

KNOW-HOW LIMINALITIES IN THE DAILY PRODUCTION OF OPAQUE SPACES
LIMINARIDADES DO SABER-FAZER NA PRODUÇÃO COTIDIANA DOS ESPAÇOS OPACOS
MAINI DE OLIVEIRA PERPÉTUO

Maini de Oliveira Perpétuo is an Architect, holds a Master's degree in Landscape Architecture, and is a doctoral student at the Graduate Program in Urbanism at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), Brazil. She is a researcher at the Temporary Interventions and Tactical Urbanism Laboratory and the Systemic Landscape Ordering research group. She studies open spaces for public use, tactical urbanism, and counter-hegemonic urban practices. mainioliveira@fau.ufrj.br
<http://lattes.cnpq.br/4779732410732479>

ARTICLE SUBMITTED ON AUGUST 15, 2022

How to quote this text: Perpétuo, M. O., 2022. Know-How Liminalities in the Daily Production of Opaque Spaces. Translated from Portuguese by Hermilo Santana. *VIRUS*, 25, December. [online]. Available at: <<http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/papers/v25/671/671en.php>>. [Accessed: dd Month yyyy].

Abstract

By casting light on the hegemonic forms of space production and obscuring the opaque spatial tactics generated in the urban peripheries, urbanistic discourses and practices reinforce the symbolic and material privilege conferred on modern techno-scientific rationality. From this perspective, practices originated outside this domain are considered precarious, and non-specialists are seen as laymen, holders of knowledge considered hierarchically inferior. This work aims, based on a liminal perspective, to dialectically tense the different ways of know-how of the specialists - who know the urbanistic norms and conventional design methods - and also of the non-experts, who daily build their living spaces, gradually and with their own resources. This reflection materializes in an exploratory investigation about the gambiarra's potential as a tactical action, capable of destabilizing the separation between the act of designing and the act of building, indicating more horizontal connections between knowing and doing, and acting as a horizontal insubordination to the rationality of the hegemonic urban project. As a result, it seeks to glimpse in everyday subordinated tactics possibilities of dissolving the epistemic boundaries imposed by the dominant theory and praxis in the field of architecture and urbanism, challenging the understanding of the project as something finished and imposed from top to bottom.

Keywords: Gambiarra, Spatial Tactics, Everyday Production of Space, Opaque Spaces, Urban Design

1 Introduction: for a Decolonization of the Urban Imaginary

Listen to good advice, which I give you for free
 It's useless to sleep that the pain won't go away
 Wait sitting down, or you'll get tired
 It's been proven, he who waits never achieves
 Do as I say, do as I do
 Act twice before you think
 I'm chasing time, I came from I don't know where
 Slowly you can't go far.
 (Buarque, 1972, our translation)

In the song Bom Conselho (Good Advice), Chico Buarque (1972) appropriates traditional proverbs and sayings of Brazilian culture, subverting them in order to provoke displacements in the conceptions considered as univocal in popular utterance. What if a similar exercise is done for some of the postulates of urban design know-how? After all, one of the fundamental roles of the urban researcher is precisely "to be **subversive**, that is, to revolve, disturb, disorder the state of things and ideas, transforming the consecrated interpretation, the action taken as correct or effective, the hierarchy of values and the dominant rationality". (Kowarick, 2000, p. 132, emphasis added, our translation).

In a subversive investigation, what is the body of knowledge relegated and subordinated by the field of urbanism? Which are the dominant ways of doing urban design and which are the silenced ones?

Decolonial theory shows that the myth of Eurocentric modernity has been designed and constructed - materially and symbolically - for the maintenance of the dominance of the colonizer (the reference, the center) over the colonized (the other, the periphery). In this framework, coloniality (Quijano, 1992), in addition to perpetuating ideas, values, and beliefs, also materializes in the production of space, establishing a conception of territory over others, which become inferiorized (Farrés Delgado, 2014). In its spatial dimension, coloniality can be perceived in the teaching and professional practice of architecture and urbanism, when only Western hegemonic knowledge and ways of doing are considered valid, and determine the ways considered correct to design, build and inhabit (Farrés Delgado, 2014).

In this sense, Boaventura de Souza Santos (2013, p. 47, our translation) observes a waste of the social experience of the knowledges considered as the disqualified parts of the hegemonic totality. Even so, these knowledges resist and continue to manifest themselves in peripheral territories, "where non-scientific and non-Western knowledges prevail in the everyday

practices of populations." Similarly, Milton Santos (2006, p. 210, our translation) identifies, in these territories, the presence of "counterrationalities," which are located "in the less modern and more 'opaque' areas, rendered irrational for hegemonic uses." The opaque spaces, in contrast to the luminous spaces, are endowed with great flexibility and adaptability, due to the immanent condition of precariousness and impermanence, in which the experience of scarcity becomes "the basis of a creative adaptation to existing reality." (Santos, 2006, p. 210, our translation).

In this situation, the opaque spaces are produced by unique organizational logics, guided by more flexible rules and adapted to the most diverse conditions of informality (Lobosco, 2011; 2022). In these contexts, the tactical action presents itself as a survival mechanism of the urban poor and expresses "ways of doing" and operating in the cracks of the system, in order to reappropriate the space organized by techniques and take advantage of it (Certeau, 1998). Based on these notes, this paper sheds light on the tactics of production of everyday space, in order to glimpse other ways of thinking about the project in opaque contexts, which are conceived in a less hierarchical and more horizontal way between knowing and doing.

Methodologically, this is a qualitative essay, which starts from the conception of the urban landscape project as a transversal field of knowledge convergences, which is located between threshold zones of different fields of knowledge (Pereira; Jacques, 2018). Other epistemologies are sought that are reflected not only in abstract knowledge, but also in social practices, especially those not legitimized by the dominant scientific rationality. In this perspective, liminal thinking (Mignolo, 2003) is assumed as a critical reflection on the production of knowledge, both from the internal margins of the colonial/modern system, and from its external margins - thinking from the margin and thinking about the margin.

The article is organized into four sections: the first section presents a debate about urban plans and projects in Brazil in its schizophrenic relationship with the informal production of the city; the second and third sections seek to dialectically friction the different ways of know-how of specialists (especially the role of design as an instrument of domination and disciplinary control), of the non-specialists, who build their spaces on a daily basis with their resources and means. The fourth section presents an exploratory investigation about the potential of the *gambiarra*¹ as a tactical action capable of destabilizing the separation between the act of designing and the act of building. The reflection intends to contribute to the decolonization and expansion of the urban imaginary, acting in its gaps, in order to glimpse the dissolution of epistemic boundaries in the field of urban landscape design.

2 The Schizophrenia of Urban Space

Important scholars of the production of Brazilian urban space (among them, Ermínia Maricato (1982), Raquel Rolnik (2015) and Milton Santos (2006) demonstrate that Brazilian cities are marked by a schizophrenia, in which a detailed urban legislation coexists with a total *laissez-faire* in peripheral settlements. This indicates a discriminatory application of urbanistic plans and projects, according to the convenience and interests of the ruling classes. Given this mismatch, most of the urban poor in Brazil "live in settlements that are neither planned nor previously urbanized, where the residents themselves produce their houses gradually, mobilizing their own material and financial resources" (Rolnik, 2015, p. 127, our translation).

In this scenario, and according to the interests of capital and real estate speculation, a large part of the urban projects usually dialogues with an exclusive part of the city and condemns the other territories, considered chaotic, which reinforces the rhetoric that the problems of the peripheries are caused by the lack of planning. Thus, we see that "selective non-planning" is an intrinsic part of urban planning itself, which acts as a reinforcement of exclusionary urbanization, in order to only manage the deep socio-spatial inequalities in countries on the periphery of capitalism (Yiftachel; Avni, 2014).

Under this logic, urban transformations and investments occur in an extremely asymmetric relationship, in which a center determines the pace and direction of changes in the periphery. Thus, the urbanistic legislation consecrates the morphologies dictated by the real estate sector, such as the vertical condominium typology, which imposes itself in the urban landscape of

¹ Note of Translator: In Brazilian Portuguese slang, "gambiarra" is an improvised solution to solve a problem or a need. It usually works temporarily.

the peripheral areas of the cities, reinforcing the symbolic charge of this housing pattern. The consolidation of these patterns substantially modifies the forms of family organization typical of popular settlements, characterized by the multifunctionality of the dwellings, by the maximum use of the land for several dwelling units, by the junction of housing and home business, or by the rental of rooms of the house (Rolnik, 2015).

By stigmatizing the spatial and sociocultural practices of these settlements, urban planning and design act as powerful instruments of territorial, ethnic and cultural discrimination. However, these territories are neither integrated nor eliminated by urban policies, being sometimes discreetly tolerated, sometimes vehemently repressed, making the boundaries between legality and illegality, and between formality and informality blurred and shifting (Yiftachel; Avni, 2014). Recognizing this ambiguity of urban policies demonstrates the fragility of thinking according to these supposed dichotomies (legal/illegal, formal/informal, hillside/asphalt, etc.), and provides a more appropriate lens to investigate the production of peripheral urban space in Brazil and in the broader context of the global south.

For Souza Santos (2013), every dichotomy hides, in its apparent relation of horizontality between the parts, an underlying vertical relation - which has nothing symmetrical about it. In this vertical relationship, the whole becomes only one of the parts that becomes the term of reference for the others. Thus, the dichotomy always expresses a hierarchy, considering that none of its parts can be thought of outside the relationship with the totality. In this way, thinking of relations in purely dichotomous terms means reinforcing the myth of coloniality and accepting the extremely unequal domination between knowledges that has relegated the countries of the global south to a position of subalternity: "inferior knowledges proper of inferior beings." (Souza Santos; Menezes, 2013, p. 17, our translation). At this juncture, hegemonic architectural and urbanistic discourses and practices continue to shape perceptions about the production of urban space by shedding light on certain ways of knowing how to make cities and obscuring social-spatial practices considered deviant and subordinated.

However, the excess of light produced by the supremacy of technique and reason often leads to blindness, and prevents the perception of alternative rationalities and non-scientific knowledge, especially to those knowledges linked to the social appropriation of available resources, present in opaque spaces as forms of existence and resistance of the popular layers: "they are spaces with less technique and more inventiveness, with less domination and more domination" (Ribeiro, 2012, p. 68, our translation).

3 The Know-How of the Experts

By the technical-scientific rationality, the hegemonic process of project is usually characterized by a linear sequence of tasks, in a vertical division of labor, which clearly differentiates the stages of conception, execution and use (Baltazar; Kapp, 2006). By this view, the projective practice presupposes the intellectual anticipation of practical doings, using methods of representation of a yet non-existent object, graphically expressed through technical drawing. In this vertical structure, the project not only reproduces the social division of labor, but also prevents the self-determination of the production of space by the residents (Baltazar; Kapp, 2006). Sérgio Ferro (2006) and Paulo Bicca (1984) show that the project formatted by modernity arises, and develops, from the moment in which the construction starts to have as its main purpose the reproduction and accumulation of capital, aiming at the extraction of surplus value. In this logic, the function of the project becomes to "enable the merchandise form of the architectural object, which, without it, would not be achieved (in non marginal conditions)" (Ferro, 2006, p. 106-107, our translation).

In the rational productivist vision, therefore, the design acts as the part that imposes and transmits orders from top to bottom. Coming from outside, it arrives ready-made, as the only immediate bond of unification among the dispersed tasks of the construction site: "The role of these roles is clear: they gather work to work, work to instrument, activity done without regard to functional purpose" (Ferro, 2006, p. 108, our translation). However, just as the dichotomy hides an underlying vertical relationship, the hegemonic project hides a segregation that appears to unify. Its primary function would be precisely to unite "the great mass of dispersed labor" in the construction process "into a single object-merchandise" (Ferro, 2006, p. 110, our translation).

Thus, in architectural and urbanistic interventions under the rational-productivist logic of capital, nothing in the work should remember or express the personal contribution of the workers who were part of it, "that is, **their action as individuals who**

transfer to the matter part of their subjectivity and knowledge" (Bicca, 1984, p. 48, our emphasis and translation). Or, in the words of Ferro (2006, p. 6, our emphasis) the "worker is forced to transform himself into an abstract labor force, without a drop of blood, to realize that precise application of **his own disappearance in the work of the other.**" The figure of the project as the previous design of a finished product has repercussions not only in the way space is built, but also in the way people inhabit it. Under this logic, the architecture and urbanism project results both in the subordination of the know-how of individuals who execute the work and in the curtailment of the freedom to modify the work by those who will inhabit it (Baltazar; Kapp, 2006).

Historically, in pre-capitalist societies, the act of designing and the act of building had not yet been strictly separated from the point of view of the social division of labor, and "the **act of designing by drawing was part of the same work that involved designing by doing**, in which, in turn, participated not only the master, but all the other workers of the corporation" (Bicca, 1984, p. 107, our emphasis and translation). In this sense, the ability to design **was not an exclusive privilege of architects**, because it made each participant of the work a designer and an executor simultaneously. The rigid separation between the work of conception and the work of execution began in the Renaissance, when the act of making architecture came to mean the act of designing in the form of technical drawing (Bicca, 1984). We must recognize, therefore, that the separation between conceiving and executing is not the work of chance, but clearly the result of historically determined constructions.

In the search for other keys to understand the different ways of know-how and the very understanding of design, we find contemporary authors who seek to reposition the place of design from a critical perspective, and which aims at socio-spatial transformation. In the field of Latin American decolonial studies, the contributions of Arturo Escobar and designer Alfredo Gutiérrez Borrero stand out.

Escobar (2016) presents a fertile debate about the subjects authorized to design and demonstrates that design has been used as a central political technology of modernity. However, he refutes the assumption that **only experts possess the domain of design** and starts from the premise that every community designs its environment, its organizations, its social relations, and its daily practices according to its unique realities. Gutiérrez Borrero (2015) proposes the extension of the notion of project to the "drawings of the south" or "other drawings" and demonstrates that, although all human groups possess the natural ability to design, only the technical project, designed by means of a graphic and industrial language, is usually considered valid and universal. In this discriminatory logic, he points out that "**the production of objects by the poor and the peasant, by the mestizo and the indigenous, or by the black is relegated to the backwardness - it is presented as handicraft when it is at the margin of the industrial impulse or as a gambiarra or recursion when it resists it**" (Gutiérrez Borrero et al., 2020, p. 65, our emphasis and translation).

In the Brazilian context, Freire-Medeiros and Name (2019), in a similar direction, present the proposition of the "Slab Epistemology", in which they question the fact that slum architecture produced by non-specialists is usually disregarded as a project. From this perspective, they defend the slab as a project "that resists the imposition of modern-colonial technical-scientific rationalities that operate in the key of universality and that, consequently, claim to be producers and holders of all possible knowledge." (p. 166, our translation). In dialogue with these propositions and in order to extend the notion of project as a field of convergence of knowledges, some peculiarities of the know-how of non-specialists in the contexts of urban peripheries are investigated below.

4 The Know-How of the Non-Experts

While in the conventional know-how of the experts, the project dictates the starting point and the conclusion point of the work - defining the "right" moment to stop, in the know-how of the self-buildings of the urban peripheries, there is no preliminary design to be followed, and therefore there is no final result to be achieved. This distinction is explained by Jacques (2001, p. 13, our translation), who identifies that the architectural and urbanistic devices in the slums are formed by unique processes, and are invested "with their own aesthetics, with peculiar characteristics, completely different from the aesthetics of the so-called formal city".

Because of this unique process, the opaque spaces are marked by transformations that occur in their daily lives, in a continuous state of incompleteness, considering that there will always be improvements and expansions to be made. Facing

the scarcity of resources, the continuous production of the houses makes possible the flexibility of costs and a constant opening for new possibilities - either because the family grows, or because some extra income arises, as can be observed in the following statement:

I bought this land, I had a little house, one of these that the government built, but I tore it down to enlarge it **because these government little houses can't be enlarged, you have to redo everything**, but I took advantage of a lot of things, I took off the roof, I laid the slab and built on top. [...] I am **going to take the roof off the bar, lay the slab, and make another room on top. Because the bar is rented, so I will rent one more room and this will help me finish the house later**. Even in the bottom part that was supposed to be my house, a part I separated and rented, after all, a room here is worth one hundred reais (Gilberto, resident of Novos Alagados-Araçás apud Lobosco, 2011, p. 263, our emphasis and translation).

From the above, one can see that continuous and successive construction occurs according to the means and time availability of the inhabitant, "who, from the beginning, must prove to have a great capacity for adaptation and constructive imagination: the "jeitinho"² is the sine qua non condition for building a shack in a favela" (Jacques, 2001, p. 23, our translation). Frequently, construction is initiated by the builder himself gathering heterogeneous materials, whether they are collected from construction sites around the city or purchased as refuse from construction materials. In this procedure, "the collected and regrouped materials are the starting point of the construction, which will depend directly on the chance of the finds, on the discovery of interesting leftovers" (Jacques, 2001, p. 23, our translation).

Due to these characteristics, the urban peripheries and slums develop specific patterns of space production, which respond to immediate needs and to a particular way of occupying and inhabiting the space. In this sense, Lobosco (2022) highlights that the spatial configuration of peripheral settlements has an internal logic guided by the maximum use of the land and the resources employed, and that produces a great spatial flexibility in its internal structure.

It is important to note that the way of producing and inhabiting the opaque spaces is not a "**second-rate reproduction of the city**," since the practices and patterns of occupation that occur there are coated with other values than the formal city: "the ugly and **the unfinished are transformed into utilitarian and in process, and the construction, even if precarious, crystallizes the effort of resistance and constant evolution in the production of housing**, awakening the appreciation and pride of its inhabitants" (Lobosco, 2011, p. 42, our emphasis and translation).

If the unfinished construction brings, in each improvement or expansion, the marks and the effort of the work employed there for its confection, it is not possible to say the same of the hegemonically produced architecture. In architects' works, once the construction is finished, all its traces are erased, making "forget everything that is objectified in it under the form of alienated labor" (Bicca, 1984, p. 219, our translation). In its inauguration, everything that refers to its construction is removed, while in the self-construction, there is no moment of inauguration, and the marks of the work crystallized there are present in the hopes of a future.

5 The Know-How of Gambiarra Tactics in Opaque Spaces

In the absence of adequate mechanisms for access to land, housing and quality urban infrastructure, the urban poor resort to a variety of tactics to overcome the enormous shortages in their territories. In this scenario, tactical action presents itself as a defense mechanism to deal with the conditions of urban, economic and social precariousness (Lobosco, 2011; 2022), without necessarily confronting the system, but finding some gaps in it as forms of survival (Certeau, 1998).

In the scope of peripheral settlements, **the gambiarra tactic** is quite frequent, and relates to the way residents "use the 'jeitinho' to participate, even if precariously, of the benefits arising from modernity, enjoying part of the infrastructure of large Brazilian cities" (Bouffleur, 2013, p. 21, our translation). The term "gambiarra", in a very comprehensive way, involves everything that is done in an improvised and unprepared way, with the skills and resources of the moment and with the

² Note of Translator: The Brazilian way, "jeitinho brasileiro" refers to a way that people in Brazil use to solve a problem when they don't have enough resources, using whatever is at hand.

materials at hand. In opaque spaces, gambiarra's motivation is based on the absence of alternatives for some practical constraint, "being rather a response to a situation of lack than a choice made with free will" (Dos Anjos, 2007, p. 34, our translation).

In these contexts, everyday tactics are "at the same time, products and producers of the very space that houses them," and "by continuously reproducing themselves, they have structured themselves as the local pattern of action" (Lobosco, 2022, p.36.076, our translation). Therefore, the gambiarra tactic acts as a way of know-how that enables the flexibility of "the temporal relationship project-construction-housing" (Lobosco, 2022, p. 36.076, our translation) and allows the functional and immediate meeting of spatial demands in a dynamic way and not linked to a project conceived a priori.

From this perspective, and in the terms proposed by Escobar (2016) and Gutiérrez Borrero (2015), the tactic of gambiarra in opaque spaces - as a systematic practice of transformation and adaptation of objects and spaces - can be understood as a project, to the extent that it starts from practical everyday knowledge shared and developed within the community. Thus, although the hegemonic urban discourse systematically seeks to exclude the ordinary practices of everyday life, they survive and proliferate, unaware of the system that intends to manage or suppress them, "combined according to illegible but stable tactics to such an extent that they constitute everyday regulations and surreptitious creativities" (Certeau, 1998, p.175, our translation).

Although Certeau (1998) has attributed the status of the theoretical object to the ordinary practices of everyday life, in the field of Brazilian urban studies very few allusions to the gambiarra tactic are found, usually linked to a negative connotation, associated with improvisation in construction processes and lack of planning in our cities. The most recurrent and abundant manifestation of the gambiarra occurs ironically in the various memes that satirize the improvised form of the Brazilian jeitinho (way of doing things) to solve, even temporarily, the most distinct adversities imposed by socioeconomic limitations, as shown in figures 1 and 2.



Fig. 1: Meme about the gambiarras of the urban poor, 2021. Source: iFunny, 2021. Available at: <https://br.ifunny.co/picture/fazer-gato-na-net-e-na-luz-e-coisa-de-4ijidu759>. Accessed: 09 Aug. 2022.

Minha casa minha vida agora com espaço gourmet.



Fig. 2: Meme regarding the gambiarras of the urban poor, 2015. Source: José Simão, 2015. Available at: <https://blogdosimao.blogosfera.uol.com.br/2015/01/08/o-brasil-e-ludico-espaco-gourmet/>. Accessed: 09 Aug. 2022.

These examples show that the tactic of gambiarra in opaque spaces is presented almost entirely in a pejorative way, satirizing the precariousness of the means and the creativity of the Brazilian people in improvising the most diverse solutions to overcome adversity. Thus, by not considering the subordinated spatial practices as legitimate or worthy of attention, the "specialists" reinforce the symbolic and material privilege of the hegemonic forms of spatial production. In this reading, the practices generated outside this domain are considered precarious and the "non-specialists" are considered laymen, holders of hierarchically inferior knowledge.

However, in contemporary times, some approaches linked to the fields of visual arts, design, and technology have been emerging, which glimpse, in the practice of gambiarra, a set of manifestations that represents a form of innovation, with its aesthetic and inventive specificities (Dos Anjos, 2007; Rosas, 2008; OBICI, 2014; CORRÊA; MAASS, 2021). Without intending to fall into a romantic view of the phenomenon or in a certain aestheticization of the precarious, we present below some of these propositions that seem forceful to reflect on the liminality between project and gambiarra, in the scope of the daily production of opaque spaces.

Rennó (2016) states that the gambiarra can be apprehended as a **contestatory act**, as "a constant **disobedience to the clean planning** that hides its constituent processes and that **imposes only one use to objects**, previously determined from top to bottom" (p. 132, our emphasis and translation). In a similar direction, Obici (2014) points out that the gambiarra "institutes, even if temporarily, the inversion of the designs embedded in technology, **revealing the reverse of the order that it establishes**" (p. 44, our emphasis, our translation). Its practitioner assumes, even if temporarily, "the role of engineer and/or designer and/or inventor capable of creating other functions to objects, leaving the place of passive consumer to that

of the active proposer, inverting hierarchies" (p. 42) Bouffleur (2013) also argues that, by performing a gambiarra, ordinary citizens demonstrate, in concrete terms, that they have **"autonomy to 'resignify' the objects around them, reversing the order of domination 'established' by those who designed it"** (p. 237, our emphasis and translation).

From the above, one can deduce that the gambiarra process breaks with the erasure of the individual and with the disappearance of his personal contribution transferred to matter. In the gambiarra practice all its connections are exposed, contradicting the logic of products as closed units and with uses predetermined by who designed them, demonstrating "a growing disrespect for an object's identity and for the truth and authority it embodies" (Rognoli; Oroza, 2015, p. 4). In a similar way to objects, gambiarra adaptations are also verified in the urban landscape of opaque spaces, in a continuous process not linked to a "final" project, which allows flexibility and openness to changes over time in function of the ever-changing circumstances (figures 3 and 4). In this aspect, the practice of gambiarra updates and subverts objects and spaces, acting as a horizontal insubordination to the rationality of the hegemonic urban project.



Fig. 3: Water connections exposed on a house facade at Pedreira Prado Lopes, in Belo Horizonte, a city located in the southeast of Brazil. Source: Author, 2022.



Fig. 4: Veja São Paulo Magazine cover about the multiplication of slabs in the peripheries of urban centers. Source: Veja São Paulo, 2019. Available at: <https://www.facebook.com/vejasp/posts/10157417831858258>. Accessed: 10 Nov. 2022.

Thus, in the gambiarra's way of know-how, the individual is simultaneously the designer and the executor of the work, in a process that unites the act of conceiving to the act of executing, configuring itself in an immediate projective reasoning. The gambiarra designates both the act of building something due to scarcity, and the apparatus built, both the operation and its result, both the product and its means (Dos Anjos, 2007). To the extent that conception, project and execution occur almost concomitantly, the gambiarra denies the dualistic logic between knowing and doing, and also breaks with the compartmentalization imposed by the vertical division of labor. From this perspective, the gambiarra's way of doing is configured as an action that knows itself to be a thought: it is simultaneously a doing-thinking and a thinking-doing.

6 Conclusion: for Other Ways of Know-How

The tactical performance in the Brazilian peripheries is established as a device to supply the needs of the moment with the available resources, and it configures itself as a response to the slow process of construction of the conventional city, considering that it starts from the urgency of the real. In these contexts, the gambiarra tactic presents itself both as a characteristic feature and as a necessity. As demonstrated, these practices do not occur, therefore, due to disorganization, spontaneity, or lack of control - but, notably, due to the discriminatory application of urban plans and projects as mechanisms to reinforce inequalities.

In this framework, the daily production of opaque spaces occurs in a complex dialectical relationship between formality and informality, and between accommodation and resistance to dominant structures. In this perspective, the tactics survive and

proliferate, unaware of the system that intends to manage or suppress them (Certeau, 1998). As exposed, the gambiarra tactic in the peripheries allows residents to "perform small 'route deviations' in the established order" (Lobosco, 2011, p. 44, our translation) - deviations that produce micro-resistances to hegemonic urbanistic practices, by challenging, even if instinctively, a certain conception of city and the understanding of the very notion of the project as something finished and imposed from top to bottom.

Although tactical interventions cannot by themselves resolve conflicts arising from systematic urban policies of exclusion, they can challenge a certain rigid conception about the project in the everyday production of space and indicate the broadening of the disciplinary horizon of urbanism as a transversal field of knowledge convergence (Pereira; Jacques, 2018).

This essay invites us to take a closer look at the opaque spatial tactics that have been systematically neglected by hegemonic knowledge. In doing so, it reveals nuances that go unnoticed by the spotlight cast on the hegemonic production of urban space. Thus, between the excess of light and total darkness, various spectrums can be distinguished that show other ways of knowing how to make cities, or, as Ana Clara Torres Ribeiro (2012, p. 67, our translation) provokes: "To see what I couldn't see, I needed to stop seeing what I always saw. I needed to change my blindness".

Acknowledgment

The author thanks the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq) for granting her a PhD Scholarship in the Graduate Program in Urbanism at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (PROURB/UFRJ), under the supervision of Professor Adriana Sansão Fontes.

References

- Baltazar, A. P., Kapp, S., 2006. Por uma Arquitetura não planejada: o arquiteto como designer de interfaces e o usuário como produtor de espaços. *Impulso*, 17, pp. 93-103.
- Bicca, P., 1984. *Arquiteto, a máscara e a face*. São Paulo: Projeto.
- Bouffleur, R., 2013. *Fundamentos da Gambiarra: A improvisação utilitária contemporânea e seu contexto socioeconômico*. Ph.D. São Paulo University.
- Buarque, C., 1972. 'Bom conselho', *Caetano & Chico juntos e ao vivo* [Vinyl]. Polygram/Philips.
- Certeau, M., 1998. *A Invenção do Cotidiano: artes de fazer*. 3rd ed. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Corrêa, P. C., Maass, M. C., 2021. O design espontâneo periférico de Brasil e Cuba na América Latina. *VIRUS* 23. [online]. Available at: <<http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/virus23/?sec=4&item=11&lang=pt>>. [Accessed: 15 August 2022].
- Dos Anjos, M. Contraditório., 2007. In: *Panorama da Arte Brasileira 2007*. Curadoria de Moacir Dos Anjos. São Paulo: Museu de Arte Moderna de São Paulo.
- Escobar, A., 2016. *Autonomía y diseño. La realización de lo comunal*. Popayán: Universidad del Cauca/Sello Editorial.
- Farrés Delgado, Y., 2014. *Críticas decoloniales a la arquitectura, el urbanismo y la ordenación del territorio: hacia una territorialización de ambientes humanos en Cuba*. Ph.D. University of Granada.
- Ferro, S., 2006. *Arquitetura e Trabalho Livre*. São Paulo: Cosac Naify.
- Freire-Medeiros, B., Name, L., 2019. Epistemologia da laje. *Tempo Social Revista de Sociologia da USP*, 31 jan./apr (1), pp. 153-172.
- Gutiérrez Borrero, A., 2015. El Sur del diseño y el diseño del Sur. In: Santos, B. S., Cunha, T., *Actas Colóquio Internacional Epistemologias do Sul: aprendizagens globais Sul-Sul, Sul-Norte e Norte-Sul*. Coimbra: Centro de Estudos Sociais – Laboratório Associado, pp. 745-759.

- Gutiérrez Borrero, A., Name, L., Cunha, G. R., 2020. Alfredo Gutiérrez Borrero – Desenhos-outros: da hegemonia ao giro decolonial e dos desenhos do sul aos dessocons (entrevista). *Redobra*, 15(6), pp. 59-86.
- Jacques, P. B., 2001. *Estética da ginga: A arquitetura das favelas através da obra de Helio Oiticica*. Rio de Janeiro: Casa da Palavra.
- Kowarick, L., 2000. *Escritos Urbanos*. São Paulo: Editora 34.
- Lobosco, T., 2011. *Como se faz uma favela: práticas e cotidiano na produção do espaço urbano “periférico”*. Ph.D. Federal University of Bahia.
- Lobosco, T., 2022. A Favela como reação à “descontextualização” da modernidade: práticas cotidianas e adaptação tática. *Brazilian Journal of Development*, 8 May (5), pp. 36074-36087.
- Maricato, E., 1982. Autoconstrução, a arquitetura possível. In: MARICATO, E. (org.). *A produção capitalista da Casa (e da Cidade) no Brasil Industrial*. São Paulo: Editora Alfa-Omega.
- Mignolo, W., 2003. *Histórias Locais / Projetos Globais: Colonialidade, Saberes Subalternos e Pensamento Liminar*. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG.
- Obici, G. L., 2014. *Gambiarra e Experimentalismo Sonoro*. Ph.D. University of São Paulo.
- Pereira, M. S., Jacques, P. B. eds., 2018. *Nebulosas do pensamento urbanístico – Tomo I: modos de pensar*. Salvador: EDUFBA.
- Quijano, A., 1992. Colonialidad y modernidad/racionalidad. *Perú indígena*, 13(29), pp. 11-20.
- Rennó, R., 2016. Cientistas da gambiarra, poetas do imperfeito. In: Paulino, F., ed. *Gambiólogos 2.0: a gambiarra nos tempos do digital*. Belo Horizonte / Rio de Janeiro: Fogão de Lenha Editora / Oi Futuro, pp. 131-137.
- Ribeiro, A. C. T., 2012. Homens lentos, opacidades e rugosidades. *Redobra*, 9(3), pp. 58-71.
- Rolnik, R., 2015. *Guerra dos lugares: a colonização da terra e da moradia na era das finanças*. São Paulo: Boitempo.
- Rognoli, V., Oroza, E., 2015. “Worker, build your own machinery!” A workshop to practice the Technological Disobedience. *PLATE Conference*. Nottingham Trent University, June, pp. 1-10.
- Rosas, R., 2008. Gambiarra: alguns pontos para se pensar uma tecnologia recombinante. *Revista Gambiarra*, 1(1), pp. 19-26.
- Santos, M., 2006. *A natureza do Espaço: Técnica e Tempo, Razão e Emoção*. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo.
- Souza Santos, B., 2013. Para além do pensamento abissal: das linhas globais a uma ecologia de saberes. In: Souza Santos, B., Menezes, M. P., eds. *Epistemologias do Sul*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora, pp. 29-67.
- Souza Santos, B., Menezes, M. P., 2013. Prefácio. In: Souza Santos, B., Menezes, M. P., (orgs.). *Epistemologias do Sul*. São Paulo: Cortez Editora, pp. 16-27.
- Yiftachel, O., Avni, N., 2014. ‘The new divided city?’ Planning and ‘gray space’ between global north-west and south-east. In: Parnell, S. and Oldfield, S. eds., *The Routledge Handbook on cities of the global south*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 487-505.