This chapter discusses a widespread but underexplored phenomenon in Brazilian cities: the growing presence of walls and other security infrastructures in low-income, peripheral neighborhoods. This practice can often take the form of bounded and internally regulated regimes of residential organization at a hyper-local scale, associated with the emic term *condomínio* (condominium). The authors propose the concept of "walling" to theorize the practices of socio-material assembly through which peripheral condominiums emerge, driven by the efforts of urban subjects to reconstruct a sense of well-being within environments experienced as precarious and insecure. While walling can significantly reshape socio-spatial relationships and everyday flows of bodies, the authors argue that broader social conditions and relationships in peripheries tend to promote forms of spatial and temporal porosity that weaken or even undermine these regimes of self-segregation. The chapter explores varying dynamics of peripheral condominiums through the presentation of contrasting case studies from three different Brazilian cities: a recently completed Minha Casa Minha Vida (My House My Life) public housing project in Porto Alegre; a partially walled and symbolically partitioned favela in Rio de Janeiro; and an occupied and subsequently formalized public housing project in São Paulo.

Matthew Aaron Richmond, LSE, London School of Economics, United Kingdom, m.a.richmond@lse.ac.uk, 0000-0002-1563-3615
Moisés Kopper, Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium, moises.kopper@ulb.be, 0000-0003-0327-7681

Referee List (DOI 10.36253/fup_referee_list)
FUP Best Practice in Scholarly Publishing (DOI 10.36253/fup_best_practice)

Matthew Aaron Richmond, Moisés Kopper, *Walling the peripheries: porous condominiums at Brazil's urban margins*, © Author(s), CC BY-NC-ND 4.0, DOI 10.36253/978-88-5518-661-2.04, in Giuseppina Forte, Kuan Hwa (edited by), *Embodying Peripheries*, pp. 74-95, 2022, published by Firenze University Press, ISBN 978-88-5518-661-2, DOI 10.36253/978-88-5518-661-2

WALLING THE PERIPHERIES: POROUS CONDOMINIUMS AT BRAZIL'S URBAN MARGINS

Matthew Aaron Richmond, Moisés Kopper

Introduction

Two decades ago, Teresa Caldeira (2000) memorably dubbed South America's largest metropolis, São Paulo, a "City of Walls." She described how, in a context of extreme inequality, faltering democratic institutions, and rising crime, wealthy Paulistanos were increasingly retreating into "fortified enclaves." Known in Portuguese as *condomínios fechados* (gated condominiums), these privatized and securitized spaces offered their residents comfort, symbolic distinction, and isolation from the perceived threats of the heterogeneous, "public" city. Being physically self-contained, and often connected to various other elite spaces like shopping centers and business complexes via purpose-built expressways, these condominiums could be built further from the city center without compromising mobility and situated closer to low-income settlements without increasing contact between social classes. Caldeira described this emergent socio-spatial configuration as "proximity with walls." Within these spaces, new infrastructures allowed extreme socioeconomic and racial disparities to be preserved under changing urban conditions while inscribing them more starkly into the built environment.

São Paulo's peripheries,[1] by contrast, had traditionally followed a very different process of urban expansion. Since the mid-twentieth century, low-income families had settled in vast, autoconstructed (self-built) urban expanses, typically characterized by irregular legal status, sparse public services, and precarious infrastructure (Caldeira, 2017). During Brazil's long redemocratization of the 1980s, social movements from the peripheries arose to demand regularization, public policies, and democratic elections. This mode of organizing life at the fringes of the city engendered physical and social improvements, as well as an "insurgent" form of citizenship (Holston, 2008), as residents learned to see themselves as rights-bearing citizens. Although peripheries were deeply impacted by the rising gang and police violence

[1] We use "peripheries," in line with emic uses of the term *periferia* in Portuguese, to refer to low-income peripheral areas, rather than peri-urban elite condominiums. This term tends to carry derogatory connotations when used by outsiders, but residents of these areas have reappropriated it as a positive identity associated with cultural innovation and political mobilization (D'Andrea, 2020).

of the 1990s, they mostly remained "open" spaces with few physical barriers constraining everyday flows of bodies (Caldeira, 1994).

Today, many of Caldeira's observations about these patterns of socioeconomic and racial segregation still hold for São Paulo and many other Brazilian cities. The withdrawal of wealthier groups into gated condominiums continues apace. However, in quite distinct ways, the walling of urban space has also subsequently become a widely diffused practice in lower-income peripheries. In this chapter, we examine how processes of social and spatial differentiation in these areas come together through the embodied practices of peripheral residents.

We define "walling" as the socio-material assembly of physical and symbolic barriers in urban space through which subjects seek to reconstruct a sense of well-being within social and institutional environments experienced as precarious and insecure. Assisted by combinations of material and human infrastructures, condominiums entail distinct modes of regulating encounters between groups and organizing flows of bodies. Elite fortified enclaves do so through tightly integrated infrastructural assemblages produced and maintained via contractually mediated exchanges, reinforcing a form of geographic isolation organized starkly along class and racial lines. By contrast, "peripheral condominiums" have the propensity to produce moral distinctions without constructing a coherent "Other" or necessarily entailing interpersonal ruptures, and employ walls that may, in various ways, fail to physically and symbolically separate those behind them. It is through this figure of the peripheral condominium that we emphasize the plastic, porous, and unruly nature of walling processes in peripheries, where resource constraints, architectural inertia and informal norms of sociability all tend to militate against the rigid enforcement of spatial separations. At the same time, as infrastructures in-the-making with different practices and degrees of "porosity," walls and fences show how aspirations for (spatial) enclosure and (temporal) completion complicate common perceptions of peripheries as open and socially homogeneous spaces containing only rudimentary infrastructures.

We explore varying dynamics of peripheral condominiums in Brazil by contrasting three ethnographic instances of walling practices: a recently completed Minha Casa Minha Vida (My House My Life, or MCMV) public housing project in Porto Alegre; a partially walled and symbolically partitioned favela in Rio de Janeiro; and an occupied and subsequently formalized and walled public housing project in São Paulo. For each site, research included several months, and in some cases years, of qualitative fieldwork, numerous interviews with residents and key informants, participant observation in local

organizations, and analysis of everyday spatial practices.[2] In presenting each case study, we focus on a particular individual whose role in the community provided them with a privileged view of local dynamics. While inevitably partial, this strategy offers valuable insights regarding the ways in which peripheral condominiums are made into symbolic and material realities, as well as the tensions that emerge inside them and at their boundaries. These accounts are supplemented with broader insights garnered from the field through direct observation and interactions with various other interlocutors.

Walling was not the initial focus of any of these research projects,[3] and the cases were not preselected based on what they might reveal about this process. Indeed, aside from all being peripheral neighborhoods in large metropolises in the South or Southeast of Brazil, the cases are extremely diverse in terms of key variables such as morphology, settlement history, legal status, and forms of organization. In each case, however, as we listened to our interlocutors speak about their lives, attitudes toward the neighborhood, practices of sociability, and symbolic distinctions, walling emerged as a major theme. As we discussed and analyzed these and other cases with colleagues at the Centro de Estudos da Metrópole (CEM), São Paulo, we discovered that walling was a widespread, important, and understudied phenomenon in Brazil's urban peripheries. Given the inductive and nonlinear way in which this research process unfolded, we do not seek here to provide a comprehensive account of walling or typology of peripheral condominiums. Rather, through analysis and comparison of three contrasting cases, and by drawing on logical inference rather than sample-based logic (Small, 2009), we seek to identify the mechanisms that drive walling across diverse peripheral contexts and the factors conditioning what form the practice takes.

Beyond this introduction, the chapter contains four different sections and a conclusion. First, we offer an overview of recent transformations in urban peripheries and introduce the concepts of "walling" and "porosity" that guide our analysis. We then present our ethnographic cases of walling in three different Brazilian cities, showing how the pervasive category of the "condominium" indexes the contingent processes of differentiation and efforts at socio-material boundary-making in peripheries today. Finally, in conclusion, we reflect on the implications of walling practices, condominiums, and porosity for the comparative study of embodied socio-material practices and relations in the urban peripheries of the Global South today.

---

[2] Moisés conducted fieldwork in Porto Alegre between 2012 and 2017 (CNPq Doctoral Grant) and in São Paulo between 2016 and 2017 (FAPESP Postdoctoral Grant 2016/16265-1). Matthew carried out fieldwork in Rio de Janeiro between 2012 and 2013 (Economic and Social Research Council 1+3 PhD Studentship) and in São Paulo between 2016 and 2018 (FAPESP Postdoctoral Grant 2015/04480-0).

[3] Moisés' research examined the long-term subjective effects of housing activism in Porto Alegre and São Paulo. Matthew's research focused on: (1) socio-spatial difference within and between Rio de Janeiro's favelas; and (2) subjectivity formation in the peripheries of São Paulo.

Peripheries, walling, and porosity

Social science accounts of Brazil's urban peripheries have offered shifting representations of these spaces and their residents over time (Kopper & Richmond, 2020). The peripheries were once understood as largely homogeneous socio-spatial formations that absorbed a hyper-exploited working class typical of the global capitalist semi-periphery (Kowarick, 1979; Maricato, 1979)—one whose social reproduction was dependent upon both the irregular appropriation of land and the autoconstruction of housing. However, major institutional, socioeconomic, and physical transformations over subsequent decades have led these spaces to be understood today as constitutively *heterogeneous* rather than homogeneous spaces (Marques, 2014; Richmond, 2018; Richmond, Kopper, Oliveira & Garza, n.d.). As the state became more responsive to the demands of peripheral populations following Brazil's redemocratization, public services and infrastructure expanded significantly, albeit in geographically uneven ways. At the same time, there has been a long-term shift from industrial employment to more precarious, but also more diverse, service jobs, while various social policies introduced during the years of the Workers' Party rule (Partido dos Trabalhadores, PT, 2003–2016) contributed to new forms of social stratification as well as material and symbolic differentiation in peripheries.

Reflecting these shifts, the social geographies and built environments of urban peripheries have also undergone radical transformations. In areas of autoconstructed housing, credit availability and governmental tax cuts on durable goods made it easier for individual households to incrementally refurbish and verticalize their homes so that they are often barely distinguishable from those of "formal" neighborhoods (Caldeira, 2017; Cavalcanti, 2009). Combined with upgrading through public-private initiatives fostering tenure regularization and incremental installation of infrastructure and utilities (Kopper & Ide, 2019), many peripheral neighborhoods have indeed undergone a process of "suburbanization" (D'Andrea, 2020). There has also been an expansion of public housing, from various state-level programs during the 1990s to the vast federally-sponsored Minha Casa Minha Vida program initiated by the PT in 2009. Under MCMV, units built by the private sector with public funds were distributed to beneficiaries screened by municipalities, sometimes limiting coordination with civil society organizations and enforcing segregation patterns in the peripheries (Cardoso & Lago, 2013; Shimbo, 2012). Finally, precarious new informal settlements or "hyper-peripheries" (Torres & Marques, 2001) continue to form, providing the only option for those unable to access housing via market or bureaucratic mechanisms.

Though largely ignored in the literature, walls have become an increasingly common feature of peripheral landscapes under these heterogeneous socio-spatial conditions. They are part of a range of socio-technical devices that foreground the expanded role of both the state and the market in catering to these residential areas (Jensen & Morita, 2017). Mass-produced housing and community-based upgrading in various parts of the Global South have come to rely on technological innovation to overcome challenges in peripheral areas, including increasing demands for privacy and securitization (Monkkonen, 2018).[4] Walls and fences have been incorporated as mandatory features of new public housing projects, sometimes accompanied by security guards and technologies like CCTV cameras, interphones, and electronic keys (Kopper, 2019). Meanwhile, residents of "open," autoconstructed areas have also, on a piecemeal basis, sought to fortify their homes, and sometimes streets and wider neighborhoods (Cavalcanti, 2009). These processes appear to be driven by the same desires for security, comfort, and symbolic distinction that Caldeira identified in the case of the elite fortified enclaves (Caldeira, 2000; Kopper, 2019). However, as we discuss further, in peripheries such processes give rise to very different, and far less tightly bounded, socio-material assemblies.

To theorize the particular conditions surrounding walling processes in peripheries, we mobilize the concept of "porosity." In his cultural history of Rio de Janeiro, Carvalho (2014) defines porosity as the capacity for some bodies, though not others, to traverse physical boundaries, much like the porosity enabled by the pores of the skin. In this way, he argues, porosity may be vital in allowing highly segregated Brazilian cities to function: "a divided city [...] can be argued to presuppose a porous city and vice-versa" (Carvalho, 2014, p. 12). Nonetheless, there are varying degrees and criteria of porosity, determining which bodies are constrained, how, and on what grounds. Spaces like Rio's Praça Onze (on which Carvalho focuses) are highly porous and allow the extensive mixing of different groups. By contrast, spaces like elite gated condominiums have highly regulated regimes of porosity in which mixing occurs only under very narrow and exclusionary conditions.

Porosity can also be understood as having a temporal dimension. Walter Benjamin and Asja Lacis (1986, pp. 156–166), for example, famously described the "porosity" of Naples, where "one can scarcely discern where building is still in progress and where dilapidation has already set in. For nothing is concluded." They attributed this to a "passion for improvisation,

[4] While technological innovations in elite condominiums can be attributed to the neoliberal policies of the 1990s and early 2000s (Low, 2003), peripheral condominiums flourished during the late 2000s in the context of the expansion of post-neoliberal governments, which focused heavily on increasing low-income consumption of goods and services via financialized credit. For residents of public housing and even informal settlements, this meant that security technologies were more readily accessible to meet emerging desires for fortification.

which demands that space and opportunity be at any price preserved." The informal and peripheral spaces of the urban Global South have similarly been understood as produced through an improvised and cumulative assembling of materials (McFarlane, 2011; Simone, 2010) and infrastructural becoming (Lancione & McFarlane, 2016). In this way, these spaces stand in stark contrast to the planified spaces of upper-middle-class enclaves, which tend to be sold as finished products, produced for immediate consumption, and furnished by the formal housing market. Moreover, walls and associated infrastructures can also be understood as "temporal devices" (Anand, Gupta & Appel, 2018) in that they seek to materialize temporal disconnects via the forms of symbolic differentiation and separation of bodies that they enact.

Fig. 1 Sentry box and gate infrastructures at Residencial Bento Gonçalves in Porto Alegre (photo: M. Kopper, February 2017).

In this regard, attempts to "enclose" and "complete" particular peripheral spaces, like those we discuss below, would seem to reflect current conditions in many Brazilian (and perhaps other Latin American) cities and may contrast with peripheral spaces found elsewhere in the Global South where similar conditions do not prevail. These conditions include the central role of fear of violence in organizing subjective experiences of the city, but also the aforementioned processes of the formalization and/or commodification of much housing and infrastructure provision over recent years. In such a context, walling offers the possibility to demarcate boundaries between spaces differentially coded as secure/insecure and formal/informal, but also temporal boundaries between a past defined by poverty and self-reliance and a desired future of comfort and participation in consumer culture. It is important to note, however, that these aspirations are certainly not universal and may only seem like plausible and desirable goals for *some* residents of peripheries. Tensions over walling processes, then, may be associated with competing visions of past, present, and future within peripheral spaces, at both the individual and collective levels. We now turn to our three case studies to further explore how these themes of differentiation and porosity intersect empirically.

Porto Alegre: domesticating porous walls

In our first study, we transport our reader to a blazing hot afternoon in Residencial Bento Gonçalves (Fig. 1), one of several Minha Casa Minha Vida housing projects in the city of Porto Alegre, which was completed in 2014. Standing before the heavy and imposing infrastructure of metal and concrete surrounding the condominium, we felt relieved when we spotted Seu Juliano's prying eyes gaping through the crack of his apartment door. After motioning discreetly, he seemed to remember us, and smiled as he walked toward the gate. "It's all right, I'll take it from here," he gestured toward the newly arrived porter. It

was February 2017, and we had been witnessing refurbishments going on for months now. In 2016, two years after 540 families had moved to the complex, residents organized to devise a plan to install surveillance and intercom infrastructures. MCMV projects are typically delivered with basic barbed wire fencing the premises. Such structures, however, do little in the way of protecting or securing residents from the surrounding areas. Instead, they are intended to work as physical signposts of sociability and mutual care, qualities that MCMV interventions aim to harbor in order to reintegrate poor communities to the urban fabric. After much public deliberation and spearheaded by an ambitious, newly elected building manager, groups of dwellers organized to put into practice a plan that would transform and modernize the condominium. Before moving, the beneficiaries of this particular housing complex had resided in informal settlements and individual rooms borrowed from family members in the tenements of the hilly Partenon neighborhood. Over the course of five years, they had prepared themselves to become responsible homeowners by engaging in painstaking mobilization via a grassroots housing association—of which Seu Juliano was a leading figure. Now, as anxious talk mounted about soaring crime rates following a dramatic deterioration of public security in Rio Grande do Sul, infrastructural improvements introduced new "authenticating procedures" (Gupta, 2012) between residents and outsiders that refashioned both the built environment and everyday sociability.

Seu Juliano, a retired electrician in his sixties, played a vital role in this process. When we met him in November 2016, he was excited by the promise of security technologies. He had

walked from door to door, attempting to convince residents to contribute monthly installments to pay for video doorbells and underground fiber-cable infrastructures. “We have to know who enters and who leaves. There needs to be *some* control. Otherwise, we don’t *really* have security,” he explained.

Over time, however, things proved more complicated. Despite the brand-new garage door with remote activation, ostensive surveillance cameras, and a walkthrough triggered by electronic magnets that were now being individually carried on key chains, many residents failed to participate in the security regime, even in their daily movements. They did not *actually* use remotes and magnet tags; instead, they expected the porters to “display their usefulness” by diligently opening and closing the gate after them. “These people,” Seu Juliano explained that same day, “used to work as housekeepers and janitors for the rich, and now they want to exercise power to show off their new social status.”

Only when measures were taken to cut costs and a new security company was hired did things begin to change. Residents helped construct a sentry box that would accommodate handpicked security guards in charge of filtering the flow of people and enforcing a separation—both moral and physical—between the inside and the outside of the condominium. These security guards—retired male police officers—were informally trained by people like Seu Juliano to ensure that they met specific standards of responsiveness.

Exercising his proclaimed right to “demand” (*cobrar*) as an informed citizen-consumer, Seu Juliano polled suggestions and admonished security guards, calling on his own past experiences as a porter in middle-class residential complexes. “Before,” he continued, “the porters let everybody in. There were no criteria. People smiled from afar, and he pressed the button to open the gate, just to be friendly. That can’t happen.” He then convinced the guards to drop what he saw as misconceived ideas about the project as just another poverty-stricken peripheral slum.

Today, Seu Juliano continues his stewardship of the condominium through eavesdropping on the porters’ conversations from his apartment and using the doorbell phone to call them and hold them accountable for their actions. He envisions his role as a “homeowner” (*proprietário*) as one of enforcing collective decisions through an experiential language of informed consumerism while also honing a critical stance toward the condominium’s problems.

Seu Juliano now filters his communication with neighbors and porters through the workings of doorbell phones from the comfort and privacy of his apartment. By availing himself of walling technologies like doorbell phones in everyday life—whether advocating for his rights as a homeowner, avoiding bothersome acquaintances, catching the

building manager in *his* place while he shuns complainants in the privacy of his apartment, or merely receiving and passing on prank calls—Seu Juliano enacts an intricate social calculation of the kinds of practices, behaviors, and bodies that are desirable as part of the purified communitarian life he envisions for the condominium.

Throughout these calculations, the private condominium figure comes to mediate the ways people like Seu Juliano conceive of security and privacy. Trickling down from middle-class high-rises, walling technologies work as socio-material reminders of how some housing beneficiaries imagine space and its porosity as they move to formalized residential addresses. From Seu Juliano's particular reasoning of what constitutes good practice in richer condominiums to collective action undertaken for maintaining condominium buildings combined with the proliferation of services and lower-income markets catering to homeowners in peripheral condominiums, it becomes clear that peripheral condominization results from numerous institutions, policies, and the everyday practices of direct beneficiaries. Together, these factors shape residents' experiences of organization within the walls and porosity of the city and beyond, both of which are key elements in rendering such space a "condominium" (Donoso & Elsinga, 2018).

The porosity managed by walling technologies also establishes new layers of temporality between desired and unwanted residents. As we learned in our—at times, tense—interactions with porters, infrastructures can be invested with deep-seated imaginaries of dangerous and unwanted individuals. When coupled with their proper "training," security figures bring these imaginaries to life in their everyday practices of blocking and releasing, enabling certain kinds of porosities that work to purge the shadows of residents' troubling pasts in the hills. However, as we learned in conversations with security guards and passersby who repeatedly crossed through the gate, the moral distinctions enforced by the orderly aesthetic belonging to such imaginaries did not wholly prevent bodies from trespassing its enacted physical limits. Chilling stories of covert robberies and undercover drug traffickers running rogue inside the projects continued to circulate in informal conversations as people mobilized to instantiate their visions of the future. Even so, not everyone would promptly acknowledge the existence of unwanted porosities. For many, these were but anecdotal rumors that only defamed the condominium image and did not do justice to the hard work they had put into trying to control the condominium's borders by enforcing symbolic and temporal distinctions through walling technologies. Such infrastructures, for Seu Juliano and many others, were vital in crafting embodied discontinuities both within and beyond the condominium while also proffering the possibility of envisioning technologically mediated urban futures.

Fig. 2
Gate, barrier, and sentry box at the entrance of Brisa do Mar, Rio de Janeiro (photo: Theresa Williamson, Catalytic Communities, April 2013, reproduced with permission).

Rio de Janeiro: regulating internal boundaries

We now invite our reader to Avenida Salvador Allende, in the western Rio de Janeiro suburb of Jacarepaguá. Walking past the main entrance of the Asa Branca favela, we arrive at a smaller subsection known as Brisa do Mar (literally translating to "Sea Breeze"). The homes here are bigger, and a gate and small sentry box guard the only entrance. No roads cut through from the central part of Asa Branca to Brisa do Mar. You have to leave one to enter the other.

People on both sides of the divide describe Brisa do Mar as different from the rest of the favela. Sabrina, who runs a small clothing boutique in the busy center of Asa Branca but who rents a small studio apartment in Brisa do Mar, commented, "It's a different atmosphere, definitely. You go there, and you don't think you're in Asa Branca." It wasn't that people had more money necessarily, but she felt they were more organized and cared more about the appearance of their homes. Was it even part of the Asa Branca favela at all? "It is, but they don't think so. The condominium has its own [residents'] association." Although located in a district dominated by Rio de Janeiro's notorious militias,[5] Asa Branca lies close to Jacarepaguá's boundary with the neighborhood of Barra da Tijuca: a land of gated elite condominiums and shopping malls, popularly nicknamed the "Brazilian

[5] Violent, off-duty police who charge extortion fees and monopoly rents on basic services.

Miami." The use of the term "condominium" and the name Brisa do Mar itself—which, despite lying some 10 kilometers from the nearest stretch of beach, could easily have been the name of an elite beach-front condominiums—seem to betray an aspirational imaginary, implying distance from the favela and greater proximity to the kinds of lifestyle associated with Barra da Tijuca.

At the entrance to Brisa do Mar, we spoke to the porter, Ronaldo. Age 56, stocky, with light, curly hair and tanned skin, he had lived in the main section of Asa Branca and worked as a porter in Brisa do Mar for about a decade. "Everything here goes through me before going to the chair [of the residents' association]," he told us. People frequently left their keys with him, gave details about rental vacancies, and asked him to carry out odd jobs in their homes. When he was on his shift, he was always visible and available, and the residents seemed to trust him.

The differentiation between Brisa do Mar and Asa Branca is as old as the neighborhood itself. The land now occupied by Brisa do Mar had belonged to a farm until the late 1970s when the purported landowner allotted it and sold it off to individual buyers who constructed their own homes. The coordinated process ensured a more orderly subdivision of the land than would occur in the rest of Asa Branca. In the latter case, occupiers (many of them the relatives of Brisa do Mar's original residents) carried out a series of land occupations on neighboring plots of land between the mid-1980s and early 2000s. Nonetheless, although it was settled via coordinated subdivision rather than land occupation, the original sale of lots in Brisa do Mar was irregular, meaning that the homeowners lack formal land titles to this day. As a result, Brisa do Mar is officially considered to be part of the same "subnormal agglomeration" (the official term for favelas used by Brazil's statistics office) as the rest of Asa Branca.

Despite this, there are several key differences in the way the two spaces are managed. Brisa do Mar's residents have sought to organize themselves and regularize their situation to the greatest extent possible. Unlike the rest of Asa Branca, everyone pays formally for their electricity. They established their own separate residents' association, which charges every resident 40 *reais* per month (about 8 USD in 2020). This covers the wages of the association chair, a secretary, and three porters, who between them ensure that the entrance is guarded 24 hours a day. The gate and security box were installed sometime in the late 1990s (Fig. 2). Residents are strictly prohibited from littering in public areas. As of 2013, when this research was conducted, the rest of Asa Branca also had a residents' association, and had attempted to create similar protocols, but with little success. Most residents refused to pay what they refer to as the *condomínio* (condominium fee), and although there were rules about rubbish collection, parking, and other local issues, they were frequently ignored.

Ronaldo lived on the other side of the gates, in the central part of Asa Branca, and was acutely aware of the differences between the two spaces. "It's not like this there. There is a community. They're still trying to sort it out because we also want to pay there. We want it to be the same as here." His use of the term *comunidade* (community), a widely used euphemism for favelas, was clearly being contrasted with *condomínio* of Brisa do Mar—also an informal space, but one which had achieved symbolic distance from the favela. For Ronaldo, this contrast was associated with the capacity to collect payments and effectively enforce rules to ensure that the neighborhood's space was well maintained.

There were, however, costs to Brisa do Mar's impressive level of internal regulation. For example, although children who lived in Brisa do Mar would go to the other side of Asa Branca to play, their friends were not allowed to enter the "condominium" to use the small playground inside. "The residents don't accept it; they think they come in to destroy the place." Ronaldo disagreed with this rule. He felt any kid from the area should be allowed to play as long as he or another adult was supervising them. "I let kids in when they come with their parents. The other porters don't. That's why everyone likes me."

Although Ronaldo was able to exercise a degree of discretion in assessing who might or might not "cause trouble," the matter was largely out of his hands. Decisions were made in the residents' association and backed by the threat of complaints. With no more than a thousand residents, and with a morphology that permitted such control, Brisa do Mar had certain advantages that the residents' association did its best to exploit. For the rest of Asa Branca, with around three times the population and a more open layout, such control was far harder to achieve. These contrasting arrangements had allowed for the creation of radically different urban environments that were the basis for important forms of symbolic distinction. Where the state saw one big favela, residents were very clear about which side was the "condominium" and which was the "community."

São Paulo: imperfect isolation

Finally, we take our reader to a public housing project in the neighborhood of Fazenda da Juta in the eastern periphery of São Paulo. Our host is Graça, a longtime resident of the area and a "community agent" in the local health center. This role requires her to make daily visits to the apartments and some of the neighboring blocks to provide residents with healthcare information, which means she is always circulating around the neighborhood.

Graça recounted to us the history of the area and her arrival there in the year 2000. "The government was building the blocks, and then a group of people came and invaded. I

bought [my apartment] from someone who invaded. So, I didn't invade myself. But there were still a lot of things missing." The building occupations had occurred three years earlier, in May 1997. Some 1,900 units were being built by the Companhia de Desenvolvimento Habitacional e Urbano (CDHU), the São Paulo state housing company, for eventual allocation via official waiting lists (Miagusko, 2011). While the basic structures of the buildings were complete at the time of the occupations, the interiors were unfinished, and they lacked basic infrastructure. As Graça explained, "it was all open, there were no walls, we walked under the buildings, we didn't even have a street [...]. There wasn't even any concrete, just earth." Resident accounts emphasize the presence of criminal groups at this time whose disputes regularly escalated into violent conflict in and around the apartment buildings. As we were told by Graça, "In each of these blocks you pass, at least three people died in the block in broad daylight. When I moved here in 2000, I witnessed two murders in my block, you understand?" In addition to their legal and material precarity, residents had to live amid a fragmented and violent criminal marketplace.

Living in the same two-bedroom apartment today with her teenage son, Graça's situation is entirely different. Levels of violence fell markedly between 2003 and 2004, a change widely attributed to São Paulo's hegemonic criminal organization, the Primeiro Comando da Capital (PCC), "taking control" of the area (Feltran, 2011). But this also coincided with important shifts in the relationship between residents and the state and the emergence of various forms of collective action. By the time Graça had arrived, negotiations with the state government were already underway to regularize the status of occupiers. Most had agreed to sign up for means-tested mortgage plans with CDHU. Work was subsequently completed on the buildings, including the construction of walls around the blocks.

Formalization processes also stimulated changes in the way residents organized themselves. The occupiers had created block associations so they could choose delegates to represent them in negotiations with the state government. These eventually morphed into permanent organizations, which today elect chairs, hold regular meetings, and establish rules and protocols. Residents pay a monthly condominium fee that covers running costs.

As explained by Graça, the process of formalization served to change the social conditions and broader "culture" within her block. Many poorer residents and those directly involved in criminal activities left, either to avoid detection or because they could not afford the costs of mortgages and bills. These processes were reinforced by the self-organization of residents as a condominium:

> When it's a condominium, you dictate your rules. [...] There are limits. So you can't listen to loud music, you can't have parties all night long, and you can't swear so much. And it's like, "[if] I can't

Fig. 3
Separation wall and access gate to a CDHU housing block in Fazenda da Juta, São Paulo (photo: M. A. Richmond, May 2019).

> even swear, then I don't even want [to be here]!" So, we kind of made these people have to leave. [...] So, they started to sell to different people, and those people came with a different culture, with a different way of thinking.

The kinds of changes propelled by the residents' associations also impacted the physical environment. Repairs are now regularly made to public spaces, and residents who cause damage or litter are confronted and even fined. In some blocks, cameras were installed to monitor the internal space. WhatsApp groups were created in others, so residents could circulate images of environmental problems that they believed needed to be addressed. The higher degree of internal organization and care given to these spaces is reflected in a stronger separation between the "condominiums" and the street. To enter, you must now pass a metal gate that can be opened with an electric key fob or by an intercom connected directly to the apartments (Fig. 3). Whereas before, the space was open and accessible to anyone, today, residents themselves control access.

Even so, this control is not as watertight as it might at first appear. On numerous visits, while waiting for Graça to release the gate, other residents regularly waved us through. Whether because our appearance was read as unthreatening or only out of social etiquette, little beyond the physical gate itself seemed to impede our ability to enter. This lax protocol left the blocks vulnerable to intrusion. For example, Graça recounted a recent incident in which a teenager had entered and tried to steal a bicycle. Some residents had caught him in the act and apprehended him. If she and some other neighbors had

not intervened, he might have been lynched. The suspicion was that someone had nonchalantly let him in as they crossed paths at the gate.

Despite significant improvements to the area's social conditions, it is important to mention that residents are still relatively poor, and the majority are dark-skinned. In other words, demographically, those inside the gates are not always easily distinguishable from those outside. Residents may be wary of criminals and believe they could identify one by sight, but they also know that someone who arouses their suspicions could easily be the friend or relative of a neighbor. Without a permanent and adequately trained security guard, Fazenda da Juta's walling infrastructures lack a reliable human component capable of potentializing and effectively enforcing the separation these infrastructures are designed to preserve. As a result of this lack, the block remains a highly porous space.

Conclusion: scales of porosity

It should be noted that despite significant differences between their respective urbanization histories and socio-spatial arrangements, the three cities in which our case studies are located share certain features. All are large, relatively wealthy cities in the South or Southeast of Brazil. All have large and wealthy, expanded centers with predominantly white populations (which have traditionally stood in stark contrast, socially, racially, and morphologically, to the peripheries and favelas). During the PT era, in all three cities there were also significant increases in incomes, heightened access to credit, and implementation of urban policies in the peripheries. These conditions are less present in other parts of the country, such as major cities of the Northeast and North regions, where white and middle/upper-class populations are proportionately smaller, state capacity lower, and peripheral populations relatively poorer and less served by urban infrastructure. The overarching conditions may also distinguish our cases from other regions in the Global South that display different patterns of urban, socioeconomic, and racial inequality.

At the scale of the cases themselves, several similarities (and differences) can be identified in walling processes. The material and technical features of walls and associated infrastructures (fences, gates, surveillance cameras, etc.) may be carefully designed and promoted by state or market actors, as in the case of Fazenda da Juta (São Paulo), or pursued independently by organized groups of residents, as in Brisa do Mar (Rio de Janeiro), or even result from the combination of these forces, as in Residencial Bento Gonçalves (Porto Alegre). Generally, though, the appearance of such infrastructures tends to be associated with processes of formalization and economic inclusion, though these may be highly uneven. In Residencial Bento Gonçalves, many of the new arrivals were former residents of informal settlements,

meaning their entry into the apartments also represented a transition into "formality," which, in turn, granted them easier access to new modalities of credit. The installation of walls in Fazenda da Juta directly followed the regularization of the occupiers' status. In Brisa do Mar, walling neither resulted from nor led to regularization. It did, however, coincide with other processes, such as urban upgrading and the formalization of utilities that enhanced both the physical consolidation and legal recognition of the settlement. In all of the cases, then, walling was associated with a temporal transition toward greater visibility, economic citizenship, an enhanced status in the eyes of the state, and greater symbolic distance from the condition of informality.

While the state was heavily involved in such processes, it is essential to emphasize the active role of residents and their representative organizations. In all three case studies, residents' associations were established during (or, in the case of Porto Alegre, before) the discussion of how to implement such walling technologies as those we've discussed. They took on critical roles in regulating space and resolving collective action problems. In each case, these organizations have been responsible for supplementing basic security infrastructures with additional components, such as CCTV cameras, intercom systems, and security guards. They have also introduced various rules about resident conduct and protocols for collective action, from waste disposal to parking restrictions. The cases suggest, however, that these organizations can quickly become dominated by small groups or even individuals, and indeed should not be regarded as representing consensus views among residents. In fact, our interlocutors regularly spoke of the tensions and even conflicts that resident association rules sometimes provoked, and of their efforts to quell them.

To understand how such processes and conflicts unfold, it is helpful to reflect on the emic category of *condomínio*, which appeared regularly during our fieldwork in all three case sites. While seemingly intuitive, this is, in fact, a highly polysemic term. At times it refers to the monthly fees collected by residents' associations, at others to the neighborhood space itself, and yet at others to the form of collective organization used to manage such spaces. The term certainly has symbolic value due to its association with elite forms of habitation and its connotation of greater security and organization than is believed to exist in "open" peripheral spaces, though all of these associations vary depending on specific context. Nonetheless, we can broadly generalize that living in a condomínio implies accepting particular rules and obligations—including financial commitments and behavioral protocols—in exchange for benefits in terms of environmental regulation, security, and social status. Similarly, it also implies accepting specific regimes of porosity—by

crafting and enforcing distinctions to adjacent areas, thus reinforcing their separation.

As all of the case studies have indicated, such a trade-off is viewed as desirable and financially viable for some residents. For others, however, it is not. For example, Brisa do Mar's residents' association had visibly achieved a far higher degree of environmental regulation than the rest of Asa Branca, where many residents refused to pay the condominium fee and failed to observe purported rules. In Fazenda da Juta, according to Graça, inability to pay costs associated with formalization (including the condominium fee) and resistance to new norms of sociability had even contributed to some occupiers choosing to leave the area. In Residencial Bento Gonçalves, the project of installing walling and surveillance technologies was ever in-the-making as leaders found themselves having to "persuade" cynical residents of their advantages.

Efforts to establish "condominiums" in the peripheries, then, encounter distinct challenges not faced by elite condominiums in which homes are purchased as ready-made products. While some residents of peripheral condominiums may aspire to extensive forms of socio-spatial regulation, whether for practical or symbolic reasons, others may be indifferent or even actively opposed to the same forms of regulation. The success of these projects may therefore depend on the degree to which the rules, norms, and obligations of condominium life can become routinized and accepted even by those for whom they are not a priority.

While the internal regulation of condominium life in peripheries poses significant challenges, managing external boundaries presents further ones. Walling involves creating and maintaining socio-material systems that can regulate flows of bodies, preserve a sense of security for residents, and uphold a symbolic rupture from an informal past. As we've discussed, however, walling in peripheries occurs in urban settings of spatial contiguity and social ambiguity that continually pose awkward questions. The lack of clearly identifiable socioeconomic and racial differences between populations within and beyond the walls, in combination with the persistence of complex social ties and cordial norms of social interaction that transcend spatial boundaries, tends to weaken regulation and encourage porosity. Even as solid walls have striated the previously smooth landscapes of many of Brazil's urban peripheries, under certain conditions, they can still, rapidly, melt away.

By chronicling efforts at designing and installing walling infrastructures at the margins of three major Brazilian urban centers, this chapter has examined the drivers and impasses surrounding the formation of "peripheral condominiums." These socio-material assemblies reflect the diffusion of distinctly middle-class modes of urbanization and distinction among lower-income groups. Simultaneously, peripheral condominiums represent the congealment of patterns long-in-the-making in Brazil's urban peripheries, including the expansion

of credit and consumer markets, the ambivalent impacts of social and economic policies, and growing cultural and socioeconomic heterogeneity. Peripheral condominiums thus exhibit layers and degrees of porosity that complicate extant notions of condominiums predicated on spatial enclosure, temporal completion, and neatly interlocking infrastructural assemblages. Powerful factors drive the growing use of walling practices, while others destabilize and subvert their logics. Together they constitute complex, uneven, and tense embodied regimes of difference at the margins of the city.

References

Anand N., Gupta A., Appel H. (eds.) 2018, *The Promise of Infrastructure*, Duke University Press, Durham and London.

Benjamin W. 1986, *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings*, Ed. P. Demetz, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York and London.

Caldeira T. 1994, *A Política dos Outros: O Cotidiano dos Moradores da Periferia e o que Pensam do Poder e dos Poderosos*, Brasiliense, São Paulo.

Caldeira T. 2000, *City of Walls: Crime, segregation, and citizenship in São Paulo*, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Caldeira T. 2017, "Peripheral urbanization: Autoconstruction, transversal logics, and politics in cities of the global south," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 35(1), pp. 3–20.

Cardoso A., Lago L. C. do. 2013, "O Programa Minha Casa Minha Vida e seus efeitos territoriais," in A. Cardoso (ed.), *O Programa Minha Casa Minha Vida e seus Efeitos Espaciais*, Letra Capital, Rio de Janeiro.

Carvalho B. 2014, *Porous City: A Cultural History of Rio de Janeiro*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool.

Cavalcanti M. 2009, "Do barraco à casa: tempo, espaço e valor(es) em uma favela consolidada," *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, 24(69), pp. 69–80.

D'Andrea T. 2020, "Contribuições para a definição dos conceitos periferia e sujeitas e sujeitos periféricos," *Novos Estudos CEBRAP*, 39(1), pp. 19–36.

DaMatta R. 1997, *A Casa e a Rua: Espaço, Cidadania, Mulher e Morte no Brasil*, Rocco, Rio de Janeiro.

Donoso R. E., Elsinga M. 2018, "Management of low-income condominiums in Bogotá and Quito: The balance between property law and self-organization," *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 18(2), pp. 312–334.

Feltran G. D. S. 2011, *Fronteiras de Tensão: Política e Violência nas Periferias de São Paulo*, Editora Unesp, São Paulo.

Fischer B. 2008, *A Poverty of Rights: Citizenship and Inequality in Twentieth-Century Rio de Janeiro*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Fischer B., McCann B., Auyero J. (eds.) 2014, *Cities from Scratch*, Duke University Press, Durham and London.

Freyre G. 1978, *Casa Grande e Senzala: Formação da Família Brasileira sob Regime da Economia Patriarcal*, José Olympio, Rio de Janeiro.

Gupta A. 2012, *Red Tape: Bureaucracy, Structural Violence, and Poverty in India*, Duke University Press, Durham and London.

Holston J. (ed.) 1999, *Cities and Citizenship*, Duke University Press, Durham and London.

Holston J. 2008, *Insurgent Citizenship: Disjunctions of Democracy and Modernity in Brazil*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Jensen C. B., Morita A. 2017, "Introduction: Infrastructures as Ontological Experiments," *Ethnos*, 82(4), pp. 615–626.

Kopper M. 2019, "Porous Infrastructures and the Politics of Upward Mobility in Brazil's Public Housing," *Economic Anthropology*, 6(1), pp. 1–13.

Kopper M., Ide I. H. 2019, "Do Estado ao Empreendedorismo Social: Burocracias Cotidianas, Risco Moral e Gestão da Vulnerabilidade em uma Empresa de Regularização Fundiária em São Paulo," *Revista Brasileira de Sociologia*, 7(15), pp. 30–52.

Kopper M., Richmond M. A. 2020, "Subjetividades Periféricas: Uma Conversa Interdisciplinar," *Novos Estudos Cebrap*, 39(1), pp. 9–17.

Kowarick L. 1979, *A Espoliação Urbana*, Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Editora Paz e Terra, São Paulo.

Lancione M., McFarlane C. 2016, "Infrastructural Becoming: Sanitation, Cosmopolitics, and the (un)Making of Urban Life at the Margins," in A. Blok, I. Farias (eds.), *Urban Cosmopolitics: Agencements, Assemblies, Atmospheres*, Routledge, London, pp. 45–62.

Low S. 2003, *Behind the Gates: Life, Security, and the Pursuit of Happiness in Fortress America*, Routledge, London.

Lopes de Souza M. 2000, *O Desafio Metropolitano: Um Estudo Sobre a Problemática Sócio-Espacial nas Metrópoles Brasileiras*, Bertrand Brasil, Rio de Janeiro.

Maricato E. 1979 (ed.), *A Produção Capitalista da Casa (e da Cidade) no Brasil Industrial*, Alfa-Ômega, São Paulo.

Marques E. 2014, "Introdução – São Paulo: Transformações, heterogeneidades, desigualdades," in E. Marques (ed.), *A Metrópole de São Paulo no Século XXI*, Editora UNESP, São Paulo.

McFarlane C. 2011, "The city as assemblage: Dwelling and urban space," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 29(4), pp. 649–671.

Miagusko E. 2011, "Mutirão Autogestionário e o Contexto Da Experiência Democrática Revisitado," *Caderno CRH*, 24(61), pp. 167–81.

Monkkonen P. 2018, "Do we need innovation in housing policy? Mass production, community-based upgrading, and the politics of urban land in the Global South," *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 18(2), pp. 167–176.

Richmond M. A. 2018, "Rio de Janeiro's favela assemblage: Accounting for the durability of an unstable object," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 36(6), pp. 1045–1062.

Richmond M., Kopper M., Oliveira V., Garza J. (n.d.), "Introdução: Espaços periféricos, ontem e hoje," in M. Richmond, M. Kopper, V. Oliveira, J. Garza (eds.), *Espaços Periféricos: Política, Violência e Território nas Bordas da Cidade*, UFSCAR/CEM, São Paulo.

Shimbo L. Z. 2012, *Habitação Social de Mercado: A Confluência entre Estado, Empresas Construtoras e Capital Financeiro*, Com Arte, São Paulo.

Simone A. 2010, *City Life from Jakarta to Dakar: Movements at the Crossroads*, Routledge, New York.

Small M. L. 2009, "'How many cases do I need?': On science and the logic of case selection in field-based research," *Ethnography*, 10(1), pp. 5–38.

Torres H. da G., Marques E. C. 2001, "Reflexões Sobre a Hiperperiferia: Novas e velhas faces da pobreza no entorno municipal," *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais*, 4, pp. 49–70.