

Insights into the Cultural Heritage Landscape

a Reader

stemming from an ERASMUS Intensive Programme Project
“European Cultural Management Policies and
Practices for the Creative Use of Cultural Heritage”

(2013, Pécs, Hungary)

Editor: Teréz Kleisz PhD

Lector: Dezső Kovács PhD

ISBN 9785-963-642-534-0

Technical editor: László Bodó

**Published by: University of Pécs, Faculty of Adult Education and Human Resource Development (FEEK)
Pécs, 2014.**

Contents

<i>Teréz Kleisz</i>	
The Growth in the Cultural Heritage Field	5
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION TO INTERACTIVE TECHNOLOGIES FOR CULTURE	11
<i>Nikolaos Avouris – Nikoleta Yiannoutsou – Christos Sintoris</i>	
Interactive Technologies for Informal Learning in Museums Through Games and Stories	12
<i>Nikoleta Yiannoutsou, Nikolaos Avouris and Christos Sintoris</i>	
Designing Mobile Games for Learning in Sites of Cultural Heritage	32
<i>Balázs Vendler</i>	
Gamification – Beyond the Buzzword	34
CHAPTER 2. CITY MAPPING AND PERCEPTION OF THE CITY	40
<i>Panayotis Pangalos – Vassiliki Petridou</i>	
INFOCITY: New Cities Reading & Promotion System	41
<i>Álvaro Campelo</i>	
Metropolises. New spaces of Urban Heritage	46
<i>Vassiliki Petridou – Eleni Antonelli – Anastasia Rousopoulou – Athina Spiliotopoulou</i>	
Patras Re-Identification Proposals: Three Demonstrating Proposals for Re-Branding the City.....	61
<i>Enikő Demény –Diána Jandala – Victor Kiraly – Hugo Morango –</i>	
<i>Marco Novo – Ana Reina – Emilia Robescu – Anastasia Rousopoulou</i>	
Heritage and Community Involment in Uránváros (Housing district of Pécs, Hungary)	72
CHAPTER 3 NEW APPROACHES IN HERITAGE EDUCATION AND MUSEUM EDUCATION.....	81
<i>Álvaro Campelo</i>	
Creative Industry, Museums: The Mediation of Cultural Heritage	82
<i>Zsuzsa Koltai</i>	
Heritage Education- Museum Education.....	87
<i>Vilja Arató – Bálint Takács</i>	
The Use of Interactive Media in Children’s Museums	92
CHAPTER 4. ROLES IN MAPPING, DEFINING AND BUILDING RECOGNITION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE	97
<i>Tünde Minorics</i>	
The Inscription Process of the First Item in the Hungarian Representative List of Intangible Heritage	98
<i>Dezső Kovács</i>	
Development Stages and Conflicts of the First Living World Heritage Village Hollókő, Hungary	105
<i>Dezső Kovács</i>	
Heritage Site Management Plan	109
<i>UNESCO World Heritage Center</i>	122
State of Conservation of World Heritage Properties in Europe.....	122
CHAPTER 5. POLITICS OF CULTURAL HERITAGE	126
<i>Álvaro Campelo</i>	
Cultural Policy and Politics of Culture: Communities and Society	127
<i>Mária Husz</i>	
Main Aspects of Cultural Heritage Policy	134
<i>Inez Zsófia Koller</i>	
How Do Politics Shape Culture?	141

CHAPTER 6. THE IMPACT OF MAJOR EVENTS.....	148
<i>Ágnes Simon</i>	
Pécs 2010 European Capital of Culture – Success or Failure?	149
<i>Balázs Németh</i>	
Learning Regions, Regional Development and New Roles for Higher Education through the European Lifelong Learning Initiative.....	156
CHAPTER 7: USEFUL SOURCES OF INFORMATION	172
<i>Anna Magdolna Sipos</i>	
Webguide for Reaching the Institutions and Collections of Cultural Heritage.....	173
CULTURAL HERITAGE RESEARCH POLICY IN THE EUROPEAN UNION.....	181
ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS.....	184

Chapter 2.
City Mapping and Perception of the City

Reading the city and generating a new city image

A guide to a layered multicultural mapping

Metropolises. New spaces of Urban Heritage

Introduction

We propose here to examine the processes of metropolisation and how it is influencing the concepts of city and the consequent concept of urban heritage. The practices of Western Cities define what we mean by urban heritage today. Both the question of spatiality, as well as the city's relationship with the surrounding territory and its specificity compared to the countryside were important for the emergence of urban institutions and architectural, politics, religious, cultural, military and housing shapes that composed them. The urban organization itself sets the historical epochs of the city, since the ruins of classical antiquity until the industrial revolution and modern urbanism, including the medieval times. The whole urban web is often seen as a feature of its own, which defines a cultural identity. Therefore, many cities, due to their history and "urban identity" were classified by UNESCO as a World Heritage Sites, as is the case of the city of Porto and Guimarães, right next to us.

When we look at the city metropolis of our days, mostly arising from an integration by phagocytosis of their neighbouring towns and villages, or by the appropriation of the surrounding rural areas, we find it difficult to discern their urban coherence. Whatever in historical cities was achieved in the course of several centuries, now happens in modern cities in a matter of few decades and with much more significant dimensions. Can this process of constitution of the metropolitan centres define the cultural heritage of contemporary societies? And can it transforming itself in a patrimonial legacy for future generations? What are the problems and the possibilities of the metropolisation process that we are witnessing, and what consequences does it have for the historical experience of the city?

We want to analyze the difficulty in establishing definitively the boundary between the world of the countryside and that of the city, both at the level of physical reality – taking into consideration the locus in which our research is based – and at the level of its theoretical and operational classification with regard to the future of urbanism. And it is precisely on that difficulty – that could be the source of “a problem” – that this reflection will fall, making of it an “opportunity” for both theory and process. The conceptual delimiting of spaces, territories and socioeconomic practices associated with the terms “rural” and “urban” has always been based on the hegemony of one over the other, in this case, of the urban over the rural. The purported ease with which these two worlds were distinguished, always viewed within a simplifying dichotomy, reveals the history of the so-called western process of civilization, where the city occupies the end goal or the reference for defining that civilizing ideal (*civitas – civilization*).

Within a structuralist logic, positive values were attributed to the city and negative ones to the rural. However, there is a paradoxical conception in this rural-urban relationship. At one point, having been contextualized in a logic of dependence, the rural is allocated positive concepts, such as “rural landscape” (synonymous with a bucolic environment and a naturalist aesthetic, close to the Garden of Eden), “healthy environment” (with all the approaches of ecological enjoyment and consumption); “proximity relations” (where social relations are founded on strategies of community life, conditioned by shared knowledge), etc. All this as opposed to the city!

At another point, when wishing to classify some of the problems of the city, rural and country terms are used, of which “urban jungle” is the most widely known, (with manifold meanings, including urban disorder and social conflict). Similarly, if originally the term “landscape” was associated with rural spaces¹, it too has been appropriated by narratives about the city, with reference being made to the urban landscape, and this

¹ The root word in “landscape is “land”, which is linked with concepts of region, the soil and homeland. The term arose in the Renaissance to designate a kind of painting depicting nature and country life.

subsequently came to be expressed in landscape architecture (Telles 1994; 2006; Shane 2006; Silva 2006). The rural, urban and metropolitan landscape share meanings and constraints, but each employs various reference elements, like points and lines that draw and outline it: spaces of continuity and discontinuity, of relation and closure - in other words, its identity! Meanings betraying the memories (Certeau 1975; Marot 2003) and experiences of social actors should be related to this transmutation, as well as the search for an interpretation of the complexity of the two spaces (the rural and the urban): each, more than designating itself, designates the relation it establishes with the other!

How can the notion of "landscape" be introduced in another form in the urban context, especially in the urban metropolis? Nowadays, the rural is imagined as a place that sustains consumption and leisure (Hadjimichalis 2003). But the rural landscape, as an asset to be preserved and a space enshrining the transformation and experiencing of the space, can include the most surprising, and even problematic elements at the level of utilitarian use and effectiveness. Can the same be said of the urban landscape? In other words, to what point does the urban landscape have to be effective and have a constant operative functionality? To what point should not the city embrace and integrate those spaces that are "meaningless" or useless in terms of effectiveness, but which nevertheless reveal other reasons, such as ecological sustainability, beauty amidst chaos, planned and assumed "forbidden places", like places of magic? How can the different and (apparently) contradictory metropolitan landscape be integrated? The problem lies in that legacy from the civilizing process of which the city is one of the prime exponents, together with its rules for use and planning. Can one plan disorder? Might disorder and the "empty" space that forms an integral part of the mental imagery be useful? Will we have to propose a new rationality for a type of space that relates the urban with the rural, in order to have meaning in our metropolises? Following the "natural form" inspiration in architecture and design, based on biological organisms, why not inspiration for urban planning from the "natural" space and the symbiosis of the ecosystem? Under what conditions and within what relationships could the different users' memories and experiences of the space (Campelo 2010) play a role in the metropolises? We would probably find it difficult to move on to this paradigm, having been trained in that fundamental distinction between the rural and the urban. Yet, if the urban has spread its forms, social strategies and values into the rural space, why should there not be an inverse movement? We know that ethnographic research has discovered this in corners of the city, in marginalized spaces and lifestyles. Could not this be the chance for those lifestyles and those spaces to escape from the marginal position imposed on them and become, in themselves, spaces for modern discussion of the metropolis?

Hence, there is nothing to dictate a logic of dichotomy or hegemony as the basis of this relationship, since such a logic has always had its moments of heterodoxy. The history of urbanism and the rural world is not linear. The latter is not necessarily a consequence of the former. At some moments of western history, the growth of great cities and urban economies has been followed by periods consolidating rural life and the values of peasant communities. The reasons for these events may be religious and political, or due to epidemiological factors and ecological/energy sustainability (Rapport 1998).

In situating my reflection in the field of anthropology, I have noted that, in the history of anthropological research, there has been a process of selecting the object of study which has been informed by the emergence of a supposedly more complex corpus, which has to some extent revolutionized the field. Thus, the study of the so-called primitive societies led on to that of urban societies, via the peasants (the departments of "Mediterranean anthropology" in the Anglo-Saxon universities are a good example of peasant studies). In order to study the peasant and rural world (the terms do not signify the same reality, as we know) the variables of the market economy and central political power had to be introduced, which was not the case with the previously studied societies. However, from the outset, a logic of belittling the peasant and the rural assumed the establishment of "reserves" (communitarian-type peasant societies; desertified spaces) whose characterizing elements prevailed, evading the great transformations being undergone by European rural societies in the 20th century. City values and industrialization (informed by technological progress and the complexification of the market) were to put an end to a supposed "uniformity" of the peasant/rural world, thereby diversifying the lifestyles and identities of those inhabiting the rural space, together with the rural landscape.

The relationship between the urban and the rural began to encourage social thinkers and land use planners to build interaction models, of dominion or imposition. Hence, we can find an extremist proposal for complete urbanization (Lefebvre 2002), and another advocating a rural renaissance (Kayser 1990). But one cannot, today, think about the urban and the rural using the previous logics, since we are experiencing, in our western global societies, a profound mutation of these two realities. One cannot speak, today, of a triumph of the urban, without considering that this supposed triumph also benefits the rural; at the same time, it is impossible to contemplate a re-emergence of rurality without analyzing how it is constituted in an interactive dialogue with urbanism.

Nevertheless, the dichotomous logic remains! It is in this context that the term “new ruralities” has arisen (Marsden & Murdoch 1993; 1994), in the belief that the current rural space is absolutely different from the rural space of the past. In fact, it is different, just as the new cities differ from those of the past. Hence, if we must now reflect on the concept of “new ruralities”), or “contemporary ruralities, where the rural spaces are no longer spaces for farming or agro-industrial activities, but enjoyment and leisure spaces - linked to tourism or the cultural and leisure industries - or even to new life styles and values), the same is true of another concept: “new urbanities”. According to this concept, the new urban spaces no longer exist in opposition to the rural, but are integrated in urban sustainability and planning models – such as the green and eco-cities – or via the reality that has arisen of an extensive urbanization (Sola-Morales 2002; Corner 2006) that increasingly occupies the rural territory in a dual character intricate network – such as the case of the area that is discussed here (Domingues 2006) – where tertiary and quaternary city lifestyles engage in environmental and ecological experiences, whether through the participation in production or through being physical neighbours to those productive agrarian units. The space of the ambiguous prevails in both concepts, the superimposing of functions and spatial planning, in an increasingly complex relation that also galvanizes new lifestyles, new uses and appropriations of the space and new architecture.

The notion of continuum, which advocates the relation of the urban space with the rural space through the advance of the former over the latter, was an important factor in the survival of the first paradigm. Others see in this relation only a difference of intensities, rather than contrasts. Here also this continuum is seen differently according to the logic of the dichotomy and the hegemony: with one being “urban-centered” (the dominant influence of the urban as the source of progress) and in the other the particularity of the rural world not being destroyed by the hegemony of the urban, instead two poles remain, based on the concept of “plurality”. In the second case, that of the “new urbanities”, what we are seeing is an intersection of mixed spaces, where both architectures and lifestyles intersect, are superimposed, and land planning and specialization is constructed in small (poly-centric) nuclei, with a prevalence of individual options. In other words, what is in question is a spatial and architectural relationship, added to a specialization of lifestyles, at times clear and at others hybrid, where the concept of frontiers and the experience of spatial and experiential intersection are manifest as the major element for the reflection and creation of this new urbanity.

The realization that the traditional difference between urban and rural territory was profoundly shaken by the so-called “urban sprawl” and “counter urbanization”, forcing us to conceptualize the metropolitan landscape (with population density and open green spaces), also made us consider the place held by agriculture in these territories, as much for the constraints in its development as for the opportunities that were created (Scott 2006). The role of agriculture in the metropolitan and peri-urban territories, at the level of products and services, forces us to rethink urban needs and the expectations of public benefits, such as health, leisure, education, in the relationship with the landscape and with nature, as well as the quality of foodstuffs, etc. Hence, the role of agriculture must be re-thought in these spaces, insofar as it has contributed towards regional development, where quality of life is one of the most important points to be retained.

Above and beyond the social capital implicated in this relational process, the multifunctional dimension of agriculture and the rural areas should also be brought into play, where the traditional rural farm has given way to new forms of organization that are innovative at the level of design, technology and technical expertise. Hence the need for new theories for new rural and urban policies in the implementation of complex territories such as metropolitan territories. Also, the question of globalization forces a repositioning of agriculture in the challenges posed to these territories.

A new geography of food products must emerge, counterposing the dominant industrialization, standardization and globalization of productive processes and marketing networks. A more sustainable production and distribution means that these regional alternatives are taken into account. The spatial dynamics implied in food production and distribution should be related with socio-cultural, economic and political factors if we want to take into account the consequences for ecology, health and sustainable development. The importance of these elements in the local economy, the education system and the environment refocus the question of local spaces as multidimensional realities, for example with regard to food safety, democratic participation and civic participation in public decision processes.

How can identity processes be located in these territories now, when the dichotomy between urban and rural was one of the strongest definers in the territory's identity reference? In western societies, the image of the rural space was constructed by the urban populations, who saw in it, in the "country", that which was different from their daily life, idealized in a natural beauty and marked by authenticity and environmental quality. The latter was a symbolic capital of the rural world, which was promoted as a "commodity" of rurality. Integrating agriculture into the national and international production processes (via the extensive intervention and maximization of production) has significantly altered this symbolic capital. But the questioning (if not bankruptcy) of this agro-industrial model, as well as the problems that the cities have had to face in the meanwhile, has led to a revaluing of the rural world. New narratives (such as the environmental narrative²) and new uses are searching for those values and ideas, of which the aforementioned "new ruralities" are the expression. And it is here that the new identities, the possible conflicts (with the diversity of actors and objectives) or the opportunities opened for both spaces (urban and rural) are located.

In the metropolitan regions, and especially in this region studied – the Litoral, north of the city of Porto and Vale do Ave – spaces arise between these two traditional poles (urban and rural) that can be characterized by neither. They are intermediate spaces, urbanized regions of high economic dynamism and intense transformation that function as adjacent spaces. The characterization of these spaces/regions within metropolitan dynamisms questions social theory as a microcosm of intermediate experiences. But certain regions, such as that which provides the study object here, have acquired urban characteristics that bring into question the classic concept of metropolitan region. They are regions where the relation between the urban and the rural is more problematic, because they are established in a combinatory and interdependent nature. If pluri-activity, combining agricultural and non-agricultural occupations, is the "new characteristic" of the rural world, these territories do not fit into the sense of a "new rurality"³, because the "rural" is a particular way of utilizing space and social life (cf. Kayser1990). So, what we have is the transformation in a territory of the use of space and the transformation of social life. In our "case study" we find that both the space and the social life were profoundly changed!

Let us first consider the notion of territory⁴. A territory is characterized by its structural and morphological characteristics, as well as practice and social domain, which are open to a relational dynamic. The territories of Litoral Norte and Vale do Ave, despite a history that situates them now in one, now in another administrative

² The introduction of the problem of the "environment" into the debate on the rural redefined contents, actors and practices. And this happened in the discussion around the polluting agrarian activity, and in the new uses and expectations of economic profitability by land owners, creating "ecological" businesses and products, On the other hand, the rural space was seen as a place of fruition and encounter with a new "natural", now reinvented and proposed as an object of desire and not as an archaic space. In the scientific disciplines, the notion of ecosystem migrated to a multidimensional nature that could bring together transdisciplinarity. The rural was transformed into a modern *locus*. It is the conjugation of the two elements (criticism of a polluting agro-industry and new development models and social practices) that will call into question the productivist model in use until then, both in rural and urban spaces. Hence the return to the rural by groups of young idealists or disillusioned adults.

³ We must not forget that pluri-activity is not really a new reality in the rural world. What is new is that pluri-activity being developed both by the same actors in different fields and by specialized actors in non-peasant activities (in the anthropological sense) who nevertheless dwell in the rural world. If one datum characterizes the peasant world it is the pluri-activity of its social actors, in a self-centered and self-sufficient world.

⁴ I think it important to employ the concept of "territory" here, since it differs from that of "region" (one generally refers to the "Vale do Ave region") in that the latter is determined by political/administrative decisions.

region, in one or another civil and religious dependency, nevertheless maintain a set of material characteristics and structural elements that endow them with a given identity. These elements, being local, because they are delimited in the territorial unit which they reference, assert themselves in a density of relations and living memories. “The territory allows for a degree of proximity that influences the relational order, since its constituent elements exist and persist in co-presence, consolidating their relations, the culture and the institutions. From it arise the sense and the perception of the collective, as well as the construction of a shared identity. That is why the territory “guards” the memory of collective practices and conserves an intrinsic historicity” (Campelo 2010: 196).

The memories of these two territories are to some extent similar and to another different, in their use of space and their social life. They are similar when we look to a relatively recent past, where the economy and type of life were associated with the world of the countryside and the predominance of maize cultivation, in intensive proximity agriculture, an economic and occupational typology that deeply marked the land planning of this territory (Ribeiro 1945). On the other hand, they are different with regard to the more recent processes of urbanization: there was heavy industrialization in the Vale do Ave in the areas of high agricultural capacity (for the Portuguese context), mainly in the second half of the 20th century, founded on the textile industry.

In the case of the Litoral (which also had excellent agrarian soil conditions) there was an urban overload, caused both by the proximity of the sea (now associated with a new leisure experience) and by the demographic pressure of an area that has had a strong economic activity ever since the 18th century, and this was a factor in structuring the new models of territorial relations. The historical conditions for sustaining this type of dispersed urban occupation were inherited from the earlier introduction of an agrarian economy based on the cultivation of maize (which required the farmer to be always on hand, given the constant care needed) and the mini-holding system of land ownership. If we add to this the transformations in mobility⁵, in demographics and in the crisis of the rural world, as well as the uncertainties and difficulties in land planning and soil use policies after the 1970's, we will obtain a closer understanding of the urban result that we have now.

And this was the transformation that occurred in the Vale do Ave, namely in the clusters such as Guimarães, Famalicão, Santo Tirso and Trofa. They fall within a diffuse urban-industrial conurbation, where the majority of the population and employment are found “inter-city”. There is no homogenization in this diffuse urbanization, with spaces that are very built up being followed by dispersed spaces, as and when centers of gravity and urban memory justify centralities or new functionalities and management policies for large social and commercial undertakings (cf. Domingues 2006: 16-79).

Our field work was in the area delimited by the municipalities of Vila do Conde, Trofa and Vila Nova de Famalicão, all of which lie in the Vale do Ave. The former, Vila do Conde, is the only one that, in addition to its Vale do Ave characteristics, is also a municipality of the Litoral, lying to the north of Porto and belonging to the Porto Metropolitan Region. All of these sub-districts are heavily populated, with a significant demographic density, and are characterized by extensive urbanism. However, in the parishes by the river Ave, in the case of Vila do Conde, population density varies significantly between the more agrarian interior (Parada 109.3 inhab/km²; Arcos 161.2 inhab/km²) and those of the coast (Azurara 996.2 inhab/km²; Árvore 680.7 inhab/km²), with the population density for the whole municipality being 518 inhab/km²⁶. The municipality of Trofa has the same overall density of Vila do Conde, and its western boundaries about the inland parishes of the latter municipality, a zone where the density for both is at its lowest. The higher density for Trofa is in the parishes that border Santo Tirso and Famalicão (the latter has the biggest density of the three municipalities analyzed: 669 inhab/km²). It is here, strictly speaking, that the urban landscape marking the in-between territory of the Vale do Ave, begins. Although in the intermediate part of these municipalities rural practices predominate (especially in the zones where the municipality of Vila do Conde borders Trofa, on the left bank of the Ave, or where it

⁵ “The proximity effect led to ease of relation; time and speed diminished the territorial ‘friction’; the possibility of choice increased freedom of movement, and varied the destinations and origins, rhythms, circuits and mobilities that support daily life” (Domingues 2006: 19).

⁶ INE data, 2001.

borders Famalicão, on the right bank), elsewhere rural practices, with their farmland, intermingle with very urbanized zones, whether these be residential buildings or industrial, commercial or service buildings.

The “rural” is a particular mode of space utilization and social life. Likewise, the relation of the country dweller with nature, in virtue of the direct relations established in daily life, is specific, configuring work and the habitat. However, “rural nature”, precisely because it is the object of human use, is the least natural it could be! Social life too, made up of “relations of interknowledge” (Mendras 1976), is expressed in differentiated and complex relations. On the other hand, we are confronted today with a “rural” that is disconnected from the peasant world, since no immediate relation can be made between the rural and the peasant (Becerra & Sánchez 2009). Hence, the permanence of the rural world, it could hardly be termed peasant, in certain spaces of this region, imparts an unexpected complexity to the classification of the territory. Urban and rural values intersect and stratify in layers where the differences are not always marked by clear or definable boundaries.

Thus, the type of occupation and continuity of social practices in this territory give it a “density” allowing for the development of given competences that can be reproduced. This territorial domination and modes of appropriation can be seen as a domination and appropriation that have not necessarily been resolved, but which are to some extent conflicting, in that their complexity, resulting from their polymorph structure, demand from their practitioners/residents a negotiation of these spaces of intersection.

For the construction of the city, at a time when the metropolitan areas are asserting themselves and expanding, there will have to be compromise in defining spaces and relations, if not of inter-knowledge, in the relation between the rural and the urban, now transformed into “new rurality” versus “new urbanity”. Such relations will have to be mediated by local intermediary authorities (residential groups, where the complexity of the problems can be organized in a restricted space). And this applies both for the city as classically understood – which will have to assimilate those forms of compromise and negotiation – and for the metropolitan areas or extended cities.

Urban planning tried to bring together the functionality of the city “zones” with their sustainability. But planning new cities was never the same thing as planning when the starting point was consolidated cities or those in transformation, or even doing so while taking into consideration territorial land use planning⁷. The purpose of planning at the beginning of the last century was to guarantee the public health of cities and organize them in line with the problems posed by industrialization. In turn, the new urbanists, such as Le Corbusier, were concerned with land use and the quality of life of inhabitants, propounding autonomous zones, concentrating on a group of buildings, various services and functions (habitation, work, leisure), neglecting the history, memory or previous urban processes of the place where these new neighborhoods were implemented. The Le Corbusier model applied more to the spirit of creation for a new, modern city, breaking with the past.

A later urban planning phase looks towards the multifunctional city that integrates and consolidates all its constituent parts and that takes into account environmental concerns, which cover both ecological and social

⁷ It is interesting to see the strategic objectives of PNPOT (*Programa Nacional de Política de Ordenamento do Território* or National Program for Land-Use Planning Policy (Portugal)):

1. Preserving and enhancing biodiversity and the natural, landscape and cultural heritage, sustainable use of energy and geological resources; risk prevention and minimization.
2. Boosting of Portugal’s territorial competitiveness and its integration within the Iberian Peninsula and Europe and on a Global scale.
3. Fostering polycentric development of the territories and strengthening the infrastructures supporting territorial integration and cohesion;
4. Ensuring territorial equity in providing collective equipment and infrastructures and universal access to general interest services, encouraging social cohesion;
5. Expanding advanced information and communication networks and infrastructures and encouraging their growing use by citizens, companies and public administration;
6. Reinforcing the quality and efficiency of territorial management, encouraging informed, active and responsible participation by citizens and institutions.

We found that PNPOT’s policy for the rural world is based on an urban policy. Hence, polycentrism is the urban structuring policy for the territory, highlighting its political, economic, social and cultural dimension. In this way, the cities are presented as the development base for the territory and the country.

problems. A new type of urban planning emerged, seeking to manage and prevent the problems created by migrations and demographic changes, expressed in the use and occupation of the urban space, revealed in the alteration in urban morphology, in the economic, social and environmental challenges with situations of social segregation, violence, insecurity in the public and private space, as well as the degradation in physical structures. The organization and classification of land use was a means to overcome these “conflicts”, hence the concept of zoning in planning (urban, industrial and protected zones).

After containing the urban sprawl over agricultural land, the concern with recovering degraded zones and the inclusion of environmental, social and economic components, we found that many of the zones have ceased to have the planned function and evolved into other occupation typologies. In other words, the city is in full mutation and is constantly rediscovering itself in new services and new morphologies, of which, for example, the biggest expression until very recently has been the use for leisure and culture of industrial spaces from the past. And if cities built from scratch are still planned according to this zoning concept, that typology must be confronted with the dynamic of other cities, in order to be aware of the bankruptcy of a rigorous and immutable schema.

The question posed is that of the sustainability of this dynamic, which calls for environmental and social negotiation in the planning, but also in the reading of the existing situation. The environmental, the economic and the social are unavoidable factors for the sustainability of the city. These factors exist both as elements supporting the urban practice, and strategic elements in the negotiation and social participation for transforming the city. There is a certain consensus nowadays that urban sustainability depends on planning that promotes the development of compact cities (high population in a small space; resources to hand; greater capacity for wealth creation; shared services within a good level of infrastructures). This compact city would be energy efficient and, through effective management and concentrated resources, would provide inhabitants with a better quality of life. But this is not the story for most cities we know, or for the metropolitan region dealt with here.

The urban space having spread, in order to be sustainable it was accompanied either by a further proliferation, that of public transport systems, or this was achieved by greater integration of city use (Beatley 2000) by the different spaces, cutting down on the distances to be covered in providing the different services. If, in the former case, planning directs/regulates the city, in the latter it is the city that directs/regulates the planning, with the aim of overcoming social injustice and environmental and economic degradation. Built “with” and “between” differentiated spaces, the urban territory multiplies itself in different typologies and practices, making those differentiated spaces its *raison d'être* and, at the place of intersection, the opportunity to consider and sustain itself. The urban territories and cities will have in these spaces of intersection/boundary the ideal locus for negotiating and creating new typologies or urban planning and architectural construction, city practice, and citizenship.

If the rural is transformed into a place for living, pleasure, tourism and industry, why cannot the city be changed into an agrarian productive space, a space of integrated, planned proximities, with a strong sense of belonging? The city that includes agricultural productivity is not exactly a novelty. It was not only in the past that another world existed at the backs of the houses with a use other than that indicated by the facade of the street; in the present, too, many empty spaces or abandoned and run-down zones of city space are being transformed into “urban gardens”, that join agrarian production to the search for a new “lifestyle”, no longer that of a peasant, but an urbanite with ecological concerns, with new uses for leisure, but also with a search for another meaning in life that is granted through contact with the soil and the fact of being a “producer” (organic, of course). Here we have both the search for a result (fresh food, close to home, organically grown), with the desire to build a different self image, one that will feed that image of being different in order to impress the neighbours. In the press, new futurist architectural and urban proposals have begun to appear, with “vertical farms” in the big metropolises (Despommier 2010).

Thus, on the one hand we have new build futurist architecture to produce the vegetables for the demanding “organic diet”, which links the sustainability of the new city to human and environmental health via local production and management of energy and of the goods needed for a healthy diet; on the other hand, we have the reconversion of industrial buildings and warehouses into “urban farms” (which in the recent past were transmuted into leisure and culture facilities).

Unlike the “city gardens” (small-scale, set up on the initiative of individuals or small communities, with traditional technology), these new agrarian production spaces (futurist in both architecture and technologies) call for big investment and follow complex, demanding organization and management processes at the level of economic sustainability. But both bring food production into the confines of the city and renew the sense of the city “green”. We could say that following the post-industrial urban space, we now have the post-rural urban space.

An examination of the urban area studied provides indicators for considering this new city. This is an area that combines urban concentration with agrarian spaces which are still worked following traditional production cycles (in spite of greater use of machinery and agrarian technology). The actors cross them several times in the course of their daily lives. The use of space is an opportunity to reinstate the negotiation and involve the acquired knowledge in putting it into practice.

“Those who live in these neighbourhoods can learn from us. Now nobody knows anything about the land! The old folks have died or are prisoners in their own houses; the young don’t want to know... The few people working the land live in greenhouses or grow corn for milk. It’s what they know how to do: riding around in a tractor and milking! But they even have machines for that! Nobody knows the land and, my friend, it’s the land that gives us everything!

We look over there (the neighbourhood piazza) and it seems like nobody does anything! What do these people live on? I’d be ashamed to do nothing! Should the government keep us? I don’t know how it can! Such a shortage of people to work the land... and I can’t get anyone. They all think it’s beneath them!” (Man, 73 years old).

A lack of understanding that includes the spaces of communication and relational strategies. Looks are exchanged and the meanings and customs of the other studied. What might the other’s daily life be like? What would happen to me if I changed my life? What do I gain and what do I lose by staying as I am? How can I approach the other and how can I let the other enter my world? Even if I don’t want to belong to that other world, what do I gain by having it close by?

“I sometimes even feel ashamed! I leave here, the land, and I have to pass through there, where there are cafes and shops... in my dirty work clothes... I don’t feel right... Sometimes I bring clothes along just to wear here and then I change when I leave...” (Woman, 69 years old).

“We are here on the land and they are looking down from their balconies.... But it’s also a good thing, because like this I always sell anything I grow in my plot. Sometimes I think about what my life would be like if I lived in one of those apartments! It would be more la-di-da, but I don’t know if I’d be any happier. They are always in such a rush and so sad. I get along OK here... pains all over, but I can’t grumble...” (Woman, 72 years old).

“In the past you could tell who was poor and who was rich... Now everyone dresses classy! And the fashions! Our land has got more beautiful with these buildings! Before it was a sorry state... there was nothing. Now we have everything. I feel just as much a farm worker as a city woman. All I lack is money...” (Woman, 79 years old).

The narratives also come from the “other side”, from the windows of verandas or the hurried cars on the highway and the new street. Contrasting and sometimes misunderstood worlds. Spaces and trades blend; the reasons are not known and mistrust and fear emerge. Nevertheless, spaces for dialogue open us and common concerns are discovered:

“I often come here, along these lanes through the middle of the fields, to get home. Rarely on foot. I work in Porto. Every now and again I come here to run. When I do, I can smell the earth and the plants, and I like it! But I feel sorry for these people who work in the country... this really doesn’t pay! Other times I envy them their life! We want to go to a garden and they always have their garden... and time! Sometimes I find myself looking at the countryside around my house and I ask myself why I don’t look at it more often! We come home and go off to work and the route we travel is an obstacle. Rarely, or never, do we see this as a good thing! We are so distracted that we are incapable of enjoying the beauty of the country” (Man, 45 years old).

“This is a waste of time, but my mother likes her cabbages and chickens. What can I do? After work in the shop I come and help her. I live there in an apartment I bought. True, I also take eggs and chickens to my house. But, after all, I’ve more than paid for them. On the other hand, I also unwind when I’m on the land. Some things you lose out on, but you win in others! But with the crisis that’s coming, many people are going to have to work on the land...” (Woman, 31 years old).

“When I was born here I thought I was always going to live off the land. It's just as well I left it, because now, with my work, I can order my life better. Now I lack nothing, but one thing I learned from the past was to save. Most people spend everything they earn in the factories. They like luxuries and more luxuries and then... and look at them riddled with debt and their houses and apartment blocks up for sale. Things are very bad round here. We can't want everything that's in the shops!” (Woman, 52 years old).

The narratives and experiences intersect in these complex spaces. Not as messages between “islands” (which is how some classify the space between cities in the extended city), but as a new language that runs through and links those spaces. The definition of space, work and time will have to be altered with these “new urbanisms”. The space has spread, on one hand (with the new infrastructures and mobility), and contracted on the other (different lifestyles and socioeconomic activities coexist side by side).

The time references (“before” and “now”) mark the differences in use of space and affirmation of customs. If capitalism grew out of the conjugation and reframing of the rural with the urban (with the integration of peasant societies in the market mechanisms, power benefits and classes), then post-capitalist society will have to formulate them anew. If in the beginning it was the State delimiting the rules of the game, at a later stage it will be groups of citizens, or interested bodies, with strong ideologies or different backgrounds, that opt to come together in function of their lifestyles. These lifestyles will determine all the organization of the space, time, work and an architectural and technological aesthetic.

Moreover, it will be the technology that defines the aesthetic, with urban excellence constituting not only beauty, but “Good”. An ethic based on a set of solidarity principles, associated to the reconstruction of what city means. It will specify the meaning of the urban and the urban experience, where it will not be the centralities or suburbs delimiting social meanings, but the capacity of having both within the limits of a relational and integrating architecture. An ethic, however, that can assume discourses and practices of a moralist and extremist character when the discourses and practices of some groups foment the emerging antagonisms. In other words, a new morality fastens on places and spaces with which groups and lifestyles will identify, where the boundaries will be clearly differentiating lines of exclusion/inclusion. As well as providing a new aesthetic, the experience of the diffused city in these metropolitan areas may open the way towards promoting a new urban ethic – an ethic where the concept of boundary is established as a spatial and political reference, where the architectural planning and social practice negotiations establish themselves as a condition of urban existence.

Currently, governments and local strategists see in the cities the means to promote community development, social cohesion and civic and cultural identity. Within the process of globalization, they show up with new economic, social and cultural roles, in the search for a new place that is legible and plays an active role in the strategies of differentiation. We are seeing the construction and valorization of an iconic place among a variety of proposals. Whether through presenting themselves as centers of decision, of communication and negotiation, or as the place where intellectual resources are concentrated in universities and research institutes, boosting high levels of innovation, the cities are seeking a “place in the sun”. The cities in turn foster regional competitiveness.

It was within this strategy that the politics of heritage valorization (including the UNESCO World Heritage classification) and physical restructuring of the centers, coupled with the role of creative industrialists, became the focus of attention for decision makers. As well as the external recognition (which encouraged cultural tourism) and the pride of the inhabitants, the aim was to achieve economic growth and population retention through job creation. However, despite this potential, many communities and individuals with the cities remained excluded from the economic and social nucleus.

The image of the cohesive, efficient city with an aesthetic that must be easily identified even in diversity, originates in the legacy of the medieval city, where the centrality of a square surrounding a bell tower defines the meaning of urban living: power, information, cultural life and exchange (Le Goff 2007). The medieval city asserts itself as «the place»! In a society of travellers, with routes sedimented by trade and religious belief along which ideas and the arts followed in more or less consenting complicity, the city represents refuge and safety. Only the monasteries of the mendicant orders, situated on the periphery or even outside the city walls, challenged the centrality of the main church.

The importance of the mendicant orders in reformulating and criticizing urban living (Le Goff, 2007) meant that the city was increasingly constructed in a single unit of meaning that linked together the city and outskirts.

But this process that has yet to find and have put into effect a modern critique of that urban way of life. The overvaluing of certain urban planning and aesthetic constraints mythified concepts and experiences of the Historic Centers, neglecting the contexts and peripheries that explain them and give them meaning. The definition of protected areas reinforces that concept that excellence can only be preserved when protected from a surrounding pollution. This aesthetic/ethic of the city prevailed for centuries.

If the medieval city had that “external space” of counterbalance provided by the mendicant orders, the cities and metropolises of consensual morality will enforce the ethic of integration, if not intimacy. In the city, there will be no opposition between the built space and the free space, because the built space will be better able to preserve the environment and social and productive sustainability, and the free space will warrant greater control. The farmer’s way of life will be coupled with the urban experience and will be established as a freelance profession or occupation; the urban way of life will, in turn, unfold between the apartment and the countryside, because both are places for practicing the liberal professions and enjoying an increasingly technological leisure. And all this without these ways of living translating into a “standardization” of society that would lead to a wiping out of the unique qualities of certain spaces or certain social groups. In the dynamic city there is room for these transhuman experiences.

The social and symbolic orders attributed to traditional legacies cannot be exclusive to the farmer. This is because urban memories (Certeau 1975) cannot be thought of as breaking down or failing to facilitate local solidarity and the symbols of sharing. Both practitioners and both spaces preserve mythical and symbolic narratives that are mutually fecund. In turn,

“the diffused city, in losing the coherence of design of the System of Public Spaces proper to the continuous city, spreads over landscapes-territories where the urban gaps come to play a preponderant role in the new urban images. Besides the environmental infrastructure (sewage and water management systems, for example), there is a need to “give meaning” to those non-built spaces and make them compatible, both with the defense of pre-existing and classified heritage, landscape and environmental values, and with the qualification of trivialized spaces (the verges of roads and intersections, land for informal use, development areas, remnants left over by the poor quality of housing, wastelands, etc.), which, taken as a whole and in all their diversity, have potential as great as the problems and dysfunctions they encapsulate. The future of qualifying the diffuse urbanization will certainly take this route” (Domingues 2009: 41).

Rather than giving meaning to these “empty spaces”, we should first find the meanings they already contain. The qualification of these spaces is not the condition for obtaining meaning through land use planning. They are charged with meaning and the planning consists in giving a new language to those meanings, so that all users can benefit from them.

The surrounding countryside now forms a part of the urban environment, and nature and agriculture have become elements of the city, making it impossible to draw the line between city and non-city. The borders are fluid and in movement; they do not separate, but are an integral part of the condition of the transhuman city. And if in the past these borders also used to exist in the classical city – dividing spaces, distinguishing classes, practices and uses – in the diffused city and the metropolis they are moveable. Thus the urban metropolis will have to combine the complexity of the differentiation/relation through the capacity to manage its potential architectural, urban, social and economic conflicts. It will be through its “traversability”⁸, between the different urban and social spaces that the city will constantly renew itself in a more creative and less conflicting way.

However, we expect this process of “transition” to be problematic, in that it will be in constant formulation and tension (whether at the architectural and urban level or the social level). In the formula “walk the way” we can metaphorically sum up the modalities of the “Urbanscape”, the city that critically reconstructs the

⁸ One of the big challenges of the city will be to construct urban structures and policies (social, cultural, economic and environmental) that enable a sort of transhumanity of the “urbanite” (city dweller) between different spaces, without falling victim to the social exclusion and segregation that render it impossible to feel oneself a citizen of one’s own city. A city conceived and programmed for a naive egalitarianism would be misguided and irrational. Spaces and their use will always create hierarchies in the city. The “transactional city” will be that which, aware of this hierarchy and differentiation, creates structures and policies that allow the different spaces to be crossed (whether at the level of physical and social mobility or residence).

environment, citizenship, ways of living (Careri, 2003). An experience of the city that establishes a cognitive world for its social actors, the formal instability and thus mutability of which allows for the stability of the respective social meanings negotiated.

The transactional metropolis (making transactions between spaces – between the rural and the urban – between ways of being, experiences, memories and lifestyles, etc.), must in turn involve the experiencing of frontiers; a relational experience since both are necessarily implicated; the experience of a place where the different lifestyles are negotiated.

In asserting itself as a creative place open to various possibilities, the frontier is no longer seen as a limiting problem, but rather as a problem/challenge that is innovative and stimulates hybrid lifestyles. These synthesize, in a logic of miscegenation, those which are physically and culturally closest; or others - those whose adhesion is made possible by the new information technologies and which are not subject to local control logics. That is the advantage of open communication spaces, where the different is presented as possible.

In the spaces of the specific urban metropolis dealt with here, we found social practices and lifestyles which could hardly be referenced as connected to the space where they occurred, whether the rural or the urban space, since the actors easily escaped from the location, travelling between both, abstracting themselves from both, not settling, in a transactional, creative logic of new places. What is happening in this highly urbanized region, where the fields are intermingled - now with completely urbanized streets and roads (cf. Domingues 2010), now with housing clusters organized in planned and parcelled developments - there has to be a logic of miscegenation, where the different is encountered and transformed into something that is no longer the sum of its parts, but rather a different reality. And the place where it is encountered is that space of interception, where they intersect and touch, on real and imaginary frontiers.

Domingues (2010) sees in the urbanized road, the support of local daily life, the continuation of the city, now in a process of “sub-urbanization” and “de-ruralization that are accelerated by the dissolution of frontiers. But the book “Street of the Road” is no more than the beginning of that reality that he called transgenic, resulting from the combination of deep-seated globalization and local typical characteristics. More than a dissolution of frontiers, what we are seeing is the multiplication of frontier spaces, seminal places for recreating lifestyles and spatial and architectural organization. More than the window display and social image of a country’s reality, as Domingues claims, the “street of the road” is the provocation and disruption of an established order. A new order of space is established and new meanings of the urban are asserted. It is this order and these spaces that need to be revealed, both in their urban language and in the language of power.

It is therefore within the concept of “frontier”, now seen as a place of dialogical dynamics rather than a boundary, which the metropolis and the city of the future must think. The hegemonic logic will always be based on the centers and the peripheries, while the dialogic logic fosters creativity and the relativity of urban functions⁹. This new logic will require a new usage and a new place for memory. Since memory is linked to the experience of space and the preservation of an associated cognitive world, with the profound change that we are experiencing, it will have to migrate to architectures and experiences of another kind that the new technological and communication models allow for or demand. And memory will be employed in the frontier places as Creative capital (Certeau 1975), that is to say, as something available to the town planner, as well as the architect, who can make use of it to recreate and transform the new spaces that have appeared in the meantime.

Planning thus finds a place to interpret and work, invoking the meanings under which the parts have lived, and a design is constructed, on the basis of which one plans to live in the future. The processes of memory and identity negotiation in the urban space will, in the future, arise in the complexity of the metropolis and the urbe: a complexity where physical and social relations are in play, as well as the relation between culture and nature. The metropolitan landscape no longer looks to the environment as a lost world, but an emerging world, in a kind of re-naturalization of the city. The “natural” spaces of the metropolis, integrated through the appropriation of the rural and now protected as a provider of quality of life for residents (Willits, and Luloff 1995), are memory

⁹ If miscegenation occurs in the countryside, why not in the city? If the rural has become a place for living, pleasure, tourism and industry, why cannot the city be changed into an agrarian productive space, a space of integrated, planned proximities, with a strong sense of belonging?

bearers, and it is as places of memory that they can assert themselves as places of dialogue and invention within the metropolitan context. They transport to the metropolis and the city know-how and experiences that have been built up over time. Perhaps this knowledge and experience can and should be worked on by science and technology, in the implementation of the new social and urban planning strategies.

Hence, in the public space, urban and architectural thinking will have to deal with experiences and realities characterized by multiple frontiers. It will be constructed in (mutant) places of the possible, of fruition and creation/production; of privacy, anonymity and agreed and negotiated interdependencies. The experiences of the city will have to be ruled by multiple and different orders of power, such as layers of identification/aggregation, over others of differentiation/imposition. The new order of the city will no longer be the search for harmony, but the management of a conflict. And this new order will be a strategic policy to meet the challenges that urban life of the future will demand and not a mere choice, or else the cities may be unsustainable.

Admittedly, in this new order, the groups and communities will play an essential role, but the individual will have to be taken into account in the reflection on the new urban space, as someone who is increasingly called on to take responsibility, as an actor and decision maker, in those spaces of transition, in a cultural and political affirmation that permits possibilities to be discussed and solutions negotiated, something that is increasingly difficult to delegate to representatives because they act in the institutional field. The dynamics of individual convictions are extremely powerful in the organization of urban life, especially in a society with free and open communication where the frontiers between the public and the private will have to be rethought. The promotion of community development, social cohesion and civic and cultural identity in the urban space will have to be done within this conflicting logic.

If the so-called pluri-activity of the new ruralities was born of the emerging economic needs and challenges posed by the alteration in the relations of work and production in the changing rural world, in the new city, post-specialization will emerge as a life-style. What used to characterize the cities of the past was specialization, the complexity of classes and activities, in contrast to the rural world. What will characterize the two worlds indiscriminately in the future will be a post-specialized world, in that each inhabitant will multiply distinct activities and affiliations. The urban revolution will thus undergo the "third modernity", the society of hypertext, where the individual is enrolled through the different forms (Certeau 1975) established with highly diverse social ties (hence the role of citizenship). Individuals today are multi-involved, multi-referenced, multi-attached.

The social actor is connected to a process of metapolization: the growth of distribution, information and interest and mobility networks that have altered relational times and spaces. In this network, the power of the individual as communicator and consumer, as well as inhabitant who moves through this meanwhile individualized space and time, calls for a reflexive process that is demanding on the role of everyone, which the State and the functions it provides must take into account. A revolution in the urban space must also be a democratic revolution that takes into account social inequalities, which challenges urbanism to adopt diversity and heterogeneity. To look at dysfunctions as multifunctional responses and to shun massification through the coordination of localized potential are the principles called for. (Ascher 2004). The new practices of the city and the metropolis are difficult to understand or delimit, since, in addition to a decoding of the meanings present there (which can be attributed via a semiotics of the space), they are subject to the unforeseen possibilities within those meanings. We must focus on the intentionality and implication of the social actor in giving value and importance (Sperber & Wilson, 2001) to elements that fall outside the predicted meanings and institutional order. Thus, the context, position (relative and overt) and intentionality of the actors are essential in determining the relevance of the meanings (explicit and implied). In the use of the space, this makes both knowledge and control of the place possible, even if a significant part of the place's meanings and possibilities is not grasped. This unapprehended part is what gives the space its "poetic" dimension, that is, one capable of creating new uses and meanings (Campelo 2010).

In traversing this diffused city, it is not only the new means of mobility which are in play, but also the topological references and linguistic codes. If, in the past, the name of cities "created" them and created Europe (Tunhas 2009), as if giving a name were the condition for existing in reproductive logic, the current naming of these emerging urban territories will entail a new classification, fruit of the experience of their practice and the

technological and codified languages that mark their paths. It is in this field that urban planning and architecture will have to negotiate their own language; in its ability to name and plan the practices of the multiple frontier spaces that structure both mobility in the diffused city and the experience of each individual living there.

Conclusion

The new organization of the urban space and its experience as a space frontier, among multiple dependencies and multiple possibilities of urban life requires a new approach to the issue of cultural heritage. We can look at the cultural heritage inherited by the inhabitants of modern metropolitan centres in two ways. On the one hand, it is possible to contextualize in historical moments of the city, the processes of town construction and the management of powers that is visible in those processes, which give the city its own identity; on the other hand, cultural heritage is called upon to be integrated in the negotiation processes between the parties which constitute the complexity of cities. Cultural heritage is both the origin and a consequence of social processes that transcend the spaces where they are visible. It is a testimony of the openness and the relationships that the communities established, with the regions near and far and, it has the ability to provide narratives and experiences which allow aggregation of the diffuse and the negotiation of frontiers, which are the distinctive marks of the metropolitan centres.

As to the second form, the spaces of frontier and miscegenation in the city of the future, they are also the privileged spaces of cultural heritage building. Much of the art (music and plastic arts) that we enjoy today is the result of negotiation and dialogue that these urban spaces undertook. It is a heritage that collides with the concepts of "authenticity", antiquity or historical purity. This is an authentic cultural heritage in its diversity, presenting a pure dynamic originality, which is alive in the novelty and inventiveness of the event management. It is a heritage that one does not have to destroy, thus annihilating, historical heritage. It lives upon the relationship with it, in a "destructive" creative action. This the urban cultural heritage with which most of the new practitioners of metropolises identify with, and which will bequeath its testimony for the future.

Bibliography

- AAVV. (2006). Congresso 30 anos APAP: A paisagem da democracia. Lisbon: APAP.
- Abalos, I. & Herreos, J. (1995). Las afueras. Siete visiones de la vida metropolitana. Madrid: Exit- LMI.
- Abramovay, R. (2003). O futuro das regiões rurais. Porto Alegre: Editora da UFRGS.
- Allaire, G. & Boyer, R. (1995). La grande transformation de l'agriculture. Paris: INRA/Economica.
- Amado, M. P. (2005). Planeamento urbano sustentável. Casal de Cambra: Caleidoscópio.
- Andresen, T. (2006). Pela Identidade dos Lugares e da Paisagem. APAP. A Paisagem da Democracia. Congresso 30 anos da APAP. Lisbon, APAP: 21-24.
- Ascher, F. (1995). Metapolis ou l'avenir des villes. Paris: Odile Jacob.
- Ascher, F. (2004). Les nouveaux principes de l'urbanisme. Paris: Editions de l'Aube.
- Barata Salgueiro, T. (1992). A Cidade em Portugal. Uma Geografia Urbana. Porto: Afrontamento.
- Barnett, J. (1995). The Fractured Metropolis. New York: Harper Collins.
- Beatley, T. (2000). Green Urbanism. Learning from European Cities. Washington: Island Press.
- Becerra, S. R. & Sanchez, C. M. (coord.) (2009). El fin del campesinado. Transformaciones culturales de la sociedad rural andaluza en la segunda mitad del siglo XX. Seville: Centro de Estudios Andaluces.
- Bell, M. (1992). The fruit of difference: the rural-urban continuum as a system of identity. Rural Sociology, 57 (1): 65-82.
- Calthorpe, P. & Fulton, W. (2001). The Regional City – Planning for the end of Sprawl. Washington: Island Press.
- Campelo, A. (2006). Património: Espaço e Vida. Da herança à construção da identidade. In Ponte de Lima. Terra Rica da Humanidade. Ponte de Lima: Município de Ponte de Lima.
- Campelo, A. (2010). "Espaço, construção do mundo e suas representações". In Bettencourt, A. & Alves, L. (eds.). Dos montes, das pedras e das águas. Formas de interacção com o espaço natural da pré-história à actualidade. Braga, CITDEM / APEQ: 191-206.
- Careri, F. (2003). Walkscapes: walking as an aesthetic practice / El andar como practica estetica. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili.
- Careri, F. (2004). Transurbance. In Les Carnets du Paysage (Cheminement), 11, École National Supérieure du Paysage, Versailles: 162-165.
- Chalas, Y. (2006). Urbanisme. Hors série, nr 28.

- Coccia, L. (2003). *Polveri Urbane*. Rome: Meltemi.
- Corner, J. (2006). *Terra Fluxus*. In *The Landscape Urbanism Reader*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.
- Despommier, D. (2010). *The Vertical Farm: The World Grows Up*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books.
- Domingues (2006). Contexto social e política urbana. In Domingues, A. (coord.) *Cidade e Democracia. 30 Anos de Transformação Urbana em Portugal*. Lisbon: Argumentum Edições, pp. 16-79.
- Domingues, A. (2009). Extensive urbanization – a new scale for planning. In Pinho, P. & Oliveira, V. (ed.). *Evaluation in Planning. CITTA 1st Annual Conference on Planning Research*. Porto: FEUP Edições, 129-151.
- Domingues, A. (2010). *A Rua da Estrada*. Porto: Dafne.
- Dorrian, M. & Rose, G. (ed.) (2003). *Deterritorialisations: Revisioning Landscapes and Politics*. New York: Black Dog P. L.
- Ferrão, J. (Coord.) (1995). *Políticas de inovação e de desenvolvimento regional e local*. Lisbon: ICS.
- Ferrão, J. (2002). *Dinâmicas Territoriais e Trajectórias de Desenvolvimento: Portugal 1991-2001, Censo 2001*. Lisbon: INE.
- Ferrão, J & Marques, T. (2002). *Sistema urbano Nacional – Síntese*. Lisbon: DGOD-DU.
- Galston, W. A & Baehler, K. (1995). *Rural development in the United States; connecting theory, practice and possibilities*. Washington DC: Island Press.
- Gaspar, J. (1987). *Ocupação e Organização do Espaço. Retrospectiva e Tendência*. Col. Portugal: os próximos 20 anos. Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Hadjimichalis, C. (2003). *Imagining Rurality in the New Europe and Dilemmas for Spatial Policy*, *European Planning Studies*, 11, 2, March 2003, pp. 103 – 113.
- Hervieu, B. (1993). *Les champs du futur*. Paris: Julliard.
- Ingold, T. (2000). *The Perception of the Environment. Essays in livelihood, dwelling and skill*. London and New York: Routledge
- Jacobs, M. (1991). *The green economy, environment, sustainable development and the politics of the future*. London: Pluto Press.
- Kayser, B. (1990). *La renaissance rurale. Sociologie des campagnes du monde occidental*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Kayser, B. (dir.) (1996). *Naissance de nouvelles campagnes*. Paris: Datar/Éditions de l'Aube.
- Koolhaas, R.; Mau, B.; Siglerl, J. (1995). *Small, Medium, Large, Extra-Large, Office for Metropolitan Architecture*, New York, Monacelli Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (2002) [c1970]. *A revolução urbana*. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG.
- Le Goff, J. (2007) [1997]. *Por amor das Cidades*. Lisbon: Teorema.
- Magnet, M. (2000). *The Millennial City*. New York: The Manhattan Institute.
- Marques, T. (coord.) (2004). *Portugal na Transição do Século: Retratos e Dinâmicas Territoriais*. Porto: Afrontamento.
- Marot, S. (2003). *Sub-urbanism and the art of memory*. London: AA Publications.
- Mendras, H. (1984). *La fin des paysans*. Paris: Actes Sud.
- Morandi, M. (2004). *Fare Centro*. Rome: Meltemi.
- Moreira, M. B. (2001). *Globalização e agricultura*. Lisbon: Instituto Superior de Agronomia.
- O'Neil, B. J. (1988). *Entre a sociologia rural e a antropologia; repensando a "comunidade" camponesa*. *Análise Social*, Lisbon, 24 (103-104): 1331-1355.
- Pavia, R. (2002). *La città della dispersione*. Rome: Meltemi.
- Pinho, P. & Oliveira, V. (ed.) (2009). *Evaluation in Planning. CITTA 1st Annual Conference on Planning Research*. Porto: FEUP Edições.
- Pinto, J. M. (1985). *Estruturas sociais e práticas simbólico-ideológicas nos campos*. Porto: Edições Afrontamento.
- Portas, N.; Domingues, A.; Cabral, J. (2004). *Políticas Urbanas*. Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Rapport, D. (1998). *Need for a New Paradigm*. In *Rapport et al. Ecosystem Health*. Oxford: Blackwell: 3 – 17.
- Redfield, R. (1960). *The little community. Peasant society and culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Rogers, A. & Vertovec, S. (ed.) (1995). *The Urban Context. Ethnicity, Social Networks and Situational Analysis*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Rusk, D. (1993). *Cities Without Suburbs*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ribeiro, O. (1945). *Portugal, o Mediterrâneo e o Atlântico*. Coimbra: Coimbra Editora.
- Sá, M.F. (1986). *O Médio Ave*. Porto: ESBA.
- Schmidt, L. (1999). *Portugal ambiental*. Oeiras: Celta Editora.
- Scott, M. (2006). *Strategic spatial planning and contested ruralities: Insights from the republic of Ireland*. *European Planning*, 14, 6, July, pp. 811 – 829.
- Shane, G. (2006). *The emergence of landscape urbanism*. In *The Landscape Urbanism Reader*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press.

- Silva, A. P. G. da (2006). Reestruturação da continuidade edificada e natural da paisagem metropolitana. APAP. A Paisagem da Democracia. Congresso 30 anos da APAP. Lisbon, APAP: 69-77.
- Silva, A. S. (1994). *Tempos Cruzados*. Porto: Edições Afrontamento.
- Silva, M. C. (1998). *Resistir e adaptar-se: constrangimentos e estratégias camponesas no Noroeste de Portugal*. Porto: Edições Afrontamento.
- Silvano, F. (1997). *Territórios de identidade. Representações do espaço em Guimarães, Vizela e Santa Eulália*. Oeiras: Celta Editora.
- Silvano, F. (2002). *A antropologia do espaço: uma introdução*. Oeiras: Celta Editora.
- Sola-Morales, I. (2002): *Territorios*. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili.
- Steven, Y. (1992). *A causa verde: uma sociologia das questões ecológicas*. Oeiras: Celta Editora.
- Telles, G. (1994). *Paisagem global: um conceito para o futuro*. Iniciativa, April (special edition).
- Telles, G. (2006). *A paisagem de outrém para hoje. Que futuro?*. APAP. A Paisagem da Democracia. Congresso 30 anos da APAP. Lisbon, APAP: 11-13.
- Tunhas, P. (2009). *Herboriser sur le bitume*. In Patim, I. et al (coord.). *da geografia das palavras à geografia das migrações*. Porto: Edições UFP, pp. 185-193.
- Willits, F. & Luloff, (1995). *A. Urban residents' views of rurality and contacts with rural places*. *Rural Sociology*, 60 (3): 454-466.