

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Back to the Future? Caldeira's Fortified Enclaves and the Consequences for Contemporary Developing Cities

Seth Asare Okyere

Department of Architecture and Urban Studies, Politecnico di Milano, Milan, Italy

Seth Opoku Mensah

Assistant Development Planning Officer, Agona West Municipal Assembly, Agona Swedru, Ghana

Matthew Abunyewah

Department of Planning, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Kumasi, Ghana

Abstract:

Urban enclaves, who could be argued as a re-emerging process of intricate socio-spatial dynamics in emerging countries are becoming physically evident. Across spaces and regions, the middle and upper class are retreating to private and enclosed spaces. Urban areas are increasingly becoming divided and separated; illustrated in new spatial patterns and forms. It is against this background that the paper through a desk study builds on the classic work of Teresa Caldeira on fortified enclaves in Sao Paulo by positioning her work in scholarly literature and also highlighting its characteristics and consequences to planning and policy in developing cities in contemporary times. The Study identified the phenomenon of enclaves and gating as pervasive in physical and social forms with a quaking effect of removing urban diversity and public life. The Study therefore proposes the need for socio-spatial conceptualization that aims at upholding diversity as a symbol of healthy urban society.

Keywords: Caldeira, urban enclaves, segregation, planning

1. Introduction

Fear, violence and insecurity whether perceived or actual by individuals in society seems to have tremendous effects on the character and the spatial organization of contemporary cities in recent decades. Cities and the neighborhoods within it are projecting a particular character that draws our minds back to the very nature of the walled medieval city built to protect its inhabitants against their enemies. Increasing social problems such as crime and violence are producing responses of spatial divisions based on what Caldeira (2000) calls 'exclusivity and separation'. Individuals and groups that feel threatened by these occurrences within the society, are producing, seeking and retreating to enclosed, protected, monitored spaces often referred to as fortified enclaves or gated communities (Caldeira, 1997). These fortified enclaves as Blakely and Synder (1997) indicate are producing new spatial and building patterns within contemporary cities. Generally and across countries, postmodern cities are becoming more defended than the old industrial city (Koskela, 2000) and a phenomenon symbolizing 'architecture of fear' is turning the urban sphere in an enclosed and privatized area (Ellin 1997, Webster et al, 2002). This kind of fortresses or walled-developments though stemming from fear and insecurity, also symbolizes the upper class dream of separation and safety and contend with the very nature of public life that characterized the modern city. In other words, the enclaves in the contemporary city, in its basic principle of privatized urban space oppose the very nature of making sense of real public experiences in the modern city. Through this type of enclosure and formation of enclaves, there is a clear separation of those seeking safety and a violence free community from those considered to be the originators of crime and insecurity. This situation produces a sort of a new urban segregation spatially defined at specific areas of the city and made visible through its organization and physical order that maintains its distinctiveness, separation and distance from the larger city (Grant and Mittelsteadt, 2004).

Several authors (Blakely and Synder, 1997, Grant and Mittelsteadt, 2004, Caldeira, 2000, Jurgens and Gnad, 2003) have stressed on fortified enclaves and its associated segregation as a global situation that could be seen in both the west and the east or the global north and south. However, its manifestations, typology and implications on the city have been identified as highly contextual and depend on the local context to a much larger context. With regards to this, Teresa Caldeira (1997) studied the experience of Brazil's Sao Paulo at the time when such city fortresses or enclaves were growing. In recent literature, various terms such as city of walls, edge cities and enclosed neighbourhood (See Almatameh, 2013 for more) have been used to synonymously describe such fortified enclaves as described by Caldeira (1997). In addition to such varied terms, gated communities have surfaced a lot during the last part of the 20th century to replace Caldeira's fortified enclave. In light of this, the paper largely draws on the work of Caldeira on fortified enclaves in Sao Paulo and its manifestation as a new form of urban segregation and the transformation of the public space. The authors extend the review to look at what these socio-spatial change in the urban sphere

means to planning in contemporary cities. The discussions here attempts to connect her work to certain theoretical perspectives, highlight the Sao Paulo case and present the implications for today's mixed and diverse contemporary cities in line with the development of gated communities in recent times.

2. Theoretical Considerations of the Study

2.1. Overview of Gated Communities

There are varied definitions regarding gated communities making its definition far from absolute. Landman and Schönreich (2002) posit that gated communities are generic term that includes enclosed neighbourhoods having controlled access through gates or booms across existing roads and security villages and complexes including lifestyle communities which provide their enclosed residents with a range of non-residential amenities such as schools, offices, shops and golf courses. Abdelhamid (2006) sees gated communities as urban settlements surrounded by walls with several entrances controlled by gates and security guards. In advancing the definition of gated communities in its spatial-residential meaning, Gruszczak (2010) defines gated communities as residential development established on a dense territorial area surrounded by walls, security personnel taking advantage of sophisticated technologies and devices of surveillance and control. Perhaps and the in the view of authors, the most appropriate and concise definition of the gated communities is given by Grant and Mittelsteadt (2004) as housing development on private roads closed to general traffic by a gate across the primary access. Fences, walls or other natural barriers that further limit public access may surround the development.

From the above, it can be concluded that gated communities generally tend to have walled boundaries, regulated or limited public access, privatized public space and sophisticated security (Anokye et al., 2013).

2.2. The Development of Gated Communities

The development of gated communities surfaced significantly during the latter part of the 20th century and so was the discussions and literature about it. Genis (2007) asserts that gated communities as a commodity appear to be the new deal in urban real estate and housing development due to their rising patronage by especially the high end income group. Commenting on this in their paper on gated communities, Grant and Mittelsteadt (2004) attest that planning literature in the last decades reflected a growing interest on the subject of gated communities. Most often, they offered descriptions, views, suggestions and arguments for or against the phenomenon in contemporary cities. One of the basic arguments that have been stressed as a causal factor for gated communities in contemporary cities has been the fortification against the objects of fear and insecurity. According to Bauman (2005), those who can afford it fortify themselves against ever presenting dangers by locking themselves behind walls and adopting strong security controls. One important point raised in this is the issue of affordability-that is those who can afford to stay in such fortifications-bringing to the fore the affluent class in urban societies. This idea is reinforced in the definition by Caldeira (1997) stating that 'are privatized, enclosed, monitored spaces for residence consumption, leisure and work' providing a new alternative for urban life of the middle and upper classes. A similar idea is also projected of the affluent being promoters gated communities; those in search of 'privacy and exclusivity' and in a constant run away from fear in the larger society (Marcuse 1997). Apart from this, the commercial real estate sector has often been also cited as a key player in the development of gated communities through the projects and advertisements emphasizing safety and violence free neighborhoods by exploiting incidences of violence and fear in other areas (Graham, 2004). However, even though the development of gated communities has seen a growing incidence in recent decades, it is worthy to note that personal safety concerns are common driving forces. Moreover, the underlying causes for urban formations and the drivers of enclaves continuous emergence may be common across borders but their typologies and relations to other areas of the city depends to a larger extent on the local context within which they are developed. Again, though the economic and social factors that make gated communities a global phenomenon-highlighting class, function and status (Webster, 2002, Van Kempen and Marcuse, 1997)- are significant, the way they manifest in urban space differ enormously; a phenomenon which emerges from the varying typologies, patterns and physical organization across the urban space. Grant and Mittelsteadt (2004) assert that 'typologies alone do not constitute theory', it also helps offer a description of complex reality. The worldwide trend in the development of gated communities is perhaps attributable to the path of neo-liberalism embraced by most governments across the world (Almatarneh, 2013). With regards to this, the Paper highlights the main characteristics defined by Blakely and Snyder (1997) in their work on *Fortress America* on typologies. Their very thorough study and investigations also included certain theoretical descriptions of typology of enclaves in America.

They define three types of enclaves which include lifestyle, prestige and security zone communities. The lifestyle enclaves emphasize amenities and cater for a leisure class with shared interests while prestige communities reflects a desire for image, privacy and control. Security zone communities on the other hand, reflect fear involving fences and gates and controlled access. They however concede that these types represent ideal types in theory but in practice may be a combination of features of these types. The features of gated communities in literature cover broad range of characteristics that often do overlap upon critical consideration. In our quest to understand how these features are represented theoretically, the Paper emphasizes the four main features of the model presented by Blakely and Snyder (1997) as they are seen as the harmonization and simplification of the vast information in literature. The main features of the model are functions of enclosure, security features and barriers, amenities and facilities and type of residents. These provide a good theoretical background for studies on gated communities. Grant and Mittelsteadt (2004) however challenge the four main features that depict the model defined by Blakely and Snyder (1997). According to them, these features of the model proposed reflect an American focus and does not offer a better understanding on the diversity in other countries and the historical experiences of fortifications and gating. They augment this position by stating that a useful framework should recognize the degree in variability around the world. They accordingly propose three additional

features to be added to the model including tenure, location, and size and policy context. Table 1 depicts the main features of the model developed by both authors on fortified enclaves and also highlights their main characteristics. This is useful in providing a theoretical understanding on the formation and functioning of gating and enclaves that accommodates differences within and across different geographical regions.

Features	Physical	Economic	Social	Symbolic
Function of enclosure	Secure people and property	Enhance property values	Control those inside and maintain visual privacy	Display status and power
Security features	Fences, guards, automatic gates	Fences-barbed wire, surveillance cameras, patrols	Private property signs, card entry	Symbolic fences
Amenities and facilities	Private road, open space, institutional facilities	Meeting place, landscape maintenance	Action centre, quality design	Recreational and commercial facilities
Type of resident	Homogenous by age	Homogenous by class	Homogenous by status, race, ethnicity	Shared activity. E.g. golf
Tenure	Principal resident, ownership	Secondary residence, condominium	Seasonal residence, crime lease	Public housing, rental
Location	Urban fill	Neighborhood	Village	Town
Policy context	Restricts gating	Enables gating	Growing area	Stable or declining areas

Table 1: Model Features for Enclaves

Source 1: Adapted from Blakely and Snyder, 1997; Grant and Mittelsteadt, 2004

Within scholarly literature, the phenomenon of gating and fortified enclaves is encapsulated within a certain debate of its relevance, purpose and impact on both citizens and the urban socio-spatial impact. It is a long held debate far from an intellectual or professional consensus albeit important in the way it will shape local policy framing and development. Caldeira (2000) in her paper on city of walls highlight this debate that encompasses the disciplines of planning, architecture and sociology.

Two scholars who have been very strong in their opinions on fortified enclaves are Charles Jencks and Mike Davis. Caldeira (1997) emphasizes their opposing theoretical conceptions in her paper on fortified enclaves in Sao Paulo. Charles Jencks, who defends an architectural style fortifications and gating in Los Angeles posits that the problem is heterogeneity in the contemporary city which results in ethnic strife. In his view, ethnic strife will increase and create tension in the city and the most practical approach to adopt is a so called 'defensible architecture' as a mechanism of protection within urban space. In the view of the Authors, Jencks oversimplifies the whole situation, takes a pessimistic view of heterogeneity and ignores the role that 'separation and distance' plays in reinforcing inequality and promoting segregation in the urban sphere. In fact he makes a stronger claim that the whole objective of the 'melting down' we have inherited from the Chicago school can no longer be achieved.

On the other hand, Mike Davis presents a critical view of Charles Jencks and the supporters of the 'defensible architecture' proposition. Also using Los Angeles as the background, he comments that heterogeneity is not the real problem but the social inequality that characterizes the urban setting (Caldeira, 1997). In his view, enclaves are the result of these inequalities and mostly enforced by 'post-liberal policies and planning' theme in Los Angeles and across America. His view helps understand how the whole theory of politics frames the spatial organization of cities.

Again, he states that social reality is the 'product of elite intentions' (Caldeira, 1997). That is, social manifestation within urban space is the direct output of the intentions of the elites in society. With reference to the recent role by homeowner associations and middle class associations in shaping neighborhood development and creating a kind of controls and mechanism limiting access and freedom by so called unwanted populations within specific neighborhoods in the United States as reported by Nelson (2004), the position of Mike Davies exerts key considerations. In line with the divergent views in America, the Paper discusses the case of Sao Paulo in the next section and outline how the situation in Sao Paulo connects or deviates from the whole theoretical perspectives discussed.

3. The Sao Paulo Experience

Today, the city of Sao Paulo in Brazil is more complex and fragmented than it was before. During the 1940s to 1970s, the City had a clear division between centre and periphery with middle and upper class living in the centre of the City and the lower class living in the precarious hinterland. During these last decades, sprawl of the city became more concentrated in the region and has been deepening the manifestations of social inequality and causing changes in the distribution pattern of social classes, groups and activities in the City. These urban transformations are producing a new form of spatial segregation in specific parts of the City that is enclosed, monitored, restricted and controlled (Caldeira, 1997). Sao Paulo today is a city of physical barriers, as fear, insecurity and violence have become a dominating element in the daily life of its urban citizens. Barriers and enclosed spaces are central to the urban life and the upper class response has created a series of new strategies for protection and isolation. These strategies focus on: isolation, impose divisions and distances, multiply avoidance and rules for exclusion and restriction of movements.

However, the social problem of urban violence in Sao Paulo becomes secondary to a more important problem: the reduction of interaction between different social class or groups which is exacerbated by an increase spread of feeling of fear and danger, consequently creating mechanisms of self-protection manifested in space. Individuals and institutions therefore shape their behavior to the new reality, reoriented to live with this problem under pressure, tension and expectation of feeling insecure (Caldeira, 2000). In response to fear, 'the fortified enclaves' were seen by Caldeira (1997) as 'privatized, enclosed, and monitored spaces for residence consumption, leisure and work'. They attract those fleeing the fear and insecurity in urban neighborhoods and prefer living isolated and separated from the marginalized, the homeless and the urban poor-often considered as the originators of urban crime and violence. The spatial manifestation of this new pattern of enclosed urban space is wide and concern several issues of security, services and function. The main characteristics of the description she offers in her study and as expatiated in the subsequent paragraphs are the multiplication of urban services, separation and distinction, proliferation of domestic services, isolation and distance and security.

3.1. Multiplication of Urban Services

The Multiplication of Urban Services involves the processes of taking every service within Sao Paulo and placing it into a fenced neighborhood. The provision of such services is total and unlimited such that any kind of amenity and facility are available from commerce, health, sports, education to cultural services, recreation, leisure activities and administration services. Real estate advertisements, she indicates emphasize this very point by certain words to potential occupants such as 'everything and anything you want, just in one space' which appeals to the taste and senses of the middle and upper classes.

3.2. Separation and Distinction

Another particular characteristic of Sao Paulo's walled neighborhood is separation and distinction with an interesting feature of controlled organization of classes even within the enclaves. Class mix within the public areas of the gated neighborhood is highly controlled. The construction of physical walls permits the control of those who are outside and inside of this fenced neighborhood. Another important feature is related to social boundaries that forbid the interaction between different social classes even within enclosed neighborhoods. In more specific terms, Caldeira (1997) identifies a particular situation where two facilities serving similar purpose are placed together but labeled 'social' and 'service'. Such labeling send particular information to occupants which one they are entitled to use even though the facilities are placed side by side. The idea of community and relations in the enclave is therefore not so strong.

3.3. Proliferation of Domestic Services

There is also the proliferation of domestic services inside of the enclaves in which domestic work becomes more professional. Paradoxically, the rich and poor classes still depend on each other because of the work of domestic services though without any physical contact between them. It can therefore be concluded that there is a kind of interdependency between the upper class and the poor even with the former's desire for distance and separation, as they require the services of the latter for domestic work.

3.4. Isolation, Distance and Security

The fundamental issue of security is central to the definition of residence (Caldeira, 1997) with privacy being critical in the formation of this new urban pattern. Security controls are therefore adapted to this walled community using a 24-hour security control and armed guards patrolling the enclaves, electronic devices among others. It is also significant to highlight that the mechanism of security and privacy is a way the middle and upper class represent their status as well as justify their thought of insecurity. The occupants are basically the economically privileged in society and mainly homogeneous by ethnicity and age; therefore status and class are important for them.

It needs to be reiterated that the middle and upper class seek to flee from people and places they perceive as 'spots' of violence in addition to 'isolating and distancing' themselves from the so called violence places within the City. In Sao Paulo, the spatial formation of the enclaves reinforces isolation and distance. The development of the enclaves occurs along "green public areas" (parks, lakes and major streets etc.) as a way of separation and denying access in these 'private clubs'.

4. Consequences and Implications of Gating for Contemporary Developing Cities

Modern gated communities have been criticized based on the grounds that it encourages segregation between the upper and middle class on one side and that of the lower class on the other hand. This therefore tends to limit public interaction within urban space and further intensifies class rivalry in urban areas especially in developing cities. It is indeed a phenomenon of 'anti-diversity' and functions to encourage social and economic monotony of cities by sustaining association between particular classes of inhabitants. It also produces social and cultural stigma and labels against the disadvantaged people and often creates limits and restrictions on access and use of facilities. With reference to the model as discussed in Table 1 by Blakely and Snyder (1997) and Grant and Mittelsteadt (2004), the economic dimension of urban enclaves often made possible by the real estate sector creates complexities. The fact that land is much privatized in most developing cities imply that land owners, developers and consumers hold significant power in the way urban form is shaped and created. The convergence of this 'triple power' in the urban development process also results to an obsession for enclosures, gates and natural elements that reinforce 'separation, distance and isolation'. In developing countries, local authorities lack the economic and consensus power to often control such emergence. One of the ways in which planning and policy can control such developments is to adopt incentives in the real estate sector that enable, support and encourage diversity in new developments. It is indeed possible to guarantee security and safety without necessarily segregating. One of the significant consequences of gating and enclaves is the private appropriation of public space. As

highlighted by Caldeira (2000) in the case of Sao Paolo and typified in the outlined model, there is a considerable extent of appropriation of 'publicness' in the urban sphere. Mostly enclosed by walls, private streets, open spaces and natural elements (such as rivers, forests), there is a restriction of access and utilization of some public facilities and services. People who are often situated outside these walls or enclaves have restrictions on accessing certain facilities and services of public nature. There are entry or access restrictions subject to control. In effect, previous facilities and services of public nature become quasi-public or what can be referred to as 'privatised' access to urban services. This has the propensity to create social and class antagonism and possible conflict, violence and antipathy; the very problem the gating and enclave process aims to address.

As indicated by Caldeira (1997), the multiplication of urban services is a major feature of gating and enclaves with reference to her studies in Sao Paulo. The multiplication of these services to the gated area echoes the fact that, the provision of these services is based on the ability to pay. This in effect may result in a natural phenomenon where many urban populations will be deprived of some basic social facilities like water, sports, education, recreation and leisure activities. In effect, people outside the wall may be compelled to look for alternative sources of privatized social facilities and services by any means possible as such facilities and services are essential to sustaining urban life. This has the propensity to deepen crime rates and class conflict thereby defeating what the upper and middle class seeks to avoid. There is therefore the urgent need to ensure that those outside the walls have access to basic services even if not in equal quantity and/or quality as those inside the walls.

The high demand for gating and enclaves presents the development results of high economic cost. The occupants of gated communities pay the overall cost as owners will have to pay for the construction and the maintenance of urban infrastructure located within the walls. Such exclusivity favors location rent and positively affect the property value. This implies that gating offers its providers with attractive economic returns on the value of their property.

Another consequence of gating is the negative impact on property values in non-gated adjacent neighborhoods and crime redistributions. The diseconomies may lead to a preventive proliferation of gating in the neighborhood and former non-gated enclaves may have to retrofit with gates if they wish to maintain their property values and avoid crime redistributions and hence clustered diffusion pattern. It is therefore imperative for city authorities to license and regulate the activities of gated community providers so as to check unauthorized walling.

5. Conclusion

The practice of enclaves, fortress or gated communities is an on-going one and has been on the increase over the past few decades. The Sao Paulo experience shows that current transformations are avoiding the public sphere with a conscious attempt at creating neighborhoods of fences and walls that forbid any significant interaction with the larger city context. There is the increase multiplication of services in the walled neighborhoods with restricted access to outsiders and security is very much embedded in the idea of residence. The evidence from Sao Paulo does not really deviate from the theoretical discussions earlier highlighted on in the Paper but offers a deeper understanding. The theoretical discussions stressed the object of fear as the most critical factor but the Sao Paulo case identifies a critical component which is inequality. In this case, though fear is crucial, the problem of widening inequality is of a primary importance in creation of insecurity and violence whether perceived or actual. Again, the location is not about urban filling but occurs everywhere real estate developers identify as marketable and profitable. It can also be said that security is stronger in the definition of residence as theory suggests but the symbolic value of class and status cannot be dismissed in Sao Paulo's gating. Again, it is doubtful to talk of community within the enclaves in Sao Paulo. That is, even though the enclaves are predominantly occupied by the middle and upper class, there is a strong differentiation within and most often people living side by side may be distant in terms of social relations. A paradoxical situation also emerges where the rich who are moving away from the poor in the deteriorated neighborhoods (often considered as a source of violence and crime) depend on this exact people for domestic services. Fundamentally, gated communities remove the public life of urban space, reduce urban permeability and make inequalities explicit. This situation in the foreseeable future may result in class conflicts and intensify violence within society. What is needed rather is a critical look at the factors that seem to widen the gap between classes; empower people and their communities toward self-development and offer more socially engaging policies. Even though the Paper maintains optimism for a better organization of urban space in the future, it is also important to mention that the role of policy makers, planners, architects, sociologists and other professionals within the urban sector will have to be critical in ensuring a more diverse, socially lively and competitive urban spaces in contemporary developing cities.

6. References

1. Abdelhamid, H.T. Gated communities: Physical construction or social destruction tool, 2006, p-1-8. Assessed at <http://aesop2005.scix.net/data/papers/att/177.fullTextPrint.pdf>
2. Almatarnah, R. T., 'Choices and changes in the housing market and community preferences: Reasons for the emergence of gated communities in Egypt: A case study of the Greater Cairo Region, Egypt' *Shams Engineering Journal*, 4(1), 2013, p-563-583.
3. Anokye, P.A., Tanyeh, J.P., Agyemang, F.S.K., 'The emergence of gated communities in Ghana and their implications on urban planning and management' *Developing Country Studies*, 3(14), 2013, p-40-46.
4. Bauman Z., 'Seeking shelter in Pandora's box or: fear, security and the city' *City*, 9(2), 2005
5. Blakely E.J., Snyder M.G., *Fortress America: Gating Communities in the United States*, 1997
6. Caldeira P.R., 'Fortified enclaves: A new urban segregation in Sao Paolo' *Public Culture*, 8(2), 1997, p-303-328.
7. Calderia P.R., *City of Walls: Crime, Segregation and Citizenship in Sao Paolo*, 2000
8. Ellin N (ed.), *Architecture of Fear*, 1997
9. Genis, S., 'Producing elite localities: The rise of gated communities in Istanbul' *Urban Studies*, 44(4), 2007, p-771-798.

10. Graham, S., 'Postmortem city: towards an urban geopolitics' *City* 2, 2004, p-165-196.
11. Grant, J. and Mittelsteadt L., 'Types of gated communities' *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 31(1), 2004, p-913- 930.
12. Gruszczak A, The European Union as a gated community: the challenge of good security governance. Paper to the ECPR Fifth Pan European Conference. 2010, p-24-26.
13. Jurgens U, Gnad M, Gated communities in the Johannesburg area experiences from South Africa, 2003. Assessed at <<http://parole.aporee.org/work/hier.php3?spec id=11953&words id=356>>
14. Koskela H, 'The gaze without eyes: video-surveillance and the changing nature of urban space' *Progress in Human Geography*, 24, 2000, p-243-265
15. Landman K. and Schönteich M., 'Urban fortresses. Gated community as a reaction to crime' *African Security Review*, 11(4), 2002, p-71-85.
16. Marcuse P., 'Walls of fear and walls of support in Architecture of Fear' Princeton Architectural Press, 1997, p-101-114.
17. Nelson R., 'Private Communities: Will homeowners associations lead to a revolution in local government?', 2004, p-41-46
18. Van Kempen, R. and Marcuse, P., A new spatial order in cities? the changing spatial order in cities' *American Behavioral Scientist*, 41(3), 1997, p-285.
19. Webster C, 'Property rights and the public realm: gates, green belts, and Gemeinschaft' *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 29, 2002,p-397-412