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This article presents some reflections that have guided me both in the didactic field and in the research and extensions carried out in recent years and the report of two experiences. I will start from the question that was asked “Design for whom? For all? Or just for some? It would complement this question: what is the role of the designer in the construction of our cities?

According to Lefebvre (2001) we are still in the process of learning for the configuration of urban man and in this sense I believe that design is of fundamental importance. Even though this text was written almost sixty years ago, I believe we are still in this learning process. For the author:

(...) It is a direction of a new humanism that it must offer and strive for, that is, a direction of a new praxis and another man, or man of urban society.

(LEFEBVRE, 2001, p.108)

The key word for this new humanism seems to me to be 'collaboration'. Unlike participation, collaboration includes joint action.

In July 2010 a debate was held by the Royal Institute of British Architects on the theme “Data and the City: Essential to Human Survival?”. Among the debaters, Usman Haque, (architect, designer and researcher of architectural systems), for whom “cities are processes, things we build every day,” says that it is not the
question of how much information will reduce the power of human beings in the formation of cities. However, access to information is a great opportunity for society to increase accountability and equality between individuals and corporations. The question then would be "how do we want things to change" and not "how will things change?"1. Haque's proposition goes in the direction of the importance of the formation of individuals for the collaborative construction. The city as a building of all.

For Elinor OSTROM (Nobel Prize for Economics 2009) in her research, Theory of Commons, cooperation is the key to success for any society. Although her studies focus on ecosystem management, her award certainly refers to the possibility that his theory has a multidisciplinary character of application. Through scientific inquiry methods the scientist proved the extreme efficiency of systems based on rules autonomously defined by community groups. The theory presents a way of resistance to the administrative political scenario, between the State and the market, community management is an efficient and flexible system that works satisfactorily with the unpredictability and diversity of socio-cultural contexts (LAURIOLA, 2009).

According to Ostrom (OSTROM, 2009), "When individuals have this way of working together, they can build trust and respect and may be able to solve problems."

Associations were presented and reinforcing the initial thesis. Hugh Dubberly deals with the theme with another bias: biotechnology in

---

the production of design. An approach that complements the first and clarifies biotechnology in the training environment.

Dubberly (2008) understands that biotechnology will predominate in human activities in the second half of the 21st century just as computer technology predominated in the second half of the twentieth century. Advances in this field of knowledge have focused on information: how organisms decode, transmit, and express signals. The vocabulary and terms that have been used around the computer also reveal the approach to biology: 'bugs', viruses, identities, among other terms.

According to the designer, the changes that occurred in the last thirty years in the production of projects initially characterized the computer as a tool as much as the pencil, without changing the nature of the design. The change begins when the computer is no longer just a tool and associates with 'network' as a media, for Dubberly 'computer more network as media'. From that moment on, design shares with biology the focus on information flow (DUBBERLY, 2008). Work relationships have become interactive experiences and services intangible in both the process and the end product. Dubberly states that in this process an ethos based on organic systems is emerging. The change, therefore for the author, went from an object-technician-based ethos to an organic-system-based ethos.

This change has changed the role of designer and client, and the author relates past models and perspectives of what will become in the future:
FROM (ESCAPE THE PAST) TO (INVENT THE FUTURE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanistic world-view</th>
<th>Ecological-evolutionary world-view</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape depletion</td>
<td>Landscape renewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface novelty</td>
<td>Evocative structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached expert</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible assets</td>
<td>Intangible assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td>Flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(DUBBERLY, 2008, p. 2)*

These would be the characteristics of the designer's production processes with the application of biotechnology concepts. The author's framework proposes the transformation from expert to collaborative professional. We can also understand from its concepts the city as the human habitat and as complementing Lefebvre an evolutionary ecological view of this system. The need to evolve into another posture where humanism surely relates to the ecological perspective. These concepts led us to practice with the understanding that design can be a tool of action, interaction and transformation.

Focusing on the city as our field of contact, contact with two Latin American networks was fundamental: the CivicWise organization and the Placemaking Latino América network. Both develop collaborative actions in the urban environment and collaborate in the dissemination of these practices through the use of technologies as open environments that provide collective intelligence. The most
important concept is the creation of places with the premise that the community expresses its territory by developing the ability to group and sit together to achieve a goal. Problem solving through self-organization without defining a lasting organizational structure. In order to organize these adhocratic\textsuperscript{2} processes it is necessary to practice multi-belonging. In this scenario we promote the creation of products by consumers, who can play the role of collaborators or even creators, giving rise to the figure of the “prosumer”, a term widely spread by Tofler (1981), uniting the idea of producer and consumer. Such a meaning had already been put forward by McLuhan in the 1970s to predict that future technology would allow both roles to merge into the production of new goods and services.

Both networks integrate numerous collaborators from various Latin American countries with the common goal of bringing quality to urban environments through design. Urban activists in action!

The collaborative dynamics of the network consolidate significant changes in consumer and consumer behavior and habits, strengthening a generation willing to create and change information and culture through fun and participatory effort. This process aims to develop active citizenship: all of us as protagonists of the territories we inhabit, neither user nor consumer. Through these practices we create places in the sense of Michel de Certeau: “Space is a practiced place” (CERTEAU, 1998, p. 202) and still referencing Lefébvre:


\[\text{\textsuperscript{2} Adhocracy is a term coined by Alvin Tofler and popularized by Robert Waterman in the book Adhocracy - The Power to Change \textsuperscript{.} It is a term used in Organization Theory, which establishes business management models based on non-permanent projects.}\]
Won't specific urban needs be the needs of qualified places, places of simultaneity and encounters, places where exchange would not be taken for exchange value, trade, and profit? (LEFEBVRE, 2001, p. 106)

For Lefebvre it is the social force that must realize urban society and "make effective and effective the unity (the 'synthesis') of art, technique, knowledge" (2001, p. 116). And he asks:

What are the socially successful places? How to detect them? By what criteria? What times, what rhythms of daily life, do they write, do they prescribe themselves in these "successful" spaces, that is, in those spaces that favor happiness? This is what matters. (LEFEBVRE, 2001, p. 110)

ARTS OF MAKING

The didactic experimentation took place at two different times. A class of graduating students developed the first experiment and a freshman class worked on the second.

1st Moment

I presented a theoretical basis for the graduating students, with the proposal of performing a collaborative action in an urban community. However, the students proposed that we conduct a pilot experiment on campus, arguing that this lack of belonging was a reality they experienced. The campus in question is in a Historic Heritage Site: Laranjeiras (SE, Brazil). The city is very close to the
capital which makes both teachers and students prefer to reside in Aracaju (SE, Brazil). Laranjeiras does not offer leisure or qualified trade options. The three courses on this campus have different schedules: one in the morning, another in the afternoon and just Architecture and Urbanism full time. The building is inserted in the ruins of the old trapiche restricting students' interventions. The weather is extremely hot making the central courtyard never used. Context does not encourage permanence.

The team was named ‘TornarLar’, created a logo and promoted playful events for three weeks to integrate the community with wide dissemination in the social technical networks (facebook and instagram). In the first week a clothesline of colored ribbons invited everyone to put their opinion and wishes on campus, in the second week promoted a day of 'beach' and picnic. In the third week a treasure hunt game and a Christmas basket prize had the largest number of participants. The actions were ephemeral interventions, occupied the courtyard, but did not collaborate in the stay.

2nd Moment

The freshman's turn. The main theoretical basis was the reading of Henri Lefebvre's book “The Right to the City” and the account of previous experiences. As we evaluated the previous campus occupation proposal, we realized that only the ephemeral playful
actions did not have the desired effect. This time the proposition was to design and execute spaces that favored coexistence. Five teams engaged in the development of furniture to create places for meeting and living together from their experiences. The work was developed in a collaborative environment and created synergy across the campus. By installing their furniture we could already see the reaction of the community that appropriated these new "places".

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The record of these moments is presented in the photos. The collaborative experience strengthened the ties of those involved. The experiences presented the possibility of an active and committed professional profile with their surroundings. Design was a tool of action, interaction and transformation and demonstrated its importance for the creation of places. The designer was a facilitator in this process. Experiences of this kind can and should be replicated in the public spaces of cities to develop urban habitat.
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Figure 1: First moment - logo and interventions days 1 and 2
Source 1: Personal Collection

Figure 2: First Moment - Treasure Hunt
Source 2: Personal Collection
Figure 3: Moment 2- multifunctional furniture, working with pallets
Source 3: Personal Collection

Figure 4: Moment 2: Furniture with Tires
Source 4: Personal Collection
Figure 5: multifunctional furniture, working with pallets
Source 5: Personal Collection

Figure 6: Furniture with PVC pipes and hydraulic connections
Source 6: Personal Collection
Figure 7: Game table with recycled wood pieces
Source 7: Personal Collection

Figure 8: Belonging through furniture
Source 8: Personal Collection
Figure 9: Figure 8: Belonging through furniture
Source 9: Personal Collection