis of the city arising from the Industrial Revolution has not only been preserved, but further radicalized: the partial arrangements that led to the creation of appeasing islands in the Global North and South no longer sustain themselves against the advance of chronic problems in the urbanization processes, such as global warming, the scarcity of natural resources, and extreme poverty. The humanitarian refugee crisis in Europe, alarming pollution levels in the megacities, growing deforestation of the Amazon rainforest, and the rise of nationalisms and the far right are some of the symptoms that endanger the civilizing project of Enlightenment origin. Within the current context, this means putting the future of the entire planet at risk, as intellectuals from different ideological backgrounds, such as Bruno Latour, Noam Chomsky, or Ailton Krenak, have warned.

This perception about the socio-spatial reality, which may now seem evident, was not prevalent within the high architecture circles during the apparent triumph of the neoliberal strategies adopted in the 1980s and 1990s, sustained by the virtuous results of the accumulation system via financialization in times of globalization. At the height of what David Harvey called the “postmodern condition,” the new logic of transnational capital relied on deterritorialization as
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a premise for both its real and virtual expansion. The borders, walls, and barriers would dissolve themselves in the face of the then-new possibilities that the communication and information technologies presented to the flexible accumulation regime. On the other hand, the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 symbolically underlines the lack of alternatives to the strategies of Western capitalism, given that the polarization of the Cold War years would lose sense with the dissolution of the Socialist Bloc. There would be no room, therefore, for architecture or urbanism critical to the (neoliberal) capitalist system in times of “single thought.” Within these intellectual disciplines, the role of criticism, which had been largely instructed by Manfredo Tafuri’s version of neo-Marxist concepts devised by the Frankfurt School, would make no sense in a world that flattened its own contradictions. Even Tafuri distanced himself from the spatial problematics posed at the time, as if conforming to the “end of history” imposed by the new world order.

Distant from the demands for social housing as well as from the utopian ideals of the Modern Movement, architecture and urbanism have treaded a recalcitrant course since the mid-1960s. Nonetheless, a certain critical activism gained traction in the following decades, and whose examples are still referenced to this day, as in the “war machines” of Archigram, Superstudio, or Buckminster Fuller, in the hippie provocation of Ant Farm, in Gordon Matta-Clark’s radical denouncement, or in the Marxist-inspired engagement proposed by the Arquitetura Nova group and in the “penetrables” of artist Hélio Oiticica (to cite some examples of the so-called Global South). On the other hand, in the 1980s, although historians such as Anatole Kopp published manifestos longing for the heroic times when architecture and urbanism were engaged in the social causes of the Modern Movement, the role played by disciplinary criticism acquires novel and diverse outlines. Instead of proposing alternatives to the spatial conditions of industrial society, it now seeks consonance with the plurality of postmodern artistic and cultural expressions, as well as academic studies devoted to the new condition of late capitalism. In this regard, the fragile convergence between the Euro-American “great narrative” and the peripheral countries—which had become acceptable since “Brazil Builds”—practically disappears. Without the ideological ballast of a social function, or even a modernizing techno-scientific (or techno-utopian) narrative, architecture and urbanism in peripheral countries loses visibility and relevance in wide-reaching disciplinary subjects. One rare exception were specific studies that sought, through their own condition of alterity, the oppositional forces to the conservatism of the dominant hegemonic system, as in the case of the “post-colonial studies” disseminated through American academia by neo-Marxist intellectuals, such as Terry Eagleton. After all, the technological progress of materials and programs, not to mention the billionaire budgets that abounded in those virtuous times of commodity-architecture and enterprise-cities, found no place in countries removed from the new world economic order—often grappling with internal political problems, State debt, and hyperinflation. Museums, cultural centers, and corporate buildings—technologically sophisticated and extremely expensive—set the tone for the “aesthetic” debate within the field of capital-produced architecture in times of globalization and disseminated in international specialized journals. As for the urban projects, in the 1980s and 1990s, the emphasis was on the emblematic examples of “strategic urbanism,” which through public-private partnerships and the logic of the commodity-city, sought instruments to circumvent the ruin of the State or its inefficiency for addressing urban issues in post-industrial cities. Political engagement—so crucial for the precursors of New Architecture—lost ground to an uncompromised version of disciplinary autonomy and regionalisms of all kinds. A dangerous wager towards the seductive allure of images and spectacle, which seemed to have no end in times of easy money, and the configuration of social sensitivities that concealed the contradictions of the so-called culture industry.
Within this context, theory, and particularly critical theory, lost ground in the architectural debate in countries that spearheaded the implementation of neoliberal policies and, consequently, the cultural logic of postmodernity. The ultra-pragmatism of free market strategies would no longer face resistance as the plight of the welfare state dissolved itself in the general crisis of the State, expedited by the 1973 oil shock. Within the field of architecture and urbanism, criticism, meant to unravel the contradictions within the modernization process and especially the contradictions of its rationality, was thus deemed obsolete since its abstractions and subjectivities, regarded as utopian, would have little use for the emerging lucrative markets in the field of arts, architecture, and urban development. For authors such as Michael Speaks, considered one of the first to oppose critical architecture, not only would there be no use to theory, but it would also hinder the pursuit for “alternative ways of thinking.” In other words, reactions to conflicts arising from the capitalist neoliberal model would exist in everyday practices aligned with the demands of capital itself. Similarly, Stan Allen, Carol Burns, Robert Taylor, Sylvia Lavin, Jeffrey Kipnis, Robert Somol, and Sarah Whiting sought alternatives to the theoretical stalemates posed by Marxist and neo-Marxist-inspired critics associated with the ideas of Manfredo or the Frankfurt School. While they were not an institutionalized or intellectually coherent group, authors such as George Baird situated them among the so-called post-critics (or post-theorists), a term which would later be used to label several cultural and artistic works in the final decades of the 20th century.

Baird sees in the post-critics a unity in their pursuit for overcoming the stalemates posed by the critics of the previous generation (Baird, 2004). After all, progressive critical thought in the vigorous epoch of neoliberalism had become an aporia, and would run against a discipline shaped by practice—through a concrete dialogue with the world and its daily realities. A dialogue synthesized in the famous essay “Notes Around the Doppler Effect and Other Moods of Modernism” by Robert Somol and Sarah Whiting (2002), whose heated repercussion in the Anglo-Saxon academic milieu would come to affirm not only a way of thinking about architecture, but above all, to produce it—a kind of project methodology within the field of theory, which had outlined the debate of the previous decades regarding “post-critical” or “projective” architecture. It is no accident that the article gained traction within the same environments in which “the design methods movement” was prominent. In this scenario, architecture and urbanism should act proficiently to solve the spatial problems that emerge in each social context, and the method should assist the conjunction between disciplinary historical knowledge and the new techniques and tools of the project. Good architecture and good urbanism would operate in a kind of perfect algorithm, shaped by the needs of the program, while excellence would come from the professional virtues of those skilled enough to surpass the expectations placed by the demands of users, society, and the market—the solutions would be in the project itself, in praxis, and not necessarily through a dialogue with criticism or theory. Architects such as Rem Koolhaas and Bernard Tschumi would be the most sophisticated representatives of this approach, whose leitmotiv involves the pursuit for new spatial content by using market strategies and the cultural plurality of late capitalism.

Yet it is precisely in the alleged absence of contradictions among the individual, society, and the market from which emerges the leading criticisms to post-critical pragmatism and neoliberalism in general. In North America, Michael Hays, a professor of history and architectural theory, formulated the most daring hypotheses on the critical possibilities of architecture. In his 1984 groundbreaking article, “Critical Architecture: Between Culture and Form,” Hays calls for a critical architecture, resistant to conciliatory tendencies against the dominant culture, and in constant dialogue with both architectural criticism and critical historiography, as well as with
the dialectical process amidst the contingencies of place and time and formal autonomy. In his best-known book, *Architecture’s Desire: Reading the Late Avant-Garde*, Hays refers to the Lacanian triad (the Imaginary, the Symbolic, and the Real) to analyze the works of Rossi, Eisenman, Hejduk, and Tschumi. In his view, the critical potential found in these works emerges from how these architects established connections among the Imaginary, the Symbolic, and the Real to contrive an “autonomous architecture” against the historical condition conveyed by postmodernity. Over the course of his writings and intellectual career, Michael Hays was notoriously close to the ideas and concepts of Manfredo Tafuri and, consequently, to the Frankfurt School’s variant of Marxism. However, we can only understand his particular version, devised for the postmodern North American context, in contrast to the neoliberal expansion movement in developed countries, especially in the Anglo-Saxon world. It is no surprise, therefore, that urban themes or city issues are not a priority for Hays. After all, the North American model of the city is structured by the logic of individual rights and private property, hence the associations between urban, urban life, and architecture are not as directly interconnected as in societies whose spatial dynamics are intrinsically linked to the spatial conditions of public and collective spheres.

The opposite occurs in European contexts, especially in southern Europe, where a spectacular postmodernity contrasts with the resistance mechanisms of the cities, their places, their culture, and their history. Critics and designers such as Josep Quetglas, Ignasi de Solà-Morales, Vittorio Gregotti, Carlo Aymonino, and Bernard Huet, among others, made use of the critical wealth devised by Tafuri to confront the consequences and legacies of the International Style as a capitalist planification strategy. Furthermore, they turned to the Venice School for the...
concepts and elements to claim an architecture of the place, of temporalities, and of permanences as a reaction project to the generic models adopted on a large scale in times of globalization. Understanding the historical singularities and the everyday spatial dynamics of cities and places seemed like an alternative to the totalizing schemes abandoned by the financial system, the real estate market, and the major transnational corporations. Their inspiration in phenomenology and their dialogue with the new French philosophy (particularly Jacques Derrida and Gilles Deleuze) brought a striking originality to this generation eager for alternatives to a discipline in crisis. Not surprisingly, these authors often devised spatial and formal hypotheses independent of ad hoc disciplinary practices—a direct consequence of their sophisticated theoretical foundations—which would go on to influence the most vibrant schools and the most original architects of those times.

Excluded from the economic affluence experienced by the Western democracies of the Global North in the 1980s and 1990s, most Latin America countries, and especially Brazil, remained relatively distant from the post-critical debate. There are several reasons for this disparity, but two hypotheses are particularly noteworthy when it comes to the relationship between architecture and urban space. The first refers to the long-standing tradition of the local Modern Architecture, whose innovative works by architects belonging to the generation of Oscar Niemeyer and Lúcio Costa gained prominence in the international architectural debate, especially after the art exhibition “Brazil Builds,” held at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York City in 1943. The notion of an architecture designed to engender a new—modern—spatiality would thus become a structural part of cultural, political, and economic movements that sought to overcome a local agrarian and archaic past and promote the modernization of the country and its society. In the words of one of the most renowned intellectuals of the period, Mario Pedrosa, “Brazil is condemned to be modern,” as this would be the only possible artistic and cultural expression capable of synthesizing and aggregating the diversity and complexity of its territory under a common goal: modernization and “independence.” The second hypothesis concerns the economic, social, and political crises that have plagued Brazil—as well as Latin America in general—over the course of the re-democratization process following the end of the military dictatorship. The high debts contracted in previous decades and the inflation resulting from the bankruptcy of the State did not ensure the same economic robustness to this region that late capitalism provided to many countries in the Global North. The result of this process exacerbated an “uneven and combined development,” since the possibilities for a definitive emancipation were contained by pre-existing conditions incapable of reversing the local dependence process.

Thus, the dialogue between the artistic and cultural production with the logic of the globalized market, with the “culture industry,” or with the consumer society would not acquire the same meaning or same potency in regions that were still recalcitrant in their industrialization processes. Within this context, the debate on postmodernity becomes undermined both by the absence of an economic backdrop able to sustain the abundance and festive frivolity of the liveliest cultural forms of late capitalism, and by the resistance of “high culture” to distance itself from the so-called local modern tradition. The modern project laid out in Jürgen Habermas’s “Modernity—An Incomplete Project” (1980/1983), or even the ideas for preserving the Enlightenment principles proposed by Sérgio Paulo Rouanet in As Razões do Iluminismo (1987), had a far-reaching impact among local architects, especially those associated with the FAUUSP (Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism of the University of São Paulo). In this context, the essays by philosopher Otília Arantes, compiled in the books O Lugar da Arquitetura depois dos Modernos, from 1992, and Urbanismo em Fim de Linha, from 1998, were pivotal for understanding the complex and peculiar local reality. The initial focus was on the singularity of the Modern
Project developed in Brazil, considered by the author as a fully realized project precisely for not having faced the contradictions of the modernization process in Brazilian society. In the author’s words:

There were many incongruities and disparities (registered from early on by visiting foreigners), and yet we cannot deny that the Modern Project reencountered its truth in the ancient colonial fringe of the system, thanks to the entrepreneurial power of the ruling classes organized by way of strong and modernizing States. One could say that, among formalistic involutions and private architectural rationality with social implications, the utopian spirit of the Plan developed itself verbatim.

(Árantes, 1998 p. 31)

The particularity and significance of her work lies in the novel way through which she situates architectural and urban issues that were relevant in Brazil in the late 20th century in relation to the neo-Marxist international debate—a debate in those years mediated by authors such as David Harvey, Fredric Jameson, Mike Featherstone, and Andreas Huyssen, among others. Furthermore, the so-called new French philosophy, particularly in the works of Foucault, Lyotard, Baudrillard, and Lipovetsky, was also central for her understanding of the cultural order amidst postmodern times. The critical content devised by Otilia Árantes is, in a way, devastating. Her interpretation of the Brazilian reality extends to the world, in those years engulfed by the neoliberal logic of late capitalism. The contradictions among art, culture, and a world ruled by commodity fetishism could lead to no other outcome than the general collapse that we face today. Neither architectures nor cities would survive this accelerated and irresponsible model of capital expansion based on aggressive free market strategies, the absence of the State, and the destitution of the idea of society. Many considered her ideas, when published in the 1980s and 1990s, excessively pessimistic and aporetic in their connection to unorthodox Marxist concepts distant from the Brazilian academic tradition or for disregarding the artistic virtues of Brazilian modern architecture. Nowadays, not so much.

Another important Latin American author of that period was Argentine architect and historian Marina Waisman, whose work stands out in its approach to Latin American architectural and urban production away from schematic syntheses, or distorted analyses, derived from thought schemes originating from “core” countries (Waisman, 1988). As she would often state, “Aim at yourself with your own eyes.” Her critique, akin to other local intellectuals such as Francisco Liernur and Graciela Silvestri, sought to acknowledge the independence and originality of Latin American production, albeit in constant dialogue with the conceptual and analytical tools derived from the so-called dominant cultures (Waisman, 1998). In this regard, the city becomes a dissonant note in the scholarly production of peripheral countries. For as much as one acknowledges the virtues and singularities of Latin American architecture during those years, represented by architects such as González de León, Abraham Zabludovsky, Clorindo Testa, Enrique Browne, Rogelio Salmona, and Vilanova Artigas, these architectures had little or no influence on the chaotic and problematic urban fabric of its cities—or its everyday life spaces. Waisman calls this result “collage cities,” appropriating a term coined by Colin Rowe and Fred Koetter, in which disconnected and often conflicting fragments are accommodated without forming any possibility of a coherent urban reading, whatever it may be. This is not, as the author herself underlines, a secondary problem:

For we should not forget that the main sphere of life of architectural products is the city, and that the development and evolution of cities, and the history of architectural forms,
are deeply and intimately linked together. However, most Latin American cities suffered
during this period of excessive growth, and even worse, growths that were not pro-
duced by their own expansion, but by the confused aggregate of multitudes of inhabitants
expelled from their environment due to economic, political, and social circumstances.
(Waisman, 1988, p. 37)

Unlike the pragmatism that had settled within the cultural environment of developed coun-
tries, something of the utopias still remained in Latin American countries. After all, as Waisman
wrote: “to build in a world dedicated to destruction; to believe in a disbelieving world; to trust
in the future of the South, yet condemned by the North to destitution. Such is the modern Latin
American utopia” (Waisman, 1988, p. 41).

Under a different context—within the neoliberal epicenter—Fredric Jameson was one of
the most influential voices of the neo-Marxist tradition, critical of the social conditions of late
capitalism. His essays, with far-reaching repercussions in the field of cultural studies (including
in Latin America), strayed away from the conformist pragmatism that pervaded the post-critical
environment of those years. Jameson was also one of the first authors to understand architecture
as one of the most thorough manifestations of the cultural logic of postmodernity. In “Spatial
Equivalents in the World System” (Jameson, 1992), for example, he mentions the house that
architect Frank Gehry built for himself in Santa Monica, California, to problematize the con-
dition of spatial isolation conveyed by American postmodern suburban mass culture. According
to the author, Gehry’s interventions in the transitional spaces between the public and the pri-

cate, using oddly arranged ordinary industrial materials (in post-industrial contexts), suggest
that the innovative spatial dynamics of that anti-urban society would exist within the dividing
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membrane between the domestic interior (private) and the urban exterior (public)—bearing in mind that the vocation for the public sphere, which in theory lies at the heart of modern spatial thought, inverts itself in the social and cultural practices of postmodernity. The other, the public, the urban, the social, the city, were to be avoided by the instruments of architectural design. This insight seems very contemporary nowadays when compared to the strategies of neoliberal biopolitics, geared towards the spatial segregation desired by the “urban enclosures,”7 as seen in the following excerpt:

The other is, on the face of it, unrelated to this, for it seems to imply a positive principle of relationship rather than this centrifugal movement, and rather suggests the way in which organisms react to foreign bodies and seek to surround and neutralize them in a kind of spatial quarantine or cordon sanitaire.

(Jameson, 1992, p. 101)

In “The Constraints of Postmodernism” (1994), Jameson emphasizes how the seemingly postmodern plurality tends to convert into a marketing strategy for late capitalism, since appeals to the local or regional would not suffice for a critical architecture against the dominant cultural systems. In the same essay, he explores the tensions between public and private spaces through an analysis of Dutch architect Rem Koolhaas’s earliest large-scale projects. Through an attempt to integrate the totality of urban issues into the building, Koolhaas ultimately incorporated public spaces into the private domain, now “replicated” within a geometric image of major proportions—the “block.” Heterogeneity, now simulated within this “new individual building” displaced from the urban tissue, would be consistent with the freedom and flexibility desired by the market—a replica of the surrounding chaos. Such a resource would also result in depoliticization and alienation from everyday life, since by consenting to the logic of corporate power, its pragmatism and opportunism would operate to reduce social awareness (Jameson, 1994).

Jameson, as well as Hays, Arantes, Waisman, Quetglas, and Morales, among others, were dissonant voices amidst the most virtuous times of neoliberalism and the cultural logic of late capitalism. Whereas dedicated to the typological dialogue with history or the possibilities of innovation via technological advances, formal experiences prevailed. Jameson prescribed that by renouncing its utopian or anticipatory possibilities against dominant values, architecture became an accomplice to such values—its spatial variant (Jameson, 1992). After all, it was in the interest of the globalized capitalist market to create symbolic landmarks on a global scale, capable of heightening the virtues of the commodity-city and the individual against the State and society. The billion-dollar financial operation that resulted in the construction of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao, known as “the Bilbao Effect,” is perhaps the most emblematic example of the status enjoyed by architecture in those years, especially as it occurred in a country with a singular tradition in the field of architecture and urbanism, both in professional practice and in the development of theoretical-critical systems. The eccentricity of the Guggenheim Bilbao brand-image, which spread throughout the world, concealed the spatial, economic, and social contradictions that would later emerge in the first decades of the 21st century. This would ultimately assist to erode the image of the architectural form as a producer of broader meanings and sensitivities, since analogies to “spectacle-images” and commodity fetishism would diminish any other cultural or artistic meaning.

In recent decades, several authors, specialized journals, and academic events have dedicated themselves to post-criticism within the field of architecture and urbanism. Most of them emphasize the return of criticism as a fundamental instrument to the disciplinary practices in the early 21st century. This could happen from a closer alignment to the material conditions of the
production of space or by way of a systematic isolation towards an alternative—or opposing—spatial logic against the realities of the world. In both cases, if the contradictions inherent in spatial relations are neglected, the discipline’s fields of activity would be limited or non-existent.

**Contradictions of Space**

What would be the possibilities for a critical architecture and urbanism in this early 21st century? Aesthetic autonomy or political and social engagement? In this regard, the debate has been somewhat similar within the field of architecture and urbanism as in other areas of culture, such as visual arts, cinema, and theater.

The question of autonomy has been approached both in an historical or philosophical perspective, with a view to understanding its meaning in relation to cultural dynamics arising from modernity, as for the methodological possibilities of establishing autonomous practices in societies increasingly dependent on the economic and political strategies of late capitalism. If, on the one hand, critics such as Manfredo Tafuri sought to demonstrate the ideological nature of the emancipation hypotheses posed by the Modern Movement, given their alignment with instrumental reason and with the strategies of industrial capital, on the other hand, the post-modern (post-critical) mainstream failed to even consider the role of architecture as a discipline of resistance or opposition against dominant social forces. The debate on autonomy, in this context, would be focused on the articulation of its forms with the historical narratives, in order to operate within a phenomenology of space; or towards the deconstruction of its self-referential language in search of new meanings; or, more recently, in the pursuit of a vision of autonomy away from an apolitical condition, in which the architectural form would be confronted with the urban and its social reality.

In contrast to these versions of autonomy, an engaged discipline, especially when addressing everyday urban and social issues, would reject any “formalist” appeal or even major aesthetic theories dedicated to the fields of culture and art. In this regard, they would act directly on the mechanisms of production, both material and symbolic, in an attempt to overcome capitalism’s structural and hegemonic strategies of domination. The “aesthetic” outcome would be a consequence of the techniques, management forms, and cooperation systems fostered during the process.

In this context, the debate concerning philosophers Georg Lukács and Ernst Bloch and their stances on the clash between Realism and Modernism could help us to understand autonomy-related issues within the scholarly disciplines addressing space—especially in the so-called post-critical period. The theme was the subject of an important essay by Rodney Livingstone, Perry Anderson, and Francis Mulhern in 1977. Regarding the issue of autonomy, our interest in this essay lies in the debate on the political role of art, in this case centered on literature. Georg Lukács favored the classically inherited modernity of the Enlightenment and rejected any contamination from irrationalism—as found in Expressionism—which he considered bordering fascism for obscuring a critical perception of society. Lukács, deemed as one of the most renowned exponents of 20th-century Marxism, believed in the aesthetic potential of form and its subsequent capacity to synthesize political, economic, and ideological positions. And realism, as glorified by a late Hegel, would be the most promising artistic expression of this model. Ernst Bloch, however, like Bertolt Brecht, valued artistic movements akin to the cultural sphere of the societies in which they sought to intervene. According to Bloch, straying away from historically structured cultural schemes would hinder an alternative becoming to the schemes instituted by the dominant classes, thus being an obstacle for overcoming the strategies of the conservative classes. Livingstone, Anderson, and Mulhern underline Lukacs’ oversight
when failing to consider the contradictory dimension in his critical scheme of Expressionism, equally valid for art-related issues in general. Bloch, in turn, resorted to “popular” practices that were not always convincing in their aesthetic or political content—which could conceal the innovative, transformative, and critical role of art.

Similarly, in the post-critical period, resistance movements against a complete submission to the cultural forms of late capitalism would sometimes promote an agenda for the autonomy of form and space towards an absolute internal spatial logic (the telos of the new sublime or historical ideal), and in some cases propose to dissolve the ad hoc disciplinary models to approach the everyday demands of social classes oppressed or ignored by the dominant market forces. We are not short of recent historical examples regarding these two forms of critical action against the hegemonic cultural expressions of late capitalism. Architects Mies Van der Rohe and John Hejduk are perhaps the most sophisticated proponents of the autonomy of the field through the protection of its forms and spatialities against the fragilities of ordinary spatial production (the oeuvre versus the world). As for those who sought to operate directly within the forces that determine the production of space, their representativeness is diffuse and commonly related to state management bodies, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), “tactical urbanism,” spontaneous activism, or even in specific fields of art. Furthermore, precisely because they strove to operate through non-hegemonic forms, architects and urban planners who sought direct social and political engagement generally denied the discipline’s canonical or iconic formal solutions—as these would allegedly carry the vices of the dominant systems, either in the scale of the social order of a given region or in the neocolonial cultural assimilation processes in developing countries. Such examples are plenty in the works of architects Ralph Erskine, Nicolaas John Habraken, the Uruguayan Housing Cooperatives, and Grupo Arquitectura Nova. A critical stance, in this case, meant criticizing historically consolidated disciplinary strata, both with regard to formal results (typological or aesthetic) as well as in the design and production processes.

While the limit of autonomy occurred within the architecture of spectacle, and therefore in connivance with the spatial model of late capitalism, engagement became practically unfeasible within a context dominated by the economic regulation of neoliberal policies, centered on profit and the private sector.

Hence, the recent reunion of theory and criticism with the disciplinary perspectives of architecture and urbanism has led to reassessments of their relationships with the State. The European welfare state, for example, has been the subject of several academic studies that underline its consequences in the everyday life of the working class, deemed incomparable with the policies aimed at privatizations and the minimum State, especially in the social housing sector, which, when privatized, did not evolve its technical-spatial attributes or its financial management mechanisms. Hence, the autonomy advocated by art, which freed it from its direct social functions and from its representational obligations (whether theological, political, or social), could not be directly applied to disciplines concerned with the urban space and its contradictions. After all, between the project and its implementation, the various agents involved would ensure the heteronomy of the process, at least from a methodological standpoint. Against this backdrop, the hypothesis of a hedonistic and radically autonomous architecture becomes unfeasible—regardless of the productive systems and urban dynamics—as in Georg Lukács’ version of realism or in Niklas Luhmann’s principle of autopoiesis. Its material, historical, heterological, and dialectical nature leads us to pursue other critical evaluation methods and theoretical formulations.

It is no coincidence that one of the most recurring authors in contemporary studies related to architecture or urbanism has been French philosopher Henri Lefebvre. His interpretations
and theories on urban space and urban life, discussed in the volumes of *Critique of Everyday Life* (1947/1991) and further developed in the emblematic *Right to the City* (1968/1996), *The Urban Revolution* (1970/2003), and *The Production of Space* (1974/1991), among others, have been fundamental for understanding the urban and social dynamics emerging from modernity.

Like so many other critics of the 1960s and 1970s, Lefebvre understands that the Modern city has failed to create spaces fully dedicated to the public life, to the contradictory, to uncompromised interactions, to cultural and artistic activation, to party, to pleasure, to enjoyment. Behind an apparent socializing and egalitarian ordering, as found in the Modern housing complex or in the urban system of the isolated suburban houses, the rationalization of everyday life would serve the authoritarian logic of industrial capitalism. This other order, imposed by technicians and technocrats, would affect both the dynamics of everyday life as well as the spatial and political segregation of those excluded or secondary to the “system” (Lefebvre, 1969). Undoubtedly, themes such as the expansion of global capitalism, the decline of the welfare state, global warming, racial and ethnic conflicts, and refugees, among others in our everyday life, are very distant from the world in which Lefebvre debated. And they are above all distant from the concept of city in the molds of the ancient boroughs of medieval Europe—a reference point for the French philosopher—often understood as romanticized or anachronic. However, his complex and sometimes paradoxical theoretical legacy has acquired a new meaning in recent decades, as his criticism of the modern capitalist city (the city of *use value*) can now be regarded as a premonition to the urban conflicts of our planet. When Lefebvre claims the City as the fundamental spatial unit for the “socialization of society,” he is not referring to a nostalgic return to the “liberating” urban agglomerations of European historical tradition, such as the medieval city described by Weber in *The City*. What Lefebvre seeks to develop is an understanding of the urban phenomenon that considers the contradictions and the confluences between space and society. In this regard, the City is the result of collective desires mediated by its objectivities and subjectivities, both historical and virtual. As he writes: “The prescription is: there cannot be a going back (towards the traditional city), nor a head long flight, towards a colossal and shapeless agglomeration” (Lefebvre, 1968/1996, p. 148).

As Lefebvre would argue, to make progress in this complex task it would be insufficient to use fragmented sciences and knowledge, such as architecture, engineering, sociology, and geography. In order to understand and intervene in the urban dynamics, we must develop new theoretical and methodological tools that systematically integrate material production, society, and space. Among them, I believe that Lefebvrian *trialectics* could contribute to the debate on autonomy since its capacity to respond simultaneously to the various spatial scales of urban everyday life emphasizes, within the theoretical field, the contradictions of the term *germane* to contemporary architectural and urban practices. Such contradictions, as we shall see, are more glaring in the accelerated modalities of late capitalism in developing countries, where the urban crisis unfolds without the effective historical experience of the City. After all, the classic notion of autonomy—centered on the possibility that the oeuvre is *critical* against the dominant structures of the world precisely because it does not belong to this same world—has proven ineffective to the themes of architecture and urbanism. When we consider architecture to be “oeuvre,” and the world to be the city (material and social), an internal fissure fractures the symbolic and phenomenological instruments of both architecture and the city. Both fail to be realized by operating partially in their spatial conditions. Such is the case of urban territories conceived according to their exchange-value, validated within the logic of the market, consumption, the commodity-city—the everyday nature of late capitalism, currently enduring an unprecedented crisis.
Conversely, when we consider Lefebvrian spatial *dialectics* as an instrument for disciplinary understanding, whether by architecture or urbanism, *city and space* become integrated around a single and comprehensive social theory, which allows for a multi-level analysis (Schmid, 2012). For (social) space is considered a (social) product, which does not exist in itself as an independent category—space is produced by the forces of a given social reality. In this sense, the production of space must consider the forces determined by space as well as (historical) time. For space represents the *synchronic* order of a social reality, while time represents its *diachronic* order—the historical process of social production (Schmid, 2012, p. 91). In other words, for Lefebvre, space and time are not independent or pure material factors, and thus must be understood as integrated with social practices. Therefore, they can only be understood in their specific social context, which makes them essentially historical. This suggests that the appreciation of the contradictions of social reality must occur through its spatial issues, which, according to Lefebvre, would be determined both by the triad of “spatial practice,” “representations of space,” and “representational spaces” as well as the conditions of the “perceived,” “conceived,” and “lived” space. The broad understanding of these terms has been the subject of several Lefebvrian studies, which are not always convergent. What interests us, however, are its foundations directly related to the issues of cities and urban space, in which the interdependence of its spatial triad seems fundamental. In this sense, broadly speaking, an understanding of the relations between space and society would occur through the simultaneous understanding of these three categories, that is: the ways through which they are “materially” apprehended through the sense, their everyday dialectical interactions of spatial practices (*perceived space*), the forms of material production of spaces and their representations (*conceived space*), and the way in which the spaces of representation (and their subjectivities) manifest themselves in the everyday lives of the inhabitants, as mediation and dialogue between the perceived and the conceived (*lived space*).

Thus, considering the dependence of the architectural object—and urban themes—upon the contradictions of the material and symbolic realities of societies, the problem of autonomy set forth by critical or post-critical authors emerges as incomplete—or even obsolete. Accepting urban conditions as purely determined by market forces, or by the demands of a dominant culture, indicates that the critical task of an autonomous architecture would be to oppose these forces towards better and more promising spatial proposals, whether utopian or otherwise. A mistake if we consider the Lefebvrian theses on the production of space. Likewise, it would not be possible to surmise the urban as the space in which social expressions exist authentically, even if mediated by interests and contradictions, in relation to an architecture always subjected to the interests of private capital or State strategies.

What we do find, in the conditions presented in these first decades of the 21st century, is that a critical perspective for architecture or urbanism must consider the contradictions and forces that determine the production of space. After all, given our current conditions, the prospects for a general crisis in the system, whether due to social chaos or environmental collapse, seem to be inevitable.

**Urban Virtualities**

One of the most discerning characteristics of the Lefebvrian approach lies in his intent to go beyond philosophy and theory to address the actions of everyday life (Schmid, 2012). Hence the connection between his theories and the practices of different fields of study dedicated to space and society.

This connection would also become fundamental for the authors behind the so-called *spatial turn*, a term ascribed to the perception that social change cannot be fully understood without
the conceptualization of the spatial categories of social life. Under the influence of Lefebvre, as well as Foucault, Certeau, and Virilio, authors such as Edward Soja, David Harvey, and Dorey Massey, among others, sought to consider the spatial contradictions of late capitalism in times when the fragilities of the neoliberal model were not yet self-evident, especially in core countries. The critical legacy of these authors helped to reveal new contradictions in post-critical architecture. In addition to the condition of product—or spectacle—such architectures, under the logic of late capitalism, would account for the spatial strategies of biopolitical control. Perhaps therein resided the mutually fueled distrust between those who dealt with urban themes (the spaces of the city) and those who addressed architecture (the space of the building), or even between urbanists and architects.

One example is the essay “What Ever Happened to Urbanism?” first presented in 1994 by Rem Koolhaas (Koolhaas et al., 1998). As in several of his manifesto-essays, Koolhaas attacks the normative ideals behind some practices of urbanism and urban planning and claims for architecture the role of operating complex spatial issues, with strategies and meanings that could interact with everyday dynamics. His goal is not merely to ignore the city, the urban, and its material and symbolic conditions, as one could deduce from his famous diatribe “fuck context.” The point is to enhance human relations through the interrelationships of the program, architecture, and the pragmatic nature of late capitalism. We see this in his major “absolute-scale” works, as well as in the China Central Television (CCTV) complex built in Beijing, as in the sophisticated small-scale interventions, as in the Prada store in Soho, New York. In these emblematic examples, the Generic Cities (to use a term coined by Koolhaas) would be the natural result of individual values and market forces, their planning being both obsolete as a disciplinary technique as well as ideological as a theoretical-conceptual foundation. Thus, the CCTV headquarters building finds, through a sophisticated vertical geometric variation of the traditional perimeter occupation common to 19th-century European cities, the solution for its complex program distributed across 473,000 m² and 44 floors. The ultimate independent, patented form—a postmodern version of the Grossform proposed by Oswald Mathias Ungers in the 1970s—thus becomes the possible urban response to the cultural, social, and economic dynamics of global neoliberalism. The same occurs in the simple scale of the Prada store in Soho, whose articulation among the streets serves merely as a pretext to locate the visitor/consumer in a de-territorialized reality, shaped by images and shapes arranged as if at random, in subtle reference to the Venturian Las Vegas Strip, now inverted into a private territory associated with the symbol-brand of yuppie consumerism and the aesthetic glamor of the billionaire market of the “fashion world.” It is no accident, therefore, that Paul Valery’s aphorism “What is deeper in a man is the skin” (via Nietzsche) would be widely used by postmodern architects who trailed the adventure of Robert Venturi and Denise Scott-Brown towards the reorganization of the discipline against the logic of consumer society and late capitalism. Valery’s poetic phrase did not always have, in its architectural and urban interpretations, the same ambiguous effect as the original meaning. After all, Valery questioned the viability of a universal human condition for the simple fact that, as Foucault stated in “The order of things” (Foucault, 1966), man does not exist. The only thing to exist is the being. Or, more precisely, the “being-there” (Dasein), in the terms of Martin Heidegger, another highly influential philosopher for these architects who tried to situate themselves amid the dilemmas of postmodernity. Koolhaas established his dialogue both with the opening provided by Venturi in relation to consumer society, and with the discursive possibilities and the diversity of narratives offered by the new French philosophy. In this context, the role of the discipline would not be to associate itself to broad social or ideological issues, but to use the structural mechanisms of the system to allow for multiple possibilities of the being to manifest themselves freely.
The mere existence (its viability) of architecture would suffice, in its practical and pragmatic clashes with the realities with which it dialogued. As we have seen, theory and criticism could be dismissed since its engagement would take place through the project, and its methods and techniques.

The ideological obsolescence of this type of “autonomous” architecture gains consistency from some of the traumatic events of the first decade of the 21st century, as mentioned early in this chapter. Such events, on the one hand, call into question the values associated with the so-called architecture of spectacle, destined to represent the power of major transnational corporations and of the countries associated with the economic strength of the private sector and the financial market. On the other hand, they deeply affect the neoliberal economic system based on global financial flows, practically independent from the State-controlled regulatory instruments. Especially after 2008, the implications became drastic for architecture and urbanism, since housing production, responsible for most of the demands in the field, was one of the most deeply affected sectors. Presently, another event underpins the critical arguments against the neoliberal model—the pandemic resulting from the COVID-19 virus. While it is too early to speculate about its economic, social, political, and urban consequences, the debates have been unanimous as to the need to re-discuss the role of the State amidst the major global problems. Such problems—universal access to the health system, minimum income, preservation of the environment, minimum housing conditions—are commonly ignored or systematically poorly managed by the private sector.

In the major cities of the so-called Global South, such as São Paulo, there is ample evidence of the need for a critical architecture and urbanism—and therefore for updating the discipline’s theoretical-critical thought.

**FIGURE 2.4** Downtown São Paulo, Brazil, 2018.
From the 1970s onwards, the architecture and urbanism produced in the city of São Paulo developed its own internal dynamics, whose most renowned variant became known as the *Escola Paulista*—a peculiar version of autonomy, with a double meaning. The first sought to consolidate the efforts of the first generations of Brazilian modern architects in their pursuit for their own language and identity, intensified during those years of post-colonial debates in vogue in the field of cultural studies. The second, with a more complex design and not always intentional to architects, sought a movement towards urban and spatial introspection, as it sought to create a self-referential spatiality away from the problems experienced by the major capitalist city in those years. In other words, given the impossibility of dialogue or intervention in an uneven and predatory structure in which a bulldozer-like urbanism transformed the historical and social fabric of the city, the critical option would be for a kind of “testudo formation”—in which the limits of the lot or architecture is akin to the demarcation between the real city and the possible (utopian) city (Medrano & Recaman, 2013). The most virtuous exponent within this architecture was the architect and professor João Vilanova Artigas, one of the founders of the Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism of the University of São Paulo (FAUUSP). Author of several projects, still relatively unknown in the international context, Artigas was a member and activist for the Brazilian Communist Party, an experience that continuously influenced both his professional performance and his pursuit for an architecture focused on the architect’s social role amidst an unequal society. His most renowned residences, schools, and public buildings stood out in their sophisticated and original formal repertoire, whose greatest virtue was to delve into the technical possibilities of concrete to devise a spatial proposal away from the commonly accepted demands of the local bourgeoisie. However, if on the one hand, isolation enabled him to create unique and emblematic spaces, such as those of the FAUUSP building and the Elza Berquó House, on the other hand the scheme authorized a certain distancing of architectural issues from city issues. The consequences of this anti-urban choice are still felt today. And what emerges as a critique of the capitalist modes of production ultimately becomes a model for the capitalist market itself. After all, free of the symbolic, utilitarian, and aesthetic urban implications, the territorial occupation strategies could follow the flow of profit and the patrimonial dynamics that characterized a large part of the growth of the city of São Paulo. The alleged autonomy, understood as a legitimate critical resource in opposition to the dominant conservative forces in the city, failed to present consistent or viable urban solutions generalized at the city scale. The anti-urban model (utopian or otherwise) was only possible in the lot, and could only become critical if the real urban model served as an opposition.

Nonetheless, if the Paulista Architecture failed to produce enough instruments to operate in the urban field, then urbanism and urban planning were equally unable to ensure a more just and democratic spatial organization to São Paulo—albeit not for the lack of efforts in the academic and professional field addressing the problems of the metropolis. But the political and economic forces, which prevailed in the city during its rapid expansion period, were guided by the interests of large construction companies and the real estate market, in line with the developmental policies of the military dictatorship. The result was a city with a social geography marked by inequality and a spatial organization without any connection to structured formal or typological models.

Throughout this period, much of the efforts of the FAUUSP teachers and students turned towards political activism against the military regime. Their activism was ideologically inspired by progressive Marxist doctrines, whose practical actions and theoretical foundations were diverse and ranged from radical revolutionary variants to reformist stances. Regarding the urban theory in vogue at the time, the concepts elaborated by Manuel Castells in the book...
Theoretical-critical repertoire devised by intellectuals belonging to the Faculty of Philosophy, Languages, and Human Sciences of the University of São Paulo (FFLCH-USP), such as Chico de Oliveira, Milton Santos, and Lúcio Kowarick, among others. Although we find diverse theoretical and practical responses among them, urban activism associated with political instruments for territorial transformation had the most promising consequences. Urban space as the result of social and political forces, along the lines developed by Castells, seemed to be a very adequate hypothesis for understanding a local reality undergoing transformations from the development imposed by the military regime, which were drastically reshaping the local landscape—accentuating the spatial contrasts between rich and poor. In this particular case, the contrasts are between neighborhoods that followed the normative instruments of urban planning and those that followed their own rules guided by basic needs and assorted internal dynamics (as in the precarious settlements of the peripheries or in the slums). Issues related to urban spatiality, to the urban form, to the relationship between alienation and the city, in the terms laid out by Henri Lefebvre in *Right to the City* (1968/1996), had little impact on the local intellectual production of those years, even though the first translation into Portuguese was published as early as 1969. After all, the political and spatial issues that emerged from areas of extreme poverty, as one would expect, seemed to demand more urgent and pragmatic solutions than those resulting from the subjectivities proposed by certain aesthetic-spatial configurations and the desire for a *oeuvre* city, as posed in a pretentious and complex manner by the French philosopher.

The architects were also influenced by neo-Marxist movements in those difficult years during the dictatorship. The most prolific and well-known comprised the *Grupo Arquitetura Nova*, founded by architects Flávio Império, Rodrigo Lefèvre, and Sérgio Ferro. According to
FIGURE 2.6 External view of the Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism of the University of São Paulo (FAUUSP), designed by João Batista Vilanova Artigas and Carlos Cascaldi, São Paulo, Brazil, 1969. Photo taken in 2018.

the group, active since the early 1960s, the alienation resulting from the relationship between production and consumption in the capitalist system would be one of the main challenges posed to architecture. Hence, they sought in their methods and concepts an approach to the working-class conditions of the construction site by way of political and aesthetic instruments. From a political standpoint, they would act in opposition to the capitalist logic imposed by the dictatorship, partaking in progressive movements. From an aesthetic standpoint, they would seek a language that represents the contradictions of the material conditions of the working class, emphasizing formal issues pertaining to the construction site, technical precariousness, lack of resources, etc. Through their works, Grupo Arquitetura Nova seeks to express the results of a productive process that truly results from popular participation in the broadest sense of the word (aesthetic, technique, and productive).

Over the course of the following decades, both the idealism proposed by Artigas’ architecture (close to Lukács’ “formalist” aesthetic conceptions, for example) as well as the engagement proposed by Grupo Arquitetura Nova (close to Bloch’s activism or the organic forces of Gramscian intellectual production) would represent the impasses of the national issues, equally embodied in other cultural or artistic expressions. Both cases, when faced with the intensification of the military regime, saw their instruments of action and their reproducibility or evolution capabilities become unfeasible. Furthermore, apart from local political issues, their conceptual arguments would lose ground in the theoretical-critical field, in symmetry with other progressive manifestations devised in core countries. The last disciplinary utopian impulses of architecture and urbanism towards the modernization of society would thus become overshadowed by the new liberal order that dominated Western capitalism. 18
In both the Brazilian and Latin American context, as well as in developed countries, perhaps the biggest mistake of specialized criticism has been to underestimate the implications of the desire for the city or, in Lefebvrian terms, the desire for the right to the city. Calling for autonomy without considering the urban inferences of architecture, or advocating for changes in the structural logic of urban society without regard for the social consequences of form proved to be strategies incapable of resisting the overwhelming methods of late capitalism. Therefore, the City depends on the simultaneous actions of its constituent parts and its projecting mechanisms—its expectation as to the future, its urban virtuality. Thus, a disciplinary critical-theoretical perspective should consider the possibilities of architecture and urbanism to distance themselves from the instruments of social domination operating in the different forms and scales in the production of space. This would allow for a closer approach to spaces suitable to different forms of social manifestations capable of problematizing their internal contradictions while seeking alternatives to these contradictions—in a continuous process that is both constituent and fundamental to urban society. These spaces would not result solely from delimited uses, bureaucratic land regularization processes, the dualism between public and private, the organization of functional orders, or the creation of new programs—or even from the preservation of unconscious and deeply rooted schemes that reinforce historical conditions for maintaining dominant orders, in relation to their class, gender, race, etc. These spaces should understand the importance of the spatial conditions that determine the public and private spheres, as well as their multiple social, symbolic, historical, and political interrelations—informed, perhaps, by new relations of solidarity, and no longer by competitiveness and individualism, typical to neoliberal ideologies. This situation is not at all novel to progressive political or ideological premises focused on the issue of urban space—the expanded concept of the City. What is novel, as we have seen, are

FIGURE 2.7 Internal view of the Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism of the University of São Paulo (FAUUSP), designed by João Batista Vilanova Artigas and Carlos Cascaldi, São Paulo, Brazil, 1969. Photo taken in 2018.
the material and symbolic conditions that the current widespread crisis of the neoliberal models demand both from the field of theory and criticism, as well as from the different forms of practical or political action.

Notes

1. For example, Massimo Cacciari, in the book *La Città* (2004), updated for the 21st century the questions posed to the urbanization processes of industrial cities, in accelerated course since the 19th century.


3. Although we find “post-critical practices” in the field of architecture and urbanism since the 1980s, it is from the beginning of the 21st century that these practices are identified as belonging to the same theoretical and methodological pattern, as found, for example, in the essays “Design Intelligence and the New Economy” and “After theory: debate in architectural schools rages about the value of theory and its effect on innovation” by Speaks (2002, 2005).

4. Hungarian scientist-philosopher Michael Polanyi used the term “post-critical” to indicate the *fiduciary* nature of knowledge. When appropriated in the field of architecture and urbanism, the term is used in reference to a so-called pragmatic production—without any commitment to go against the dominant cultural, economic, or political systems by way of theoretical foundations. Several authors refer to the term when addressing the disciplinary production in the final decades of the 20th century and the first years of the 21st century (e.g., Foster, 2012; Mallgrave & Goodman, 2011; Montaner, 2011; Saunders, 2007; Sykes, 2010).

5. The exhibition, which consisted of photographs, drawings, and audiovisual material, had enormous repercussions in the US as well as in the various countries where it was held. Modern Brazilian Architecture presented itself to the world as the most original and promising version of the New Architecture with Central-European origins. It also spawned the book *Brazil Builds: architecture new and old 1652–1942*, by Philip Goodwin and G.E. Kidder Smith (Goodwin & Smith, 1943).


7. See, for example, the article “The New Urban Enclosures” (Hodkinson, 2012).

8. For example, Michael Hays in *Architecture’s Desire: Reading the Late Avant-Garde* (2008).

9. North American architect Peter Eisenman is perhaps the most influential example of this variant, commonly called “deconstructivist.”

10. The issue of autonomy gains traction in the field of architecture mainly through the initiatives and texts of Joan Ockman and Pier Vittorio Aureli, e.g., Aureli (2008, 2011).


12. For example, Tony Judt in *Ill Fares the Land* formulates an interesting critical reflection on the privatization processes that have occurred in the past 40 years, especially in Europe (J Judt, 2011).

13. In recent years, several books, conferences, and academic articles have delved into the relationship between social housing, the State, and the financial market. Some examples are the books *Urban Warfare: Housing Under the Empire of Finance* by Raquel Rolnik (2019) and *Architecture and the Welfare State*, edited by Mark Swenarton and Tom Avermaete (Swenarton, Avermaete, & Heuvel, 2014).

14. The debate about a post-COVID-19 world has brought together intellectuals from all over the world. I emphasize here, for example, the recent contributions by Bruno Latour, Slavoj Zizek, Giorgio Agamben, José Luís Fiori, and Laura Carvalho.

15. The Elza Berquó House, from 1967, is one of the most enigmatic works by Vilanova Artigas. In this mature work by the architect, its pillars made of raw tree trunks, in contrast to the reinforced concrete, perhaps signal the hardships encountered by local modernity. The technological advances, so overwhelming to Modern Architecture, were not symmetrical to the structural social changes in Brazilian society. This mismatch thus began to inform the local production, both as a criticism and as a strategy for eccentric and original spatial solutions.


18. Among the authors who have faced this debate, which emerged from the original issues posed by Manfredo Tafuri, we find Reinhold Martin, Felicity Scott, and Sven-Olov Wallenstein. In Brazil, philosopher Otilia Arantes was the most important representative of this theoretical-critical posture in recent decades.
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