Article

The city and the public space: Fragmented diversity

Claudia Teresa Gasca Moreno[*], **Aquiles Omar Avila Quijas**

Department of Social Studies, University of Guanajuat, Guanajuato 38096, Mexico
* Corresponding author: Claudia Teresa Gasca Moreno, ct.gasca@ugto.mx

Abstract: This paper scrutinizes the way diversity is understood in urban zones and cities. It seeks to demonstrate that diversity is a consequence of the fragmentation of social interactions drawn from the blurring of the other in order to root out liberal subject, the one that holds political and social equality. In this sense, we propose looking once again at the city and public space from the perspective of its distances and social separation, as well as the recognition of social absences in what is called "plurality" that, nowadays, demands an interdisciplinary dialogue and creatively crafted methodological frames.

Keywords: uses; appropriation; urban realm; fragmentation; urban realm; fragmentation

1. Introduction

The analytical tradition in history and political science starts from the idea that the urban and city-related contains the diverse, i.e., to speak of the city means to speak of a multiplicity of realities that juxtapose, intertwine and overlap with each other to form a gibberish that only acquires order with the categorization of zones, This makes it possible to draw a mental and, above all, linear picture of the public space that orders it both materially and culturally, in such a way that borders are generated between the different actors and social groups that share it, which is why an anthropological vision is necessary.

Considered in this way, there is a precise ordering based on the semantic composition of space, which marks and determines the uses and appropriations of space. However, are these categories the ones that determine diversity? What can we see if we change the prism through which we have so far observed the city and urban phenomena? What are the elements that would allow us to discern the diversities contained in spaces organized in semantic fields?

How can we disinvisibilize the set of elements of the environment that draw the multifaceted? The analytical tradition of urban anthropology can offer some clues in this regard. Consequently, what this text will present is the analysis of public space as the melting pot that we have built to house diversity and that, nevertheless, in reality seems to be a recipient of exclusions and invisibilizations of subsets of society. If we start from the idea that diversity is a social construction, which recognizes the existence of the other insofar as it is different from the referential framework from which the liberal subject is constructed, which is idealized and, therefore, homogeneous [1], how to observe with new lenses a reality that seems more complex than what was established?

2. Public space in the foreground

The study of public space as a starting point for the investigation of diversity in

cities is not something new, in the seventies and early eighties the concept acquired relevance in disciplines such as architecture, sociology, geography, anthropology, among others, which aimed to study the dynamics in the city, this notion became a reference of diversity and multiple possibilities and edges from which the study of the city could be approached [2].

In the mid-nineteenth century, the notion of the public from the urban experience was related to a territorial materiality and a collective use that should be guaranteed by the State, but that the capitalist economic model and its consolidation put in crisis with the defense of the private [3]. This trend produced new interrelationships in the urban experience, where even the existence of public space and its condition of "accessible to all" came to be questioned. This fading had repercussions in the academic sphere, where the concept of public space was used without distinction to refer to sites of open access, but also to allude to places in the private sphere such as supermarkets or shopping malls.

In the approach to the experience of the city and its spaces, the public has been defined based on collective use and an apparent heterogeneity of users who appropriate it according to their interests, imaginaries and perceptions. These uses are imposed by privileged actors who establish how and when they should be used [4] and, although there are resignifications and appropriations that oppose the original use for which they were created, there is a permanent regulation that undoubtedly limits the experience of the inhabitants in the city. Until a little more than a decade ago, anthropological writing on public space and the city emphasized the importance of this binomial as a strategy to approach the dynamics of scenarios of an unusual type, organized around anonymity and composed of ephemeral relationships that placed the diversity, heterogeneity, and difference of urban life at the center of the discussion [5–8]. These ethnographies revealed public space as an organizer of life in cities and a detonator of the diverse by, apparently, agglutinating heterogeneous practices and expressed simultaneously by different types of actors such as passers-by, tourists, lovers, workers, merchants, vagrants, to mention a few.

Abilio Vergara [9] points out four moments of public space: a) its functions were reduced to ritual-political or ritual-religious; the space was a producer of actors, people and leadership, at the same time as an arena of contention; then, b) it acquired the characteristics of a forum for staging identity; then, c) the production-consumption relationship configured relations between the generation of a public and clients that materialized spatially; finally, d) it became a scenario for recreation and coexistence. We would add one more moment, the public space as a scenario of exclusion and segregation in the contemporary city.

Streets, squares, gardens or markets -all of them identifiable public spaces in cities- have been explored as places where the urban anthropologist could witness social activity "in the natural", without hindering or interfering with it [10]. At the time it was revealing to conceive of public space as an entrance to floating otherness [11] because at first glance it seemed to group everything contrary to the homogeneous and sheltered in a given territory. The explorations revealed the practices and expressions of multifaceted users, populations in continuous transit, actors who only entrenched themselves at specific times or under certain circumstances, provisional and intermittent uses and appropriations, which made us think of public space as a banner

of diversity, which undoubtedly posed a set of theoretical and methodological challenges for urban anthropology.

All these works already warned of a neuralgic point that Manuel Delgado [10] summarizes in the question: who has the right to use public spaces? A question that calls into question one of its most prized characteristics: diversity. In these opening paragraphs we have insisted that the heterogeneity of public space is apparent, a sort of fiction, insofar as it agglutinates "compatible" diversities with points of confluence whose conflicts are usually negotiable or trigger the implementation of strategies to share and remain in the space in question. In the event that the uses, users and practices prove to be discordant, what are the reactions, what exercises are used to resolve a symbolic conflict whose scenario is the space, in principle, conceived and built for all? What we observe is a set of inequalities in the access to the urban space, which detonates processes of expulsion and segregation of the less favored group or with less resources to remain in it, and also propitiates distancing of actors that we have studied from other approaches and themes, but that could be absent from our idea of diversity of the urban public space.

In Mexico we find numerous works that analyze the dynamics of public space from its variety of practices and relations, research that has addressed the new configurations of the public and the private [12], relations between public space and commerce [13], privatization and forms of residential self-segregation [14]. One of the richest veins in the study of modern cities has been that referring to young people and urban public space. Various researchers of the youth phenomenon [15–17] have privileged the analysis of the use of time in cities, projecting young people as the main social actors of public space [18,19]. Also noteworthy are the works of Mauricio List Reyes on the uses based on gender and sexual preference [7,8] More recent works lead us to reflect on public space as an expression of the global [20], as a patrimonial entity [21,22] and perimeter of conflict [23] until landing on the processes of revitalization and putting cities up for sale [24,25]. As a whole, they reveal that the city is configured as a mosaic of diversities that public space fragments because it only allows coexistence between equals or similarities, far from that idea that for decades sheltered our reflections on the city and its spaces. In other words, the appropriation of public space triggers immaterial and material conflicts whose corollary is the construction of social islets made up of those who comply with the institutional discourse or, alternatively, with the informal scheme of use of the site. If right, this leads to projecting new ways of observing the city and urban phenomena, not as a monolith, but from its fragmentation. Conceiving public space as a restrictive element of diversity has theoretical and methodological implications that force us to dis-invisible our almost idealistic assumptions about public space and the diversity contained in it; it is a matter of recognizing the limitations and proposing new strategies for approaching the multiple fragmented diversities. How did we arrive at this point? Why do we think this?

3. The blurred diversity

The liberal project and its consequences

For the Western world, the questioning of absolute monarchies stemmed from the

little or no political representation that the various groups in those societies had in the decision-making bodies. In other words, the invisibilization of diversity was the driving force behind the evolution of a form of organization that made it visible, recognized it and, ultimately, made it invisible again.

The gestation of political equality, first among men, and then, little by little, including women, assumed that all individuals deserved to be represented by obtaining citizenship. In other words, it was only possible for everyone to have the same rights if certain requirements were met. If they were fulfilled, they had access to the possibility of influencing decision-making; but diversity was eliminated by accepting the quality of citizenship, which is nothing more than the homogenization of the individual in order to build a prototypical citizen, suitable for a specific national project. The triumph of liberalism is also the political validation of the annulment of diversity.

Today, with the evolution of the concept of democracy, which goes hand in hand with liberal development, diversity is even recognized as part of the cultural richness of a society. Also, as already mentioned, it has been established that cities, almost by definition, are containers of diversity. How to find a balance between the liberal principle of political and social equality and diversity? The political development of the Western world does not have it on the agenda; on the contrary, as Pierre Rosanvallon puts it, we are facing the emergence of a society of the particular. That is to say, social ties are no longer developed around macro structures of identity, but rather "selective couplings, punctual approaches, parallel paths" [26]. That is, the projects that shaped what we have called nation-states passed through the sieve of the generation of a set of identity symbols that allowed social cohesion around abstractions such as nation, homeland, Mexicanness (in the case of our country), and thus configured an ideal individual that would become the aspirational representation of a society that, at that point, had given up its otherness in pursuit of being part of something that surpassed it as an individual. The idealization of the subject is the result of the social-historical development of each population and, of course, changes over time [27], what Rosanvallon proposes is that social cohesion today no longer depends on those abstract forms, but on mechanisms that are more associated with the interaction between those who share common interests and establish symbolic and physical meeting points, there is a selection of the pair that surpasses the homeland and the nation, the reproduction of the Mexican is no longer on the agenda that defines the approaches, encounters and sociabilities. How does this define the use of public space?

Until today, the research agenda on the governance of public space has privileged the analysis of large cities, for example Mier y Terán, Vázquez and Ziccardi [28] for Mexico City; Hernández García [29] for Bogotá. What we can hypothesize is that, in line with that society of the particular, governments do not deny diversity; however, they are not interested in managing public spaces in which everything that is different from their idea of citizen is manifested. Therefore, the administrative exercise has tended to the zoning of space, to the construction of semantic fields on it [30]. The creation of zones implies organizing the territory, but also society, since limits are established for social practices in the territory: "here you cannot..."; "that can be done over there"; "here you are allowed...". The semantic fields act in the same way, but

instead of organizing space physically, they do so symbolically, so that territories generate invisible borders and ways of acting that correspond to the space in which one is, shares, cohabits. Basically, what happens is that there is a process of veiled exclusion that privileges, on the one hand, the model citizen, that is, the one who represents the political and social equality of the liberal project and, on the other hand, fragments diversity by generating islands of coexistence between the different social groups that share and cohabit the same public space. In our ethnographic exercise we can even observe a self-segregation that is the culmination of the success of exclusion and fragmentation of diversity. The individual is aware that he/she does not fit in with the citizen model and chooses to remain on the margin, depending on how he/she conceives the use of the space: "what am I going to do there"; "those places are not for people like us". Thus, there is a type of user defined by zoning or by the semantic field that matches the discourse of diversity and allows validating the invisibilization of the marginalized, despite being the object of an exclusion that is produced from the fragmentation of sociabilities, from their particularization.

This inherent paradox: to include-exclude, at the same time, promotes a set of resistances that force to place the public space as a subject of negotiation. The negotiability of public space occurs from the interaction of formal and informal orders that are woven on a zoned or symbolically delimited territory [31].

All public spaces, in general, and in some cases in particular, have a normative order, formal rules that must be observed by each of the users and that imply, in the case of not doing so, sanctions of different types, although the social ones stand out. Despite this, informal rules are also gestated that on many occasions delimit zones and semantic fields, which promotes a constant process of negotiation between authorities and users, and among the users themselves [32]. According to the neoinstitutional approach, what is sought is to generate frameworks of certainty that are guarantors of social relations, although what they generate are processes of exclusion and fragmentation of diversity.

Under this logic, are we to understand territory as a space in constant dispute? As an anchor that marks and determines collective identification, as classical anthropology tells us it happens? [33, 34]. From this perspective, territory is not a resource in dispute, since social actions are not understood from their territorial positioning, but from their place, existing or nonexistent, in the public space. Presence and non-presence have things to say for the ethnographer and for the analysis of cities, with their respect and promotion of diversity. The territory ceases to be a space that conceptualizes interactions, it is the interactions that give meaning to space and territory. This represents a methodological challenge: how to observe a reality that is more complex than what was established, how to approach these fragments and from where to do it?

4. New lenses, new problems: Fragmented diversity as a methodological challenge

Exploring the particularities of contemporary diversity in cities from a renewed view of public space that makes it possible to distinguish and analyze fragmented pluralities requires a methodological shift in line with the position or, rather,

questioning that we propose. For more than a decade, the experience of urban anthropology has highlighted the importance of interdisciplinary exchange in the study of diversity expressed around themes such as heritage, cultural consumption, youth imaginaries and festivals in cities [33–39]. It also revealed the dynamism of the spaces studied, as well as a variety of actors, practices, relationships, lifestyles and other expressions that were encompassable in terms of the scale analyzed. Nevertheless, there are intersections that have not been exhausted and that pose chiaroscuro in the approach and understanding of diversity, just there is where we identify multiple possibilities for analysis and understanding of what may have been left untraced [40].

Although the dynamics of cities have forced the urban anthropologist to modify the duration of fieldwork, the type of links and to incorporate new technologies in his research to approach the interactions and configuration of spatialities, as is the case of social networks or the activisms that are generated in virtuality, whose dynamics and incidence in the social and cultural sphere were unimaginable until a couple of decades ago, it has also led him down a path where methodological creativity and interdisciplinary dialogue are imperative to understand the actions of urbanites. If we start from the idea that public space is fragmented into a set of homogeneous islands where practices, interactions, relationships, imaginaries and lifestyles of city dwellers that do not touch each other, on the contrary, repel each other, are expressed, then anthropology offers the magnifying glass of the public space, anthropology offers the magnifying glass to look closely at what happens in them, while disciplines such as geography, urban planning or history, among others, propose a set of lenses to amplify, assemble, relate, compare or even distance themselves to obtain an overall view. A sort of methodological and strategic eclecticism [41,42] is necessary to illuminate those chiaroscuros housed in the everyday and unstable.

The public space is a formula for approaching the urban, collective negotiations occur, they acquire visibility while others are diluted in anonymity [43] for this reason it is important to reflect on the way we approach these realities and the lenses we use to do so. In this sense, it is substantial to rethink the approach to the city and its spaces from radical forms, that is, from non-regulated experiences, random and adrift encounters [44, 45]; to look at and describe what happens in the public space from an exercise of contemplation that allows us to identify the expressions and negotiations of diversity and the way it is fragmented.

To achieve a critical attitude towards what happens there, within the framework of contemporary dynamics, we need to make use of a plurality of means to obtain information, to develop a reflective eye towards how space is practiced, how it is conceived (semantic fields), but at the same time how it is fragmented. We are faced with small pieces that must be analyzed with means and tools that border on the intuitive, but are the only way to try to understand them. If in the public space there is a constantly changing socialization, how do we approach its dynamics if not in the same logic? An example of this is provided by Leal Sorcia [46] in her study of indigenous migrants and their dynamics in urban public space. This author identifies that the interaction of ethnic groups with the city reveals interactive contexts of cultural oscillation that manifest themselves through new practices in parks, streets, markets, stores and other spaces. The analysis of the interrelations of these groups does not focus (as traditionally treated in anthropological literature) exclusively on the

sociocultural sphere [47,48], but on the spaces where interpretations are constructed and daily life is internalized through displacements, insertions and relationships from the continuity and interdependence with urban dynamics, for example at school or the celebration of festivals, among others.

A useful strategy to study public space and these fragments is to do it from the processes of insertion of the actors, as suggested by Leal [49] for ethnic groups in the city, and that works for the analysis of urban collectivities that may or may not be visible in the public, to achieve this it is necessary to conduct ethnographies with short but intense visits, combine writing and audio and video recordings, focus the gaze on very specific aspects that allow us to make research times more efficient [50]. Focused ethnographies help us to recover the samples of diversity that public spaces contain in fractions and that are constantly rearranged by the rhythm of urban life. There is no other way to approach these elements than by parts, because that is how they are arranged in social life. If the gaze has to rest on the everyday, on the subtle and the minuscule of public space [51], but we only have access to different parts that may or may not be connected to each other, we have to employ strategies such as collective ethnographies to try to put together the pieces of the puzzle, combine them with looks at different scales, consider embedded ethnographic experiences in which our bodies also operate as a vehicle to accompany and understand what happens in urban spaces and the practices of groups that slip away from us from urban dynamics [23].

The idea of a fragmented diversity and the challenges to study it originates in our experience in the analysis of the uses, appropriation and control of public space and the study from an anthropological approach of the relationship between precarious populations and the city in two medium-sized cities. In these experiences we identified that in their main squares, gardens, parks and markets there is a plurality of actors, uses and even discordant actions. At first glance, these sites manifest themselves as places of encounter and otherness [30]. In them coincide "almost all" the inhabitants of the city; but not all of them are there and that is where we want to stop, in the population that is not present, in those absent from the city and its spaces. They are urban actors who belong to precarious population groups whose relationship with the city and its emblematic places is minimal and, in some cases, non-existent. They are inhabitants of peripheral urban zones, but also of central areas, for whom the city does not bring together their voices and does not form part of their identity or sociability references.

In our research experiences in precarious areas and polygons of poverty the inhabitants interviewed reported that their relationship with public spaces in the city is practically null, the causes are diverse: lack of economic resources to move, insecurity in the environment they live in that forces them to withdraw into their homes and limit their outings, especially for women who dedicate themselves almost exclusively to childcare and household chores, some others reported not having any business to attend to in the places mentioned:

One has nothing to go out to, it's been almost ten years since I've been going there [downtown], I have nothing to go to, to the health center I go here to the other neighborhood and with my family too, those are my places [Paty, field note, 24 May 2019].

I don't leave the house at all, I am the one who takes care of the children [Lourdes,

field note, 26 July 2019].

The truth is that I don't go out, because of the insecurity. So, between my sister and I we set up the stall [of used clothing] I take it out in the morning and here I am looking after the children [Rosa, field note, 2 August 2019].

When exploring what activities, they carry out in the city's public spaces, the participants in almost twenty interviews referred to some approach only for work-related reasons; in general, there is no relationship and for almost all the interviewees these spaces do not figure in their references as inhabitants of the city. The relationship of these groups is limited, it is a population segment that experiences the public and the private from more homogeneous than diverse scenarios, whose study also requires us methodological challenges for its approach, to the extent that it works in contexts of risk and violence [52,53]. The spatial practices of these inhabitants revealed to us that they inhabit physically and symbolically isolated urban spaces and face a set of problems associated with precariousness with more or less homogeneous realities. Their relationship with the city is limited: they do not know it, do not live it, do not walk through it and only some experience it partially under conditions of subordination: as low-level employees, street merchants or self-employed in streets and avenues to clean car windshields or ask for money from passers-by.

While it is true that the analysis of the ways of inhabiting the city and the study of urban inequalities has contemplated exclusion and segregation by exploring cases such as the indigenous population or street dwellers [41, 42], based on the idea that public space is plural and these populations can demand their right to the city, it is also true that this diversity is partial, since in cities there are groups that are completely alien to the dynamics of public spaces. With the above, we do not disdain the analyses that have been undertaken so far, on the contrary, those explorations on the ways of inhabiting of everyday users and those who struggle to use public space have allowed us to notice the absence of other populations that do not even dare to step on that contested and unequal space [24].

The main squares, corridors, streets, buildings and other public spaces are alien to this population that only knows the reality of the unconnected islands it inhabits. This led us to look again at public space, or what we thought was such, from its opacity to recognize that it is not so diverse, nor is it so public, and that it is difficult for the wealthiest and the poorest of a city to be under the same scheme of use and appropriation. It also placed us in front of a scenario that made explicit the difficulty of studying those fragments of social life that seem to be in continuous transit between the public and the private.

In order to make visible and approach the multiple conditions of urban spatiality and its diversity it is necessary to rethink how we are approaching it, from the academy we need to connect disconnected spaces in social reality, form multidisciplinary teams with eyes that simultaneously see different things, these multiple narratives of otherness can uncover non-traditional actors, new materialisms manifested in the bodily practices of urbanites, perceive affections that open windows of multiverses that are pressing in the reflection on cities [12, 13]. The above is not something new; on the contrary, we could point out that these ways of looking at urban diversity are nourished by the applied research works promoted since the 1990s in the field of health in agricultural contexts and other inter- and transdisciplinary projects [23] that are of

great utility to optimize the analysis of plurality in cities from their own rhythms, as is the case of rapid ethnographies proposed for research with limitations of time, economic and human resources, which demand to be examined from other disciplines to validate the information and generate questions about a reality that is only possible to understand through teamwork, triangulation of research methods and an operative process of data interpretation [34]. This dialogue and the combination of techniques and strategies are imperative to reach the unexplored chinks of urban life.

Dialogue with other disciplines and the recovery of unimagined strategies will allow us to break through theoretical and methodological barriers to avoid the homogenization of ideas and thus achieve an understanding of public space from its fragmentation. It is necessary to recognize that the diversity we knew is not so heterogeneous and that our most pressing task is to find the intersections and adapt the indispensable tools that can be focused ethnography, drifting tours, collective observations and many others that may arise in order to approach the dispersed fragments of contemporary diversity whose dynamics force us to devise new underpinnings for its approach.

5. Final considerations

Here we have argued that the city is a container of diversity and that, in its quest for political and social equality, it generates at the same time forms of homogenization that blur the former. In other words, there is a paradoxical dichotomy: include-exclude. What is the driving force, then, that would serve us to account for the cohabitation of public space? We have proposed that observing the city from a preconceived idea of culture will result in diversity being promoted, respected and strengthened in tune with the liberal project. But if we stop to look with a different perspective, what appears in the public space is a fragmentation of it, that is, the construction of insular manifestations of diversity through semantic fields or zoning that mark rules for the use and cohabitation of public space, in fact, in the relationship between each of these social islands there is a constant tension that can lead to conflict. Thus, the use of public space is a constant process of negotiation between those who have access to it and create, most of the time unconsciously, islands of interaction that seek to maintain a vital space between them and thus avoid conflict.

Although there is a set of formal rules that regulate the use of public space, perhaps the most important are the informal ones, since they are established and administered by the users; and they are also respected by the authority. With the usual view we have to see that space and cohabitation are organized and even predictable. With the lens we propose, what underlies is a constant process of social exclusion, but also of invisibilization. In this sense, the categories for the definition of diversity are insufficient, since it is no longer a matter of understanding the construction of a hegemony of the concept of citizenship, but of understanding that in public space there are inclusions and exclusions that occur at the same time and constantly avoid conflict through a negotiation of use and cohabitation [54].

In this sense, it is necessary to change the prism through which the city, urban phenomena and public space are viewed. Diversity is recognized to the extent that the discourse of inclusion functions as a political banner. The result is a homogeneous city,

where a set of expectations must be met in order not to become the marginal, the alterity, that which lives on the margins and is therefore excluded and made invisible. What are the characteristics of this homogeneity? They will vary according to the social context in which it develops, but will involve skin tone, way of dressing, way of expressing oneself, educational level, consumption capacity, to mention a few; then, that homogeneity will be fragmented, not as part of the diverse, but as cultural manifestations of the same population, that is, not as ways of understanding each other in this world, but as social constructions based on the institutional recognition of their difference. In other words, diversity only exists to the extent that it is expressed in public spaces in a fragmentation of sociabilities regulated by formal or informal rules that are validated by the immediate or mediate institutional actor [37, 38].

Does this mean that all those who do not comply with expectations are made invisible from the public space? Perhaps. The spaces "open to society" are in fact places that can be accessed by certain groups for two reasons: the institutional discourse that establishes the fundamental characteristics of the subject-actor of public space, and the informal practices that can reinforce that discourse or, alternatively, resist it, but that reproduce the social exclusions and segregations constructed from the institutional. The success of this form of organization of society is that it has generated semantic fields that lead the marginalized to establish that there are places that are off-limits to them. For example, as has already been argued in various studies [50, 51], poverty is not only an economic condition, but also a social status that sustains two antagonistic discourses and actions: the recognition that the poor should be included in development and tucked away by the city they inhabit, while, at the same time, the population in these conditions is systematically excluded from development. Although this is the extreme example, there are also processes of social exclusion among those who represent the ideal model of the urban individual. For example, sectors of the population decide not to attend classical music concerts because a semantic field has been created around concerts of symphony or philharmonic orchestras: they are public spaces where one must dress in a particular way; one must know about music to enjoy the concert. So, when attending a concert of this type, the usual thing is to find people who are dressed in a formal style, who drink table wine and who apparently know about symphonic music, that is to say, "they are cultured people". While the rest of the population, who are assumed to be "uneducated" or "uneducated", prefer to remain on the sidelines, they have been denied a space that should be public, but in reality, becomes a place for a (self-constructed) cultural elite.

But how can this be done? In the text we indicate that it is necessary to use the existing methodological tools in a different way and to generate, if necessary, new ones. From our point of view, for now it is enough to change the gaze and observe everything that is not manifest, the reading of the outside, as Foucault [34] would suggest. What is observable and what cannot be grasped with the taxonomies generated so far? What does everything that is manifest say?

That is, without losing sight of the fact that we are dealing with the study of human beings [36] and their interactions, what we must keep in mind in our ethnographic practices in urban settings is that many of these social relations are mediated by institutional practices (formal and informal) that skew the agency of each of the actors; In this sense, what we propose here is that it is directed by a set of

practices that fragment and create isolations that maintain a constant tension with each other, this insular organization of society can also explain details of the social-historical development of a population [20], what does this reveal? The implicit need for the generation of interdisciplinary dialogues that combine, on the one hand, methodologies and, on the other hand, analyses that complement what is observed from ethnographic exercises [12].

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Almada FH. The appropriation of public space through youth sports practices [PhD thesis]. El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, Tijuana; 2014. p.192.

2. Azuela A. Introduction. A kind of legal neorealism (Spanish). Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México/Procuraduría Ambiental y del Ordenamiento Territorial de la Ciudad de México, Mexico; 2016. pp. 9–40.

3. Balbi FA. Comparison, ethnography and generalization. Anuário Antropológico. 2017; 42(1): 9–35. doi: 10.4000/aa.1628

4. Banerjee AV. And Esther Duflo Rethinking Poverty (Spanish). A radical turn in the fight against global inequality, Taurus, Mexico; 2019. p. 372.

5. ChÁVez, MÓNica. Ethnic identity, migration, and urban socialization (Spanish). Antropología Social/El Colegio de San Luis.

6. Delgado M. The Public Animal. Anagrama, Barcelona; 2008. p. 224.

7. Del MÁRmol, Camila JF, Susana N (Coords.). The boundaries of heritage. Consumption and values of the past, Catalan Institute of Anthropology, Barcelona; 2010. p. 421.

8. De La Peña, Guillermo. Cities, Diversities and Citizenship in Mexican Anthropology (Spanish). Desacatos. 2015; 48: 177–191.

9. DurÁN S, Luis A. Urban gazes on public space: the flâneur, the drift and the ethnography of the urban .Reflections. 2011; 90: 137–144.

10. Foucault M. Thinking from the outside (Spanish). Pre-Textos, Spain; 1997. p. 40.

11. GarcÍA C, NÉStor. Urban anthropology in Mexico (Spanish). Fondo de Cultura Económica/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2005. p. 381.

12. Gershon I. Neoliberal Agency. Current Anthropology. 2011; 52(4): 537–555. doi: 10.1086/660866

13. Giglia A. Privatization of space, self-segregation and citizen participation in Mexico City: the case of the closed streets in the Coapa area (Tlalpan, Mexico City). Trace, Mexican and Central American Processes. 2002; 42: 71–78.

14. Giglia A. Regulations and rules of use of Mexico City's Alameda Central: a hybrid regime (Spanish). Sobre la huella del derecho en el orden urbano. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México/Procuraduría Ambiental y del Ordenamiento Territorial de la Ciudad de México, Mexico; 2016. p. 381–422.

15. Giglia A. Public spaces, sociability and urban order. Some reflections from Mexico City on the rise of urban revitalization policies. Cuestión Urbana. 2017; 2: 15–28.

16. Giglia A (Coord.) Urban renewal, modes of habitation and inequality in Mexico City (Spanish). Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico, Mexico; 2018. p. 404.

17. González-Abrisketa O, Carro-Ripalda S. The ontological openness of contemporary anthropology (Spanish). Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares. 2016; 71(1): 101–128. doi: 10.3989/rdtp.2016.01.003

18. GuÉDez, VÍCtor. Diversity and inclusion: implications for culture and education. SAPIENS. 2005; 6(1): 107–132.

19. Hernández García J. Social Construction of Public Spaces in Popular Neighborhoods of Bogotá (Spanish). Revista INVI. 2013; 28(78): 143–178. doi: 10.4067/s0718-83582013000200005

20. Hjorth B, Susann V. Risk assessment and risk reduction in fieldwork. Alterities. 2018; 28(56): 73–84.

21. Hoffmann O, Morales Gamboa A, eds. Territory as a resource (Spanish). Published online 2018. doi: 10.4000/books.irdeditions.32632.

22. JirÓN, Paola, Imilan W. Observing together in motion: possibilities, challenges or crossroads of a collective ethnography. Alterities. 2016; 26(52): 51–64.

23. Lacarrieu, Monica. An Anthropology of Cities and the City of Anthropologists. New Anthropology. 2007; 20(67): 14–39.

24. Leal Sorcia O. Experimentation and new themes in the ethnography of indigenous groups in Mexican cities (Spanish). Andamios, Revista de Investigación Social. 2012; 9(19): 103–126. doi: 10.29092/uacm.v9i19.392

25. Licona V, Ernesto. 2007 The zócalo of the city of Puebla (Spanish). Actores y apropiación social del espacio, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla/ Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2007. pp. 11–18.

26. Licona V, Ernesto. Space and culture: an approach to public space (Spanish). Actores y apropiación social del espacio, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla/ Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2007. pp. 19–44.

27. Licona V, Ernesto. The zócalo of the city of Puebla. Actores y apropiación social del espacio. Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2007.

28. Mauricio. Urban masculinities (Spanish). Una reflexión a partir de algunos ejemplos de la ciudad de Puebla. Espa cios públicos y prácticas metropolitanas, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2007. pp. 177–206.

29. Mauricio. Men, space, sociality (Spanish). El zócalo de la ciudad de Puebla. Actores y apropiación social del es pacio, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2007. pp. 119–144.

30. Maldonado A, Salvador. 2013Ethnographic challenges in the study of violence. Experiences of a research. Revista de Antropología. 2013; 22: 123–144.

31. MelÉ, Patrice. Uncertainties and urban regulations: the role of the legal qualification of space (Spanish). La ciudad y sus reglas. Sobre la huella del derecho en el orden urbano, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México/Procuraduría Ambiental y del Ordenamiento Territorial de la Ciudad de México, Mexico. 2016; pp. 43–82.

32. Mier y Terán A, Vázquez I, Ziccardi A. Urban poverty, residential segregation and public space improvement in Mexico City (Spanish). Sociologias. 2012; 14(30): 118–155. doi: 10.1590/s1517-45222012000200005

33. Monnet, JÉRôme. 1996Public space, commerce and urbanity in France, Mexico and the United States. Alteri dades. 1998; 6(11): 11–25.

34. Montes DOB, Laura B. Among activists, officials, and industrialists: applying ethnography-focused and political-in governance settings. New Anthropology. 2015; 28(83): 25–46.

35. NivÓN, Eduardo. Towards an anthropology of urban peripheries (Spanish). La antropología urbana en México. Fondo de Cultura Económica/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2005. pp. 140–163.

36. Portal, Maria A. Introduction, public space and urban transformations in public spaces and metropolitan practices (Spanish). Espacios públicos y prácticas metro politanas, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2007. pp. 45–68.

37. Restrepo, Eduardo. Anthropology and cultural studies: disputes and confluences from the periphery (Spanish). Siglo xxi, Buenos Aires; 2012. pp. 240.

38. Reyes, Alejandro. Modes of inhabiting the Roma neighborhood: the use of public space by young residents in Otomí neighborhoods (Spanish). Renovación urbana, modos de habitar y des igualdad en la Ciudad de México. Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana/Juan Pablos Editor, Mexico; 2017. pp. 219–250.

39. Reyna, Oscar, Alberto A. Cosmopolitics, heritage and counter-development: the modification of spaces of actoral action in the face of the risk of mining exploitation in the Natural Sacred Site of Wirikuta. Minería y capital transnacional sobre un territorio en riesgo. Análisis interdisciplinario sobre el sitio sa grado natural de Wirikuta, El Colegio de San Luis, Mexico; 2015. pp. 93–123.

40. Rojas, Mauricio. 2007 Towards new configurations of the public and the private in urban spaces. Espacios públicos y prácticas metropolitanas. Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2007. pp. 69–110.

41. Rosanvallon P. Democratic Legitimacy. Published online July 25, 2011. doi: 10.23943/princeton/9780691149486.001.0001

42. Rosas M, Ana Disputes over heritage. Analytical and contextual transformations of the patrimonial problematic in Mexico (Spanish). La antropología ur bana en México. Fondo de Cultura Económica/ Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2005. pp. 60–88.

43. Ruiz, Alí. Criminalization of street life in Mexico City (Spanish). Renovación urbana, modos de habitar y des igualdad en la Ciudad de México. Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2017. pp. 321–352.

44. Seville, Amparo, María. Festivals in the urban environment (Spanish). La antropología urba na en México. Fondo de Cultura Económica/ Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2005. pp. 341–372.

45. solís, Patricio. Inequality and social mobility in Mexico City. Estudios Sociológicos. 2011; 29(85): 283–298.

46. Taplin DH, Scheld S, Low SM. Rapid Ethnographic Assessment in Urban Parks: A Case Study of Independence National Historical Park. Human Organization. 2002; 61(1): 80–93. doi: 10.17730/humo.61.1.6ayvl8t0aekf8vmy

47. Téllez, León. Urban renewal, nostalgia and living in Downtown Mexico City (Spanish). Renovación urbana, modos de habitar y desigualdad en la ciudad de México. Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2018. pp.183–216.

48. UrteAgA C, Maritza. Uses and appropriations of the zócalo by young people (Spanish). El zócalo de la ciudad de Puebla. Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2007. pp. 81–117.

49. Urteaga CM, Inés CP. The Affective Privatization of Commercial Spaces by Young People. Cities. 1995; 27: 24–28.

50. UrteAgA C, Maritza, Carlos F. Of young people, music and the difficulties of integration (Spanish). La antropología urbana en México. Fondo de Cultura Económica/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2005. pp.265–298.

51. VAlenzuelA A, José MAnuel. El Colegio de la Frontera Norte, Mexico; 1988. pp. 233.

52. VergArA A. Introduction. The anthropological place. La ciudad desde sus lu gares, trece ventanas etnográficas para una metrópoli, Porrúa/Consejo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes/Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico; 2005. pp. 5–33.

53. VillAgómez O, PAlomA. The social constitution of food experiences in poverty. A qualitative study with low-income families in Iztapalapa, Mexico City (Spanish) [doctoral thesis]. El Colegio de México, Mexico; 2019. pp.319.

54. ViVeiros C, EduArdo. Cannibal metaphysics: lines of poststructural anthropology (Spanish). Katz Editores; 2010. pp.258.