

THE FEAR OF “OTHERS”: A STUDY ON SOCIO-SPATIAL CHANGES AND SOCIABILITY IN A DISTRICT OF CRICIÚMA, BRAZIL

Regiane Viana da Silva

Master in Environmental Sciences (UNESC)

Professor in the Centro Universitário Barriga Verde (UNIBAVE)

Orleans, Santa Catarina, Brazil

Viviane Kraieski de Assunção

Doctor in Social Anthropology (UFSC)

Professor in the Graduate Program of Environmental Science (UNESC)

Criciúma, Santa Catarina, Brazil

Abstract

São Domingos, district in the municipality of Criciúma (State of Santa Catarina, Brazil), has undergone several transformations arising from the advance of urbanization. Since the 1980s, the neighborhood is no longer exclusively agricultural, with the installation of a ceramic industry, the beginning of a process of fractionation of properties and, more recently, the installation of a prison complex. This article presents the results of research that understand that the changes in the neighborhood are, among other factors, the fruits of the interaction that occurred between the subjects, producing various forms of social relationship. The research focuses on the perspective of the oldest residents of the neighborhood. The results show these changes are understood as a risk to their sense of community and to the values, which has contributed to the establishment of a culture of fear and insecurity, marked by the demarcation of differences between the subjects and the rupture of everyday life.

Keywords: culture of fear; everyday life; penitentiary; community; difference

1.Introduction

The district of São Domingos, located in the municipality of Criciúma, in the south of the State of Santa Catarina, has been going through several transformations arising from the advance of urbanization over rural areas. The locality's history is marked by the arrival of European immigrants, mainly those of Italian origin, in the second half of the 19th century, when they started to inhabit the region and to develop agriculture (HOBOLD, 2005). The neighborhood stopped being exclusively agricultural only in the 1980s, with the installation of a ceramic industry. More recently, with the economic instability of family farming and the shift of the children of farmers to other professional activities, it has been observed the fractionation and sale of lots of properties, which has resulted in more residents coming to the locality. In 2008, the South Male Penitentiary was installed in the neighborhood, and ten years later, the South Female Penitentiary and

the Socio-Educational Service Center (CASE), aimed at receiving teenagers who committed infractions. The process of installing the prison complex was controversial, and sparked protests from residents.

This article is the result of research that aimed to investigate the socio-spatial changes that have occurred in the São Domingos neighborhood in recent decades and its impacts on sociability among its residents. Sociability, according to the Simmel perspective, is defined as “being with one another, for another, against another who, through the vehicle of impulses or purposes, forms and develops material or individual contents and interests” (SIMMEL, 1983, p. 168). In this approach, “society is not external to individuals, but emerges from the interaction between them” (ASSUNÇÃO; CONCEIÇÃO, 2018, p. 71).

Thus, it is understood that the changes that occurred in the neighborhood are, among other factors, the fruits of the interaction that occurred between the subjects, producing different forms of social relationship (SIMMEL, 1983). Often this contact with "others" brings "opposition, aversion, feelings of mutual strangeness, disgust, hatred, social struggles" (SIMMEL, 1983, p. 127). These interactions are part of modern urban life, which “[...] puts each person in contact with innumerable others every day. The entire internal organization of urban interaction is based on an extremely complex hierarchy of sympathies, indifference and aversions, from the most ephemeral to the most enduring type” (SIMMEL, 1983, p. 128). The neighborhood is a social place with multiple representations (FRÚGOLI, 2013), which can be understood as an intermediary between small and large neighborhoods, where relations of solidarity and conflict arise between residents, and between these and subjects from other contexts (CORDEIRO, 2001). It is also the locus of the processes of identification and constitution of feelings of belonging. Thus, it is in the neighborhood that “difficulties are perceived and social problems” of multiple orders (ALMEIDA, 2011, p. 2).

This article focuses on the perspective of the older residents of the neighborhood, who have been participating in the socio-spatial changes that have occurred for several decades. It points out that the arrival of new residents and the installation of prison projects have been the most impactful changes for these research subjects. These changes are understood as (1) a risk to their sense of community and to the values considered traditional, which has contributed to (2) the establishment of a culture of fear and insecurity, typical of the modern city, marked by the demarcation of differences between subjects and the disruption of everyday life.

2. The social production of space

The research starts from the understanding that “everywhere is a social product and, therefore, spatiality, appropriated by social practices in meeting the individual and collective needs of reproduction and identification” (SALGUEIRO, 2003, p. 99). According to Carlos (2011, 2015), space is a condition, means and product of human action. “Space as a social product is a concrete production process, born of work, which is nothing more than man's response to a series of needs that he must satisfy in order to survive” (CARLOS, 2011, p. 7). Thus, space and society are understood in a strictly related manner, as “each stage of the development of society will correspond to a stage of development of spatial production” (CARLOS, 2015, p. 31).

Space, for Lefebvre's theory, is a product and producer, a passive agent in social relations, and active in

relations itself, portraying the divergent dimensions that compose it in terms of social reality and its constitution linked to capital (LEFEBVRE, 1991). Thus, the production of space refers not only to its use and appropriation, but also to the development of social practices (LEFEBVRE, 1991).

Historically, some conceptions of the rural have emphasized the cultivation of agriculture as a way of survival for the subjects who inhabit the space, while the urban is related to industrial production. “The rural is a historically situated category, which emerges with the process that sees the combined forces of industrialization and urbanization (mobility rather than the expansion of cities) to progressively integrate the fields within a unified economic and socio-political system” (MORMONT, 1996, p. 161).

In order to understand the socio-spatial transformations that affect the rural environment, it is necessary to understand a new dynamic of this production process, which includes an expansion in the territory of “infrastructures and the general conditions of production related to production and consumption for the market” (RESGALA, 2017, p. 269). In Lefebvre's words, “the expanding city attacks the countryside, corrodes it, dissolves it” (LEFEBVRE, 1991, p. 68-69). This expansion, still according to the author, leads to the disappearance of the so-called “traditional elements” of peasant life, such as handicrafts and the “small centers that define for the benefit of urban centers (commercial and industrial, distribution networks, decision centers etc.)” (LEFEBVRE, 1991, p. 69).

This expansion of the city into the rural environment is called by several authors as rural-urban transition, whose limits are difficult to define, and can encompass both “urban manifestations concretized in space” and “cultural manifestations related to the urban way of life” (QUEVEDO NETO; LOMBARDO, 2005, p. 12158).

These transformations also change the ways of life of those who live in the so-called rural spaces. The development of pluriactivity is observed, in which the income obtained for the support of families living in rural areas does not always come only from agriculture and agriculture, constituting a multiple form of work and income from agricultural units (BALSADI, 2015; SCHNEIDER, 2001; RODRIGUES, 2014). Wanderley explains that this process of “rural modernization” does not imply the “end of agriculture” or the “end of the rural”, but the emergence of a new reality.

The modernization of society in local / rural spaces is based on the growing “social parity”, that is, the similarity between the living conditions of the populations living in cities and in the rural environment and the increasing availability, in the rural environment, of that which is still defined as the standard of “urban comfort” (WANDERLEY, 2003, p. 132).

For Wirth (1997), there are three elements that distinguish the city, namely: number of inhabitants, population density and heterogeneity. Therefore, it is stated that the attempt to differentiate the rural from the urban is based on three dimensions: demography, economic development and ways of life (RODRIGUES, 2014). The rural-urban transformation initiates a new contrast in the place, with the “emergence of new dilemmas, inequities and social inequalities” (BACCI; SANTOS, 2017, p. 199).

2.1 The culture of fear and the prison system

This new socio-spatial dynamic also impacts the relations between the inhabitants of the urban environment. As Almeida explains, Simmel understands a tension in the configuration of the modern city, which impacts “the development of new actions and reactions of the subjects, new configurations and social and cultural possibilities”. In this context, “the city and the neighborhood become the stage for the emergence of possibilities, actions and reactions of the individuals who are immersed in it, where the other of the relationship is present as a model of social practices” (ALMEIDA, 2011, p. 4).

A striking feature of modern urban life, contact with "others", strangers or foreigners, can lead to conflicts.

A fixed component of urban life, the ubiquity of foreigners, so visible and so close, adds a remarkable dose of unease to the aspirations and occupations of the city's inhabitants. This presence [...] is an inexhaustible source of anxiety and latent aggression - and it is often manifest (BAUMAN, 2009, p. 36).

One of the consequences of this socio-spatial reconfiguration pointed out in the research was the emergence of a culture of fear and insecurity. Fear can be understood as inherent to the human being, a feeling that can avoid danger, which arise from any nature. In this research, fear is considered as socially constructed, which is constituted from the dynamics of social groups, as explained by Baierl (2004, p. 48):

a socially constructed fear, with the ultimate aim of subjecting whole people and collectivities to self and group interests, and has its genesis in the very dynamics of society. Produced and built in certain social and individual contexts, by certain groups or people, with a view to achieving certain objectives of subduing, dominating and controlling the other, and groups, through intimidation and coercion. This fear leads collectivities, territorialized in certain spaces, to fear such a threat from these groups.

The culture of fear, according to the same author, “has been profoundly altering the territory and the urban fabric and, consequently, the daily life of the population. Everyone feels affected, threatened and in danger” (BAIERL, 2004, p. 20). This is because the city has been associated with images of crime, leading individuals to fear being victims of violence, such as robberies, assaults and assaults. Freedom has been curtailed, and the victims, whether real or not, are adopting protection strategies and criticizing the lack of security in cities (ECKERT, 2002).

One of the main responses of the public authorities in Brazil to the increase in crime and the feeling of insecurity of the population is the policy of incarceration (PASTANA, 2009), which generates an increasing need for places in prison systems.

The application of penalties for those who break rules has a long history. It goes back to the Hamurabi Code, proposed by the King of Babylon, which had as its premise the determination of “an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth”, which occurred in the year 1970 before Christ (PAULA, 1963). Subsequent to this Code, other forms of restraining criminal practices remained in place, as described by Foucault (2013), such as those that fell on the physical body, through punishment, and that would occur publicly, so that everyone could follow the punishment.

Over the years, it was observed that these practices of criminal torture did not prevent new criminal conduct

from being committed, culminating in the need for other means to be found, with more effective results (FOUCAULT, 2013). Thus, surveillance techniques emerged, which consisted of measures aimed at social regularization, based on establishing the rules of disciplined behavior, so that they were docile and useful for society (FOUCAULT, 2013). “Disciplinary power builds a disciplinary society, collectively training and producing individualized and docile bodies” (BENELLI, 2014, p. 64). In the transition from the 18th to the 19th century, the penalty of detention is created, in which punishment becomes a general function of society (BENELLI, 2014).

The prison is a “place for observing punished individuals: surveillance to control detainees, but also knowledge of each prisoner, their behavior, their profound dispositions and their progressive improvement” (BENELLI, 2014, p. 64). This new model, in which it has been gaining growth nowadays, has as its premises “the retributive punishment of the evil caused by the delinquent; prevention of the practice of new offenses, through the intimidation of the condemned person and potentially criminal people; regeneration of the prisoner, in the sense of transforming him from criminal to non-criminal” (THOMPSON, 1980, p. 04).

Brazil was no different from the rest of the world, considering that the penalties applied to physical bodies were also practiced, in which the slaves suffered public penalties. Subsequently, the first prisons were created; reports demonstrate that they were places where misery prevailed, with no penal policy, there was disregard for the place of serving sentences and there were already problems with overcrowding (SANTOS; ALCHIERI; FLORES FILHO, 2009).

Wacquant (2009), when analyzing the American prison system, denounces that mass incarceration started to be used as a systematic form of repression after the advance of neoliberalism. With fewer social protection services offered by the state, the prison becomes a central element of discipline and control of the masses, acting in the repression of the poorest. Thus, the biggest targets of the prison system become poor and black, residents of the ghettos of the cities (WACQUANT, 2001). At the discursive level, incarceration acquires a positive moral connotation as a means of punishing offenders, while social policies are now considered immoral (WACQUANT, 2009).

Like the United States, incarceration emerged with great emphasis on Brazil in the late 1980s as a means of implementing public security policy, constituting a form of social control (SOBRINHO, 2014). There are several criticisms of this form, as it is understood that it is high-cost and inefficient in resocialization (BENELLI, 2014). In addition, academic studies indicate that the majority of the incarcerated population is black, poorly educated, with low income and living on the outskirts of Brazilian cities (PASTANA, 2009; FERNANDES, 2015; ZACKSESKI; MACHADO; AZEVEDO, 2016; DANIN, 2017), denouncing the system prison for reaching only socially disadvantaged classes.

The construction of prisons and prisons is currently also being directed to rural areas, due to the concentration of people in urbanized areas. When installed, prisons generate demands for services and products that were previously nonexistent in the locality. The construction with guardhouses, electric fences, cameras, sensors, among other elements also present in closed condominiums to ensure safety (ZOMIGHANI JUNIOR, 2015), contributes to the alteration of the local landscape.

Developments such as the South Male Penitentiary, the South Female Penitentiary and the Socio-Educational Service Center (CASE), installed in the district of São Domingos, are, therefore, due to the

existing public security policy. The beginning of the installations of the penitentiary enterprises, in the location of the research, occurred with the South Male Penitentiary, inaugurated in the year of 2008, and should receive only people in the masculine gender. This project is considered to be of maximum security, and has the capacity to house 790 men, although it started with a capacity for 352 people, and in 2014, it was extended to 552 people.

In 2018, the South Women Penitentiary also started to operate, next to the South Male Penitentiary, which is also intended to receive those women who are convicted in a closed regime, from all over the State, and with a capacity for 286 people.

The operation of the CASE in the district of São Domingos took place in November 2018, and is to receive teenagers from the city of Criciúma and the entire region. Initially the capacity is for 60 male adolescents detained, and, during the research, 43 people were detained.

3. Methodological procedures

The research has a qualitative character (GOLDENBERG, 2004), and was carried out through field research, with semi-structured interviews (GASKELL, 2002). The interview script consisted of 13 questions, which comprised questions about the residents' knowledge about the emergence of the neighborhood, their perceptions about the changes that have occurred in space over the decades and the impact of these changes on their lives.

The selection of the research subjects was made by the oldest residents of the neighborhood, descendants of the families that started the colonization of the place. Thus, 16 (sixteen) family nuclei were selected. All interviews were conducted with the participation of people who were present in the house at the time of the survey, therefore, with more than one family member. The families participating in the research develop agriculture, but not exclusively, with the pursuit of other professional activities, mainly among the children of farmers. It was also observed that a good part of the children does not reside on the parents' property or even in the neighborhood, as can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Families participating in the survey and numbers of children residing in the district.

	Number of children	Number of children residing in the district
Family 1	2	2
Family 2	2	0
Family 3	3	0
Family 4	3	0
Family 5	2	2
Family 6	3	3
Family 7	3	0
Family 8	2	1
Family 9	4	2

Family 10	2	0
Family 11	9	5
Family 12	3	3
Family 13	5	1
Family 14	3	3
Family 15	2	1
Family 16	14	2

Even though they were informed that they would not be identified in the research, most of the research subjects did not accept that the interviews were recorded, demonstrating the existing tension around the installation of the prison complex (South Male Penitentiary and South Female Penitentiary) and Service Center Socioeducativo (CASE) in the neighborhood. Some interlocutors even requested that some information not be noted by one of the researchers. One of them explained his fear by stating that, if he affirmed that the installation of the Prison System was positive, other similar undertakings could be installed. On the other hand, if it claimed to be bad, the community could be penalized for not complying with the compensatory measures for the installation of the complex.

The research subjects signed the Free and Informed Consent Form (ICF), presented before the beginning of the interviews, following the recommendations of Resolutions nº 466/2012 and 512/2016 of the National Health Council (BRASIL, 2012, 2016), with Presentation Certificate for Ethical Appreciation (CAAE: 07204818.7.0000.0119).

Data analysis was carried out following the method of interpretation of meanings systematized by Gomes (2010), which associates two distinct theoretical bases: hermeneutics and dialectics. This method has the following steps: 1) comprehensive reading of the selected material, seeking to have a complete view of the data, as well as the particularities of the material; 2) exploration of the material, with the identification of the main ideas and search for meanings, in addition to its articulation with the studied literature; 3) elaboration of the interpretative synthesis, relating the research objectives, the theoretical framework and the study data (GOMES, 2010, p. 100-101).

4. Risks to the sense of community and values

The socio-spatial changes that have occurred in the district of São Domingos, such as the installation of the ceramic industry in the 1980s and the prison complex since 2008, in addition to the fractionation and sale of properties in recent decades, have led to an increase in the population of the neighborhood and to a greater circulation of vehicles and people. The arrival of new residents and the circulation of “strange” individuals in the locality appeared in the speeches of the research subjects as the greatest impacts of these changes. In these statements, markers are repeatedly used to establish differences between old and new residents. The latter, according to the research subjects, put the values and way of life of local families at risk.

To understand this context, we start from a non-essentialist perspective, seeking to distance ourselves from approaches that reduce differences to identities (SILVA, 2002) and opting for a perspective that considers

relational processes. Miskolci (2012, p. 15) clarifies that the term “diversity” is supported by the notions of tolerance and coexistence, while the term “difference” is based on “recognition as social transformation, transformation in power relations, of the place that the Other occupies them”. Thus, the author argues that, while the first term presupposes the idea of maintaining distances, the second emphasizes the relationship and dialogue between the subjects. Thus, the perspective of difference admits that “we are all involved in the creation of this Other”, and, through the relationship with the different, it is possible for the subjects to transform themselves (MISKOLCI, 2012, p. 16).

Added to this perspective is Bauman's observation (2009) that borders serve to define differences, not just separate them. Using the work of Barth, the sociologist points out that it is “precisely because boundaries are drawn that, suddenly, differences emerge, that we perceive them and become aware of them. In other words, we are looking for differences precisely to legitimize the borders” (BAUMAN, 2009, p. 75).

During the interviews, the concern of the research subjects was evident in maintaining the values perpetrated by the families of descendants of European immigrants who started the constitution of the neighborhood, mainly those of Italian origin. These families and their values are characterized by the interviewees themselves as “traditional”.

The concept of family adopted in this research refers to the interconnection of obligations between its members, which provides the basis for coexistence and social life (SARTI, 1994). It is understood that the family is supported by a “moral axis”, whose values transcend the family entity to the social world, shaping the subjects' ways of acting and thinking (SARTI, 1994).

When asked about living in the neighborhood, some interlocutors associated their positive experience in the neighborhood, among other factors, with the presence of the so-called “traditional” families: “Yes, I like [living in the neighborhood], as it is easily accessible to cities Criciúma and Araranguá. [The neighborhood is a] community of well-structured traditional families.” “Yes, [I like it] a lot [to live in the neighborhood]. Because family, educational, behavioral and religious values are still preserved here.”

In the statements of other research subjects, it was noticed that the neighborhood was associated with the idea of integration among its residents, which is also related to the notion of family. One of the interlocutors, for example, stated that she likes to live in São Domingos “because it is a quiet place and people are still united. Whenever there is something, they are participative in the community, since they are children, young people ... opportunities abound.” When asked if her observation is attributed to all the people who live in the neighborhood, the resident emphatically explained that she referred only to the people who make up the family nucleus of those families considered “traditional”. For another interlocutor, “before the prison there was more tranquility, families had peace and knew each other, they have means of communication”.

It is evident in the speeches of the interlocutors that the relations between the residents of the neighborhood were marked by personality, which is one of the characteristics of the community. The academic literature mentions that community differs from society. Bauman (2003, p. 7) explains that the word community has a positive and idealized connotation, “a good thing: whatever” community “means, it is good” to have a community “.” The community refers to the idea of comfort and coziness, and suggests a social group in which everyone maintains relationships of trust and mutual help, without the presence of strangers (BAUMAN, 2003). The notion of society, on the other hand, “seeks to highlight the aspects of competition, conflict, competition and rivalry between social actors. At the same time, it also contemplates moral

dimensions and rules of conduct that permeate social relations". However, the sociologist warns that "" community "is the kind of world that is unfortunately not within reach - but in which we would like to live and hope to have" (BAUMAN, 2003, p. 9).

In the research, the notion of community is associated with families with the strong religiosity that is cultivated in the neighborhood and its surroundings, where the presence of the Catholic Church predominates, especially for those belonging to the so-called "traditional families". This importance is evidenced in the speech of an interlocutor who assured that the coming of other people is a negative point of the neighborhood, because she understands that "it weakened the religious part", being that "some are evangelicals and others have no religion, reducing the demand of people by the Catholic religion."

Similarly, another interlocutor demonstrated that the arrival of new residents was negative for religiosity, referring to a loss of believers from the Catholic Church, as she understood that "before they had a strong religious culture. In Vila Maria there are Evangelicals, and a large majority disconnected from religious belief. With the arrival of families, the religious part weakened." Vila Maria is the locality of the district of São Domingos where the South Male and Female Penitentiaries are located, a place where the city of Criciúma has been seeking recognition as a district, as they demonstrate their intention to dismember themselves from São Domingos.

Likewise, another interlocutor highlighted the arrival of new residents, with regard to their religious beliefs, one of the interlocutors stated that they "do not have their faith in the Catholic Church", and highlighted that the Assembly of God Church was installed in the community. Still, according to the research subject, there are still people who still do not have any religion, "a fact that was not seen".

The arrival of new residents was characterized as positive by only one of the survey participants, who justified: "the arrival of new residents is positive for the community. In addition to growth, we have the opportunity for new friendships and new knowledge, being able to share ours". Another interlocutor considered what she considers to be the positive and negative sides:

a double-edged sword. Positive about knowing new cultures, new people, different ways of seeing life, in short a bunch of things that can enrich our knowledge. On the other hand, it shakes our structures, our comfort, things are changing without being able to do much. Our children are absorbing what is different from their classmates and changes happen. So, the coming of new residents has its pros and cons.

The speech of this interlocutor refers to an observation by Bauman (2009) about the ambivalence of urban life. The heterogeneity of the city can offer attractions and possibilities, even if it causes fears. According to the author, mixophilia and mixophobia coexist in the city space, and can manifest themselves in the same subject.

However, the most recurrent perception of the research subjects was that the arrival of new residents is concomitant to the increase in violence in the neighborhood, as is highlighted in the statements of two interlocutors:

I am insecure with the arrival of new residents, as there may be more crimes, drug use and trafficking. [The arrival of new residents is] negative... and more violence is happening [in the neighborhood]. We no longer know the people who pass on the road, who live in the neighborhood. There have to be closed gates,

which we didn't feel needed before.

The community brings, in an imaginary and sometimes idealized way, a concept of greater security among its social actors, which, in the neighborhood, occurs through the development of the same religious belief and personal relationships, while society distances itself from this understanding, generating a greater feeling of insecurity. This feeling appears in the speeches of the research interlocutors regarding the insertion of new people.

It is agreed that Almeida's statement (2011, p. 2) that "to be strange in a neighborhood with personal characteristics is to be intrusive and different". The author correlates the figure of the stranger with that of the foreigner analyzed by Simmel, defined from the unification of proximity and distance. According to him, the foreigner's position in the group "is essentially determined by the fact that he did not belong to him from the beginning, by the fact that he introduced qualities that did not originate and could not originate in the group itself" (SIMMEL, 1983, p. 182). Thus, the foreigner, as a sociological form, must be understood through spatial relationships, which are, concomitantly, the condition and symbol of relations between human beings (SIMMEL, 1983).

At least two interlocutors stated that the arrival of new people has culminated in "various cultures", which they understand as being negative, since "they have been distancing themselves from family values". It appears in another speech by the interlocutor that "it is visible that the respect of the traditional family values has been lost, as they are unstructured families". When asked to explain this understanding, the resident highlighted:

in the sense of children, parents who do not take the children, and children of several different parents, marriages are not lasting. [Catholic] religion was cultivated and today it is being lost. The appreciation by the elderly person, the care that should be given to them. There are no visits to the sick, not least because the new families don't even know each other. Gossip started, which doesn't exist with those traditional families. There was peace between families, everyone knew each other, which is not seen today.

The research subjects attribute to the new residents the rupture of the nuclear family model, given that they have other family arrangements. In this sense, it is clear that there is different treatment for those arriving in the neighborhood, classified as having "lesser virtue and respectability", as found in the research carried out by Elias and Scotson in a small town in the south of England:

(...) in this small community, they faced what seems to be a universal constant in any figuration of established-outsiders: the established group attributed to its members superior human characteristics; excluded all members of the other group from non-professional social contact with their own members (ELIAS; SCOTSON, 2000).

According to the authors, the discrimination of certain subjects resulted from a social process that acts to stigmatize certain individuals and, at the same time, reinforce the norms and values established by the dominant groups. Thus, the normal and the stigmatized do not refer specifically to the characteristics of

individuals, but to an expectation in the fulfillment of certain social rules. This process is permeated by power disputes between groups in an antagonistic way (ELIAS; SCOTSON, 2000).

4. 1 The feeling of insecurity and the disruption of everyday life

In addition to the mistrust towards new residents, there is also a fear of strangers who circulate in the neighborhood, caused by the installation of the prison complex. One of the interviewees explained that these subjects "are strange people, we don't know who they are and where they come from." Another interlocutor said that this circulation is changing the way of life of the former inhabitants of the neighborhood: "With the installation of the penitentiaries, a certain discomfort was born in the community ... of mistrust of strangers. You never know if they are people of good faith or not. We are no longer welcoming as we used to be. When someone unknown arrives, we receive them with closed doors and without much attention, wanting to get rid of it soon".

In addition to this fear of the "other", the "fear of escape and fear of being persecuted" also appeared in the speeches of the research subjects, or "my fear is that there will be some rebellion, and that prisoners will come in. in our homes, taking us hostage." Furthermore, the fear of the detainees' actions also extends to their family members and relatives, as shown in the speech of one of the interlocutors, who states that "he fears for his grandson, since he may come into contact with the offending adolescents on the bus, staying unsure of what might happen". The subject of the research explains that, with the increase in the number of bus lines that go to the prison enterprises, "the tranquility has been lost", since the relatives of the prisoners, when making their visits, "pass by the houses, and keep watching. " It is observed that the discrimination suffered by detainees includes their family members, who are now identified as "the drug lord's son" and "criminal's mother", among others (GONZAGA, 2013, p. 50).

Referring to social groups in situations of poverty, Sarti (1994) considers that, in addition to the political and economic dimensions, differentiations and social identifications can be established in the moral sphere, which constitute social hierarchies and maintain the exclusionary system of capitalist society. Taking the author's analyzes on loan, it is valid to state that the category "family members" or "relatives" of "prisoners" also participate in this logic of oppositions, which differentiate and rank subjects on the moral plane, serving as symbolic frontiers in the construction of the "other".

Bauman (2009), citing Castells, understands modern insecurity as derived from the exacerbation of individualism, which breaks with the trust in solidarity between human beings. If in the community the protection of its members was maintained by the control and unity of its members, in modern society there is an "individual duty to take care of oneself and to do for oneself", which makes the inherent insecurity and danger to this form of social life.

Many of these violence prevention solutions are the construction of fortified enclaves - closed spaces for housing, leisure and consumption. By definition, they are privatized and securitized spaces, aimed at the upper-middle and upper classes, which separate different social classes (CALDEIRA, 1997). Its presence intensifies socio-spatial segregation and encourages the abandonment of public space (GOULART; GONÇALVES, 2019).

This consequence is evidenced in the statement of a research interlocutor: "we had to surround our homes, deprive our children of playing in the street". The undertakings, which are considered as security, for the

interlocutors represent insecurity. In the words of another interviewee, with the installation of CASE and penitentiaries, “the Government is making the neighborhood a prison complex”.

Souza (2008) characterizes the proliferation of these fortified enclaves as an international phenomenon, and considers them a form of self-segregation. This would be an “escapist solution”, a false solution that favors the denial of the idea of the city as a “unity in diversity”. Self-segregation contributes to “deteriorating the quality of life, civility and conditions for exercising citizenship in the city” (SOUZA, 2008, p. 73). This is because, according to Souza, it threatens values such as solidarity, as they prevent spaces for socialization, implying a lack of commitment by the subjects towards the city. In addition, the “voluntary enclosure” reinforces prejudices, leading to an “additional impoverishment of the city experience and the experience of contact with the Other” (SOUZA, 2008, p. 74). It is also a movement, according to Bauman, for the construction of a “community of similars”, which

[...] it is a sign of withdrawal, not only from the otherness that exists outside, but also from the commitment to internal interaction, which is alive, although turbulent, strengthening, although uncomfortable. The attraction that a “community of equals” exerts is similar to that of an insurance policy against risks that characterize everyday life in a “multivocal” world. It is not able to reduce risks and even less to avoid them. Like any palliative, it promises nothing but protection against some of its most immediate and feared effects. (BAUMAN, 2009, p. 22)

In addition to the encounter with the “other”, the feeling of insecurity is also the result of the rupture of the neighborhood's daily life. One interlocutor reports that, on two occasions, she had to retire to the interior of her residence, together with her family, when the transfer of prisoners was taking place. This transfer was accompanied by helicopter. Both in the aircraft and in the car, the police and agents had their weapons pointed outward, ordering people to withdraw.

In the words of another interlocutor, “in the neighborhood, we saw more police movement, which had not been happening before. This movement does not come to take care of the neighborhood, but to look at the penitentiary and CASE. Many strange people also came”. And she adds: “with the asphalt the speed of the cars is very high, which brings danger to the residents when crossing or traveling on it. It doesn't have a shoulder either, which further increases the danger”.

Daily life, according to Lefebvre (1980), must be understood from its interrelation with time and space. As Levigard and Barbosa explain, the French author shows us that “the domain of space is a fundamental source of social power over everyday life, which is linked to other forms of social power, such as the control of time and money” (LEVIGARD; BARBOSA, 2010, p. 87). Thus, space constitutes, concomitantly, as “a means of production and control, a means of domination and power”, while the daily life empirically reveals reality and acts as a mediator between the universal and the particular (LEVIGARD; BARBOSA, 2010, p. 87). The quotidian appears as the “place of the expropriated man”, reproducing the relations of exploitation and domination, or, as explained by Damiani (2011, p. 111), “the distance between power and the common man”.

Damiani admits that the daily life does not only present inequalities of power and repression, because “it is, on the subjective level, an organization of assured life”. Talking to Lefebvre, the author relates everyday

life to the feeling of security: “When the banal of everyday life, how to eat, dress, stay, move around, produce, is part of life in a safe way. With these times, activities and spaces conquered in a way that seems definitive. It is the daily order of material security. Having daily life one sleeps in peace” (DAMIANI, 2011, p. 112).

With this analytical lens, it is understood that the increase in the circulation of strangers, cars and police forces break with a socially established order, and manifests a detachment of the subjects of the research with the spheres of power and with the space of the street. This distance is also evident in the way the interlocutors referred to the process of installing the prison complex and the CASE in the district of São Domingos. According to them, despite the holding of public hearings, there was no community participation in decision making. According to one of the research subjects, "it was not questioned whether we accepted, because they had decided, they were going to put it [...]", referring to the meetings in which they participated. For Lefebvre, effective participation in decision-making processes is essential to overcome the hierarchical and oppressive relationships of everyday life, as it allows “individuals to go beyond the limits of repetitive practices and develop inventive and liberating practices” (LEVIGARD; BARBOSA, 2010, p. 87).

5. Conclusion

The research presented in this article sought to demonstrate how the socio-spatial changes that occurred over the past decades in a neighborhood in the municipality of Criciúma, SC, impact the sociability of its residents. In this sense, qualitative approaches are valid, which use the perspective of the research subjects to access the different ways in which these changes are experienced and also change the ways of life of those who inhabit the space. Thus, it is emphasized that the relationships that individuals establish with each other are also relationships with space, from which the anxieties, fears and insecurities of everyday life emerge.

References

ALMEIDA, A. P. 2011. Uma análise sobre sociabilidade, cotidiano e vizinhança em um bairro popular de João Pessoa-PB. *Ponto Urbe*, São Paulo, n. 9.

ASSUNÇÃO, V. K.; CONCEIÇÃO, Z. S. 2018. Verticalização e sociabilidade: as relações entre moradores de edifícios e suas formas de uso e apropriação do espaço. *Ra'e Ga*, Curitiba, v. 44: 69-84.

BACCI, D. C.; SANTOS, V. M. N. 2017. Proposta para governança ambiental ante os dilemas socioambientais urbanos. *Est. Av.*, São Paulo, v. 31, n. 89: 199-212.

BAIERL, L. F. 2004. *Medo social: da violência visível ao invisível da violência*. São Paulo: Corty.

BALSADI, O. V. 2015. Mudanças no meio rural e desafios para o desenvolvimento sustentável. *Perspec.*, São Paulo, v.15, n.1, p.155-165.

CORDEIRO, G. Í. 2001. Territórios e identidades sobre escalas de organização sócio-espacial num bairro de Lisboa. *Revista Estudos Históricos*, Rio de Janeiro, [s.v.], n. 28: 1-16.

BAUMAN, Z. 2003. *Comunidade: busca por segurança no mundo atual*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.

BAUMAN, Z. 2009. *Confiança e medo na cidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.

BENELLI, S. J. 2014. *A lógica da internação: instituições totais e disciplinares (des)educativas*. São Paulo: Editora UNESP.

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Saúde. Resolução no. 510, de 12 de dezembro de 2012. Available at: http://www.unesc.net/portal/resources/files/379/Res%20466_2012.pdf

BRASIL. Conselho Nacional de Saúde. Resolução no. 466, de 07 de abril de 2016. Available at: http://www.unesc.net/portal/resources/files/379/Res%20510_2016.pdf

CALDEIRA, T. P. do R. 1997. Enclaves fortificados: a nova segregação urbana. *Novos Estudos CEBRAP*, n. 47: 155-176.

CARLOS, A. F. A. 2011. A Cidade e a Organização Do Espaço. *Revista do Departamento de Geografia*, 1: 105-111.

CARLOS, A. F. A. 2015. *A cidade. Repensando a Geografia*. 9. ed. São Paulo: Contexto.

DAMIANI, A. 2011. A Cidade (Des)Ordenada e o Cotidiano. *Revista do Departamento de Geografia*, n. 9, p. 107-116.

DANIN, R. A. 2017. Loic Wacquant: Encarceramento em massa como política social na contemporaneidade. *Rev. Sem Aspas*, n. 2, p. 125-133.

ECKERT, C. 2002. A cultura do medo e as tensões do viver a cidade: narrativa e trajetória de velhos moradores de Porto Alegre. *Illuminuras*, Porto Alegre, v. 3, n. 6, p. 1-32.

ELIAS, N.; SCOTSON, J. L. 2000. *Os estabelecidos e os outsiders: sociologia das relações de poder a partir de uma pequena comunidade*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.

FERNANDES, D. F. 2015. O grande encarceramento brasileiro: política criminal e prisão no século XXI. *Revista do CEPEJ*, Salvador, n. 18: 101-153.

FOUCAULT, M. 2013. *Vigiar e punir: nascimento da prisão*. 41. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.

FRÚGOLI JR., H. 2013. Relações entre múltiplas redes no Bairro Alto (Lisboa). *Rev. bras. Ci. Soc.*, São Paulo, v. 28, n. 82.

GASKELL, G. 2002. Entrevistas individuais e grupais. In: GASKELL, G.; BAUER, M. W. (Org.). *Pesquisa qualitativa com texto, imagem e som: um manual prático*. Petrópolis: Vozes. pp. 64-89.

GOLDENBERG, M. 2004. *A arte de pesquisar: Como fazer pesquisa qualitativa em Ciências Sociais*. 8ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Record.

GOMES, R. 2010. “Análise e interpretação de dados em pesquisa qualitativa”. In: MINAYO, M. C. de S. (Org.). *Pesquisa social: teoria, método e criatividade*. 29. ed. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes. pp. 79-112.

GONZAGA, V. P. G. 2013. *À sombra do encarceramento: o entorno das prisões*. Tese de Doutorado em História - Instituto de História, Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Uberlândia.

GOULART, J.; GONÇALVES, C. 2019. Enclaves fortificados e segregação urbana: a dinâmica contemporânea de urbanização de Ribeirão Preto. *Risco Revista de Pesquisa em Arquitetura e Urbanismo*, v. 17, n. 2, pp. 41-59.

HOBOLD, P. 2005. *A história de Araranguá*. Araranguá, SC: Ed. do Autor.

LEFEBVRE, H. 1980. *A vida cotidiana no mundo moderno*. São Paulo, Ed. Ática.

LEFEBVRE, H. 1991. *O direito à cidade*. São Paulo: Moraes.

LEVIGARD, Y. E.; BARBOSA, R. M. 2010. Incertezas e cotidiano: uma breve reflexão. *Arq. bras. psicol.*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 62, n. 1: 84-89.

MISKOLCI, R. 2012. *Teoria Queer: um aprendizado pelas diferenças*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.

MORMONT, M. 1996. “Le rural comme catégorie de lecture du social”. In: JOLLIVET, M.; EIZNER, N. (Org.). *L’Europe et ses campagnes*. Paris: Presses de Sciences. pp. 161-176

PAULA, E. S. de. 1963. Hamurabi e o seu código. *Revista de História*, v. 27, n.56: 257-270.

PASTANA, D. R. 2009. Estado punitivo e encarceramento em massa: retratos do Brasil atual. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Criminais*, v. 77: 313-330.

QUEVEDO NETO, P. S.; LOMBARDO, M. A. 2006. Dinâmica e qualidade da paisagem na área de transição urbano-rural. *Geografia, Rio Claro*, v. 31, n.2: 257-268.

- RESGALA, G. 2017. A moeda social e o fortalecimento do espaço diferencial nas periferias. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais*, Recife, v.19, n.2: 267-287.
- RODRIGUES, J. F. 2014. O rural e o urbano no Brasil: uma proposta de metodologia de classificação dos municípios. *Análise Social*, v. 211, n. xlix (2.º): 430-456.
- SALGUEIRO, T. B. 2003. “Espacialidades e temporalidades urbanas”. In: CARLOS, A. F. A.; LEMOS, A. I. G. (Orgs). *Dilemas Urbanos: novas abordagens sobre a cidade*. São Paulo: Contexto.
- SANTOS, M. M.; ALCHIERI, J. C.; FILHO, A. J. F. 2009. Encarceramento humano: uma revisão histórica. *Revista Interinstitucional de Psicologia*, v.2, n. 2: 170-181.
- SARTI, C. A. 1994. A família como ordem moral. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, São Paulo/SP, n. 91: 46-53.
- SILVA, T. T. Identidade e diferença: impertinências. *Educação e Sociedade*, São Paulo, n.79, p. 65-66, 2002.
- SIMMEL, G. 1983. O estrangeiro. In: MORAES FILHO, E. (Org.). *Simmel – Sociologia*. São Paulo: Ática. pp.182- 188.
- SCHNEIDER, S. 2001. A pluriatividade como estratégia de reprodução social da agricultura familiar no sul do Brasil. *Estudos Sociedade e Agricultura*, Rio de Janeiro/RJ, v. 16: 164-184.
- SOUZA, M. L. 2008. *Fobópole: o medo generalizado e a militarização da questão urbana*. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil.
- THOMPSON, A. 1980. *A questão da penitenciária*. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense.
- WACQUANT, L. 2001. *Deadly Symbiosis: When Ghetto and Prison Meet and Merge. Punishment and Society*, v. 3, n. 1: 95-134.
- WACQUANT, L. 2009. *Punir os pobres: a nova gestão da miséria nos Estados Unidos*. Rio de Janeiro: Revan.
- WANDERLEY, M. N. B. 2003. Agricultura familiar e campesinato: rupturas e continuidade. *Estudos Sociedade e Agricultura*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 21: 42-61
- WIRTH, L. 1997. “O urbanismo como modo de vida”. In: FORTUNA, C. (Org.). *Cidade, Cultura e Globalização*. Oeiras: Celta.

ZACKSESKI, C.; MACHADO, B. A.; AZEVEDO, G. 2016. Dimensões do encarceramento e desafios da política penitenciária no Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Criminais*, v. 126: 291-331.

ZOMIGHANI JUNIOR, J. H. 2015. Modernizações seletivas e os circuitos espaciais da economia urbana: cidades e prisões no atual período tecnológico. *Urbe Rev. Bras. Gest. Urbana*, Curitiba, v. 7, n. 2: 211-226.

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).