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Abstract

This paper aims at a rigorous re-examination of the complex relationship between the physical, functional and social space in the city, in relation to the concept of segregation. Social segregation, inequalities in living conditions and accessibility to resources, are considered as major social problems and have been the focus of research work related to issues of sustainability. Social cohesion strategies and anti-segregation initiatives have been the subject of many far-reaching political decisions. Interpretations of segregation have often been formulated purely in terms of social and economic factors, without invoking space. Social initiatives rarely address urban design and prevailing methods of analysis provide few analytical insights from a spatial perspective. The paper posits that segregation has a significant physical meaning over and above its social meaning. The manner in which patterns of spatial integration influence the location of different social groups in the city is discussed, suggesting that spatial form needs to be understood as a contributing factor in forming patterns of segregation.
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1. Introduction

1.1. The city: relationship between the physical and the social

Louis Wirth defined the city and more specifically “urbanism as a characteristic mode of life” in terms of three perspectives: first as “physical structure,” second as a specific “system of social organization,” and third as a “set of attitudes and ideas”. Martina Low suggests that cities are spatial orderings that differ from other entities by their density and their heterogeneity and interprets “physical structure” as the spatial structures (built, planned, placed, grown) of each particular city. The “system of social organization” is suggested to be “the web of spatio-temporal actions directed towards social cooperation and in this sense “routinized” or “institutionalised.” Structures and action are systemically linked via routinized paths and routes, the habitus of the body, and the routines of perception. A “set of attitudes and ideas,” is linked to symbolized forms of everyday life that determine the representation side of urbanism and includes the stories that are told about a city, as well as the images that are formed of a city.

Low further suggests that the aforementioned characteristics are interrelated. In other words, she sees urban space not as expression or as the mirror of society but as having its own intrinsic logic: “one basic assumption is that cities, being socially constructed phenomena, develop intrinsic logics that affect the
patterns of experience of the people who inhabit them… The intrinsically logical is thus itself structural; it is embedded in everyday life and experienced through routines…”

Hillier suggests that on the face of it, the city is essentially two things: a physical sub-system, made up of buildings linked by streets, roads and infrastructure; and a human sub-system made up of movement, interaction and activity - the physical city and the social cityvi. It is argued that the disciplines associated with both notions of the city - that is, the spatial sciences on one hand and the social sciences on the other - take an asymmetric view and foreground one city while back grounding the other. Based on a large number of research projects, Hillier and Vaughan suggest that there are good reasons why in principle we might expect the city to actually be one thing: “the social city is either side of the physical city: it brings it into existence, and then acts within the constraints it imposes”. As such, cities can be thought of as socio-spatial systems. Theories of urban complexity continuously face the challenge and the need to link the social and spatial sub-systems to each othervii.

However, as the authors point out, both relations raise issues of determinism: “how can a physical process in the material world relate to a social process in a non-trivial yet systematic way?... In practice, we also find that any time, intervention in the city is governed by a consensus of beliefs and practices about the city as one thing: that small scale inward looking residential developments promote community, for example, or that mixed use reduces crime....But these beliefs shift over time, often dramatically, and it is hard to think of a case where a one thing proposition has acquired the status of a tested – or even testable – scientific proposition. The beliefs and practices allow us to act as though the city were known to be one thing, because this provides a rationale for our interventions, but all our formations and paradigms make the tacit assumption that the cities can safely be treated as twovii.”

According to the authors, the real challenge to the two city paradigms comes when we seem to face problems in cities, as a result of belief-based interventions which come in time to appear mistaken. In such cases, we need to know whether the spatial form of our interventions has contributed to the social problem faced. Such a challenge was posed in the 1950s by the problems faced in many social housing schemes and the belief that spatial form was involved.

Such a challenge is also posed in contemporary cities, as the problem of the social segregation in urban space, its nature, its causes and its consequences. Anti segregation initiatives aiming at socially sustainable urban development, have been the subject of many far-reaching political decisions. Social and ethnic integration is increasingly connected to globalised processes of urban transformation and democratic governance. One could easily formulate interpretations of segregation in terms of social and economic factors without invoking space. Social initiatives many times do not address urban design and prevailing methods of analysis provide few analytical insights from a spatial perspective. But as Hillier and Vaughan suggest “segregation is a spatial term and the way in which patterns of segregation and exclusion cluster in the city leads us back to the one city question: does urban segregation have a significant physical meaning over and above its social meaning?”

1.2. Understanding urban segregation - theoretical framework
The conception of segregation as an urban problem, dated back to the 1920s, forms a prominent research issue in a wide range of disciplines, both at a theoretical and at an operational level. However, it has recently been suggested that approaches to understanding urban segregation differ according to geographical contexts and according to different disciplines, which rely on their own concepts, beliefs and research methodologies. European research focuses on social and ethnic differences, Latin American on class differences, Australian on first and second generations of immigrants, whereas research in the US focuses on racial segregationviii. A shift in scale is also observed, from the micro scale of the home, to the neighbourhood, and the macro scale of the inner-city and the suburbs. A debate surrounding the
concepts, measurement, labelling, scale, modelling and representation of segregation, is evident in the academic literature. This observation highlights the need to consider the concept of segregation as a complex and multi-dimensional problem that takes place in space and time, rendering it difficult to describe by means of one theory or discipline alone.

Spatial segregation is, historically, an undeniable urban reality, as pointed out by Vaughan and Arbacci. Cities by their nature bring together heterogeneous people and activities. European cities are changing rapidly in partial response to the processes of economic globalization, mobility and European integration. Population movements frequently result in an intense flow of people and cultures in cities and the creation of large ethnic clusters in urban space. Such clusters have frequently been viewed as the main reason for the creation of a number of problems such as high demands on physical infrastructure and transport, greater needs for housing supply in certain areas of the cities and various social problems often related to concentrations of ethnic groups and mainly workers in the centers. Spatial segregation has very often been equated with social exclusion.

Residential ethnic concentrations, in particular have been looked at with suspicion and have been usually associated with a lack of social integration. The subject of the relationship between social and spatial segregation has thus been brought to the foreground of policy debate. Many recent studies of residential segregation usually equate spatial segregation of ethnically homogeneous neighborhoods and fragmentation in contemporary cities with social exclusion. Although there is no agreement in academic disciplines on the degree to which spatial characteristics of a residential neighborhood influence socially the inhabitants, spatial distance between residences of different groups in the city has been frequently equated to social segregation and has thus led to a negative perception of ethnic concentrations.

Neighborhood mixing policies and programs of dispersal have instead been suggested, as the way to overcome the increasing fragmentation in the city, integrate houses of ethnically and socially different families and potentially lead to a more inclusive society. Such strategies and approaches influenced perhaps by the 60s discussions of “social mixity”, have been frequently proposed as a model of alternative ways of communally inhabiting the city.

Such approaches have also been widely contested by a number of scholars. Peach notes that the notion of “segregation is bad, integration is good” and vice versa, is a simplistic view of the city: “…in reality for those groups who choose it and for whom it is not enforced, concentration may have many benefits. We need to be able to recognize the difference between the chosen enclave and the enforced ghetto…..”.

The fact that in many cities immigrants and minorities choose to live in localized clusters, yet at the same time maintain a variety of social ties outside of their immediate neighbourhood, is growing in recognition. Recent research work even suggests that when such areas are located close to economically active, well integrated streets, such spatial patterning can actually serve as a necessary mechanism enabling social integration in the urban environment.

Furthermore, it also seems necessary to challenge the focus on segregation in the city as a purely residential phenomenon. “The public realm, the street […], park, and other public spaces, [which] are more meaningful sites of ethnic segregation for people’s everyday lives. As Vaughan and Arbacci point out “although segregation is traditionally seen to be a residentially placed problem of poverty and ethnic exclusion, it should also be broadened to encompass the broader ranges of inequalities in the urban realm”.

Public spaces in cities play an important role in urban experience, being the meeting spaces of cultures, politics, social and individual trajectories. We therefore need to address a number of important issues:
how is public space accessible to all and shared? How are cultural differences and social inequalities addressed in public spaces? How is local everyday life knowledge taken into account by professional disciplines planning, developing and designing public spaces?

The changes identified at the beginning of this paper, also entail a respective transformation of public space where public life of the different groups inhabiting contemporary cities, unfolds. An understanding of the role public spaces are expected to play in the continuous and fast transformation of cities, as well as the impact of these transformations on the nature of public space as a shared resource is needed. Understanding the processes at work in the way different users of public space relate to it and to each other is quite complex and difficult, even in cases where, apparently, different groups or communities tend to cluster in different areas or places, giving the impression that, for some underlying reasons, space has been neatly divided.

The difficulty may be because ‘community membership can shift in time and space, so that an individual can express different solidarities throughout the course of a day or week’ while the term ‘community’ can have a highly spatialized as well as a highly transpatial formationxix (Hanson, 2000). It could also be, as Masseyxx argues, because the notion of place is a process redefined in terms of social interactions which are dynamic processes. Since places do not have boundaries in the sense of divisions that frame enclosures, they do not have unique identities and are instead full of internal conflicts, a mixture of wider and local social relations, making them progressive and outward looking instead of self enclosing (Massey, 1994). As Tzfadiaxxi points out, the construction of place is an endless process, subject to power relations among users even within a specific locality.

Although the physical environment has become more prominent in the analysis and understanding of the mechanisms of differentiation, there is still a lack of clarity and focus regarding the relationship between settlement patterns and use of urban space by the different groups in contemporary cities and the possible impact on social outcomes. The difficulty may well be because of the inherent complexity and multi-dimensionality of the concept, the process and mechanisms of urban segregation, highlighting the need for in depth multi-disciplinary research approach.

Things get more complex in the case study explored in this paper -Nicosia, Cyprus- where the ethnic demographic of the city (historically inhabited by a number of transient ethnic groups) is subject to a changing population dynamic precipitated by net in-migration, both from EU and Third World countries. Irrespective of how short their planned or intended stay may be, individuals from these countries tend to form groups based on ethnicity, usually in the city centre (figure 1). The historic centre within the traditional Venetian walls accommodates a diversity of ethnic groups that co-exist and share the public realm with the indigenous population. The spatial and social dimensions of the use of public space by ethnic groups in relation to the concept of socio-spatial segregation in the city, lie at the heart of the next section.

2. Public Space and Ethnic Groups
The existence of transient people in cities due to globalization has resulted as mentioned in the previous section, in an intense flow of people and cultures leading to ‘social and cultural diversity to most cities’, challenging people’s sense of identity and social relationshipsxxii. Public space is suggested to be an important and necessary platform for immigrants’ socialization through social and economic ‘exchanges’, building of group identityxxiii and negotiations of relations among the immigrants themselves and between them and the host societyxxiv. Display in the public sphere is, according to Madanipourxxv, a necessary first step in the process of assimilation in the host society, the means through which immigrants participate in the public realm. Perhaps this explains immigrants’ preference for the city centre ‘as this is where they can intermingle with the multifarious society that already exists there…’xxvi. The patterning ‘of ordinary Streets’ in the traditional city centre potentially enables a comfortable mixing and co-
existence of the immigrants and the indigenous population\textsuperscript{xxvii} as ‘the intense layering of activities [enabled by the traditional Street grid] creates the opportunity for the creation of a strong self-supporting immigrant community which can then venture out to the main Streets of the city to start to integrate with the indigenous population\textsuperscript{xxviii}.

Co-existence in public space may also result, according to Noussia and Lyons\textsuperscript{xxix} in the creation of spatial boundaries, ‘locales where people, activities and ideas come into contact with each other’ and where ‘the contrast maintains the distinction’. In some cases, Noussia and Lyons\textsuperscript{xx} argue, intensive use of space by some groups excludes others, resulting in the colonization of urban space by dominant groups. This sense of exclusion may turn public space into a place of fragmentation\textsuperscript{xxii} with a direct influence on the interface between the immigrants themselves and between the immigrants and the host society. ‘When a dominant group yields space to the “other”, boundaries are redrawn in urban space or time\textsuperscript{xxii}’.

If space in the cities is by definition continuous, artificially constructed boundaries will, according to Hillier\textsuperscript{xxiii} be reflected in the way people will experience it and social inequalities will potentially be reflected in the spaces they occupy. Legeby\textsuperscript{xxiv} points out that if such inequalities in the use of public space influence movement flows, co-presence and the nature of activities, then spatial exclusion has a direct influence on people’s everyday lives and the interface between the various groups.

As Vaughan suggests “an understanding of how the public realm, shaped by urban form, can create the potential for encounters and co-presence between different types of social groups is essential to achieve a more nuanced understanding of cities, migration and settlement patterns, since only thus is progress made from the simplistic assumption that clustering equates with ghettoization.”\textsuperscript{xxxv}

Acknowledging the fact that the use of public space is vital to immigrant’s relation and gradual assimilation to the host society, the paper addresses the spatial and temporal dimensions of ethnic exclusion in the use of public space.

\textbf{2.1. The Use of Public Space in the Walled City of Nicosia}

\textbf{2.1.1. The walled city – historical background} - The study focuses on the walled city of Nicosia on the island of Cyprus (figure 1). In 1567 the Venetians built defensive walls around the then city thus creating the circular form of today’s walled city and a boundary which today separates the old part of the city from new developments. The Ottoman conquest, and subsequent rule of Cyprus until 1878, is of central importance in the evolution of Cypriot society, as it introduced a number of fundamental changes, which had both ethnic and spatial consequences. The walled city was inhabited by two main ethnic groups – the Greek Cypriot majority and the Turkish Cypriot minority and grew around two ‘foci’, which reflected the ‘dual administration’ in Cyprus. Spatial arrangements during this period were found to be related to a number of social groups, differentiated according to ethnic, occupational and economic status\textsuperscript{xxxvi}.
Early on in their rule, the British administrators, who succeeded the Ottomans, placed their offices, as well as some residences, south and southwest of the walled city (presumably for health reasons, as this area was slightly higher up and away from malarial swamps, but possibly also in order to separate themselves from the natives). By the 1930s some wealthy Greek Cypriots had followed the example of the British, moving southwards, out of the walled city and separating themselves from poorer Greek Cypriots and ethnic minorities. This process was accentuated after the post World War II with economic growth and the increasing use of the walled city for commercial purposes. This meant that many residences in the inner city were converted into shops and commercial offices. Gradually this development expanded out of the walled city and a new commercial area grew, in a south and southeast direction. Effectively there are now two main commercial areas: the older one, within the walled city and the newer one, starting outwards from the walls.

These developments brought more changes in the walled city. Firstly, because of the increasing congestion, most wealthy and middle-class families moved to new areas of Nicosia, leaving behind the poorer families and the elderly. Secondly, increasing numbers of immigrants and other foreign nationals (such as unskilled manual workers, housemaids and students in local colleges) moved to the area, since the rent for these, mostly old flats and houses, was much lower than elsewhere in Nicosia. During its recent history, especially after the formation of the buffer zone which cuts Nicosia literally in two, the walled city according to the perception of the indigenous population gradually became an ‘urban ghetto’, accommodating ethnic minority and lower social and occupational class groups. Thirdly, some parts of the walled city have acquired a new importance as cultural centers or as parts of the city’s heritage. In most cases this latter use involved restoration work by the Nicosia municipality or the national government. This brought about a fourth trend, relating to commercial restoration of old houses, restaurants, pubs, galleries, and so on, aiming at exploiting the higher values bestowed on the return of culture and tradition in the area.
The historic city centre is currently characterized by a diversity of users, uses and activities. The impact of these transformations on the nature of public space as a shared resource is of interest to this paper.

2.1.2. Empirical studies - A recent study by Parpa sets out to test the hypothesis that the use of public space by ethnic groups in the south part of the walled city, is strongly defined both spatially and socially. The research work is based on field observations of the use of public space by a number of diverse ethnic groups, subsequently compared to spatial analysis, in an attempt to identify any spatial mechanisms that may have resulted in space use inequalities. Both quantitative and qualitative methods (a variety of space syntax measures, observation and questionnaires) were employed to explore whether the spatial organization of the public realm may have an effect on the use (social structure) by the various ethnic groups.

The study suggests that the city within the walls ‘presents a complex mosaic of different places, ethnically divided at a number of levels and forms’. Parpa’s ethnographic observations, using counts of flows and recording of snapshots of activity in public spaces, shows that the use of public space tends to happen in fragmented ways, and cross-ethnic interactions are in general rare and poor: in some cases the use of public space is clearly partitioned according to ethnicity, while in only a few cases, ethnic groups co-exist temporally and spatially. Research findings suggest that for most of the Cypriots, during the weekdays, the area is a destination either for business or work, while for a number of retired people, it is a destination for leisure. The immigrant population, on the other hand, is all working during weekdays. For most of the immigrants, the area is a destination for leisure activities during the weekends or after work.

Parpa argues that the concentrated presence of foreigners in some of the areas described above, cannot be explained through the syntactical characteristics of the spatial configuration in which these areas are embedded, suggesting the social as the main parameter behind it. On the other hand, the same research finds that the way Cypriots use this space is related to the syntactical properties of the city. If both of these are taken into account, then any observed segregation between Cypriots and foreigners cannot be fully accounted for by either the social or the spatial. It could even simply be that a group does not prefer to be in places where the other predominates. As Noussia suggests in investigating the social conditions that create “boundaries” or interfaces between locals and immigrants, intensive use of space by some groups excludes others.

However, there are spaces where ethnic groups co-exist in space and time. Franzen has referred to such spaces as ‘blurred spaces’. These are areas in the city where the lines of segregation are getting blurred. He finds that such spaces are of interest since they have the potential for greater integration over time. He suggests that the outcome – either greater social integration or greater hostility – depends on the stakes involved in maintaining group differences.

Such spatial sharing is observed in the two main squares of the walled city, Eleftheria and Faneromeni Squares, which are also the most ethnically diverse in the area (figure 3). The two squares lie at either end of an axis: from the southern entrance to the walled city, to the northern edge of the buffer zone. In other words, we can observe two different types of edge conditions at either end of the axis: a highly integrated edge in the south and a relatively segregated edge towards the north.
ELEFTHERIA SQUARE: The square, which is well integrated spatially contains a diverse population in terms of age, ethnicity and gender. Most activities seem to be of an individual nature, like sitting, reading a newspaper, eating; ethnic clustering is less frequently observed in this square and when it happens is found to shift in time between the different groups.

FANEROMENI SQUARE. The Square is not very well integrated locally and globally. It is characterized by a diverse population. In this case, ethnic but also social clustering is observed more frequently. The nature of interaction between the various ethnic groups in this part of the walled city was studied by Evzona\textsuperscript{xii}. Focusing on the ‘triangular’ part of the walled city highlighted and then on the micro-scale of Faneromeni Square, the author suggested that the degree of interaction between ethnic and/or social groups in the public space of the walled city in general and of the square under study in particular, is rather weak and confined to commerce and labour exchange. Activities such as street performances or demonstrations were observed to shift in time according to the groups that claimed and negotiated ownership of the space. Usage patterns also differed according to age groups; younger people tended to prefer the relatively segregated spaces and older people tended to occupy spaces where there is an important flow of through movement, like in Eleftheria Square.

The studies described above suggest that different ethnic groups and locals either maintain distinct artificially constructed spatial boundaries within overlapping areas or access distinct spaces through temporal negotiations. The interface between ethnic groups in the public realm of the city centre is found to be delimited according to social – rather than spatial – differences and the degree of place sharing also seems to shift across time.

The temporal dimension appears equally important and highlights the role of history and spatial adjacencies in the aforementioned discussion. The section that follows attempts to facilitate the
concluding discussion by providing additional information otherwise lost simply due to the spatial scale used or because of the temporal frame examined.

3. Discussion

3.1. The role of time in the form of speculation
And while the clustering of poorer ‘visitor groups’ in city centres is a frequently met phenomenon, the case of Nicosia reveals some peculiarities due to the political situation which keeps the city divided in half with a no man’s land running in between. Property in the city within the walls has been concentrated in the hands of a few individuals or companies which, speculating that value will dramatically rise in case of reunification, have bought these properties from their long term owners, keep them in bad condition and rent space to individuals who cannot stay for a long time in the country, either because their work permit lasts for a maximum of about four years or because they are illegal aliens. With the legislation in Cyprus, it is extremely difficult to terminate someone’s lease of a place, while the rent remains practically the same making their owners hesitant in renting to locals who may exercise their right to stay there practically for life. As a result, increasing numbers of immigrants and other foreign nationals (such as unskilled manual workers, housemaids and students in local colleges) are moving to the area. Clearly, the described situation creates a kind of segregation which results from the combination of a complex set of factors.

3.2. The role of time in the form of history - spatial adjacencies
The temporal dimension as already discussed in the previous sections, may play an important role even if no traces of its action are visible. This seems to be the case with the areas studied, and is especially evident in the relationship between Eleftheria Square and the area around Rigenis Street, which lies adjacent to it. The latter has long been, and still is the main red light district of Nicosia. It could actually be argued that, while other areas may have gone through rather big changes through the years since the island’s independence, this area kept a similar character in relation to its spatial characteristics and users profile. We can thus detect a persistence through time of the same patterns of use and the same users’ profile, suggesting an underlying spatial effect. The above described situation is important for the present study, since the Rigenis area spills into Eleftheria Square and vice versa.

3.3. ‘Making Do’: Strategies in Space versus Tactics in Time
If, as suggested by Parpa, immigrants’ use of space is more socially conditioned while locals’ use it according to an inherent spatial logic, then De Certeau’s distinction between strategies and tactics may help in understanding such a phenomenon better. According to De Certeau, bodies of authority and power can use ‘strategies’ to create space while individuals use tactics in order to use such spaces so as to create their own private and usually short lived utopias.

Strategies are here seen as controlling or producing space while tactics are seen as using the dimension of time. Strategies define a proper space and can thus be located above it, while tactics operate immersed in such a space without gaining the right or ability to have a panoramic and thus controlling relative position to it. It is tactics that immigrants use in the already existing space in order to ‘make do’. Opportunities for employment, many times illegal, or for socializing may appear in space but are actually offered through time since they may not be offered constantly. The public seating available under the trees in one of the city’s squares is a good example of a place where marginalized individuals take advantage of the characteristics of space at the right moment in order to claim, for whatever duration, some agency in their dealings with their environment.

Empirical evidence from the aforementioned studies indicates that it is mostly individuals and not groups that are actually using this square. Some groups may be formed of individuals of common ethnicity, but this is not the same as having an ethnic group which is already a consolidated social entity using the
space. Some of these individuals may indeed come here in search of a connection to such an entity but the search focuses on the social connection with other individuals.

Risking oversimplification, the different analytical lenses reveal that such diverse and ‘blurred’ public spaces may well have integrative social functions, of either an individual or collective initiative. Public spaces such as Nicosia’s main squares, could be seen as fields of maximal encounter between the maximum number of potential individuals; the more a space is integrated and diverse, the more potential it offers for inter-group connections; the more a space is segregated and uniform, the more limited and specific are the possibilities of connecting to a member of a contrasting group.

Configurational analysis gives valuable insight into the spatial patterns of segregation in public space, taking into consideration each place in relation to the whole city. It is obvious from the empirical evidence presented that urban form does play a vital role in the difference in spatial advantages or disadvantages each place affords. As Legeby suggests, this has a direct influence on people’s everyday lives and the ways public space is socially and physically accessed and used. The present study also reveals the difficulty and the inherent complexity in any attempt to map the urban segregation in a comprehensive way and by one theory or discipline alone. The lines of segregation are different in different parts of the public space; in some cases they are distinct and persistent through time while in others they are blurred and continuously modified. Although not thoroughly explored, this observation suggests that one could also look at urban segregation through its temporal dimension, as a dynamic process “where boundaries are continuously being raised, bridged and evaporated along different social lines”**xlvi**.

The previous section has shown that possible interpretations of spatial phenomena need to take into account additional information that is not readily available through a configurational analysis. The dimension of time as history, as speculated future, or as a fleeting moment of opportunity, and the difference between individuals who may appear to form clusters based on common ethnic origin from consolidated social entities, ethnic or other are just some of these factors. While patterns of ethnic co-presence in public space are explained by spatial analysis, it is evident that the old city of Nicosia does not follow a spatial logic alone. This is not surprising when analysis reveals a strategic use of space by individuals, in the context of a city effectively cut off to the north with constrained movement from the south.

Urban segregation is suggested to have a physical, a temporal as well as a social meaning and as such needs to be considered with an interdisciplinary intent as a multi-scalar and multi-dimensional phenomenon that takes place in space and time. Spatial form needs to be understood as a contributing factor in forming the patterns of integration and segregation in cities. An understanding of urban segregation and use of public space by different ethnic and social groups requires a more nuanced approach that enriches our “understanding that society leaves traces on its surroundings and that those surroundings have in turn an influence on how society is structured”. Detailed analysis of the relationship between the spatial, social and temporal advantages of public spaces where activities, uses and users are ‘blurred’ will potentially enrich our understanding of the nature of public space as a shared resource.
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Space syntax is a set of theories and non-discursive techniques which aim to use rigorous comparative analysis to analyse the configurational aspects of space and form in settlements, cities and buildings, through which culture is transmitted. Space syntax (or ‘syntactic’) analysis has shown that seen as systems of organized space, cities seem to have deep structures or genotypes, which vary with culture. Spatial properties which define cities as cultural types seem to be associated with the social systems of their corresponding societies. It has been proposed that space is the medium that both generates life in cities and conserves cultures by controlling encounter and co-presence. Hillier and Hanson, 1984, Hillier, 1996.

Dixon describes the south-west (“Levantine”) quarter of the city within the walls, as the area of dancing women and money lenders (1879).

De Certeau’s 1984