

Symbolic Interaksionisme a Social Reality in an Architectural Public a Transformation of Space

Hidayat Marmin

Teaching Staff of the Faculty of Architecture
Department. Engineering, Pepabri Makassar University, Indonesia

Arfenti Amir

Megarezky, University Lecturer

Abstract:- This article is a research record on the ongoing transformation of the public sphere in Indonesia. Where the characteristics and behaviors of users of the public sphere experience dialectics, the cause is the hegemony of a capitalist group's domination over another (dominated) group by means of incorporating dictated idealism, then accepted as something natural. For example, the 'indoctrination of architectural design' which causes the commodification of public space, raises a new awareness for users of public space and unconsciously they raise their status to the middle class, follow popular culture, and imitate the behavior or lifestyle of the bourgeois class. These are all illusions that capitalists deliberately create so that the characteristics of the dominated people lose their ideology and identity as free individuals. Public space becomes a new means of accommodating all those desires, so it is difficult to avoid how then public space transforms, and no longer becomes a social space that is free to be accessed by the public at no cost.

Keywords:- Transformation, Capitalist Hegemony; Commodification of public spaces; Social space.

I. INTRODUCTION

The impact of globalization has dramatically affected the lives of millions of people around the world and resulted in a transformation, caused by the spread of practices, relationships, awareness, and organizing in almost all corners of the world. And mobility becomes a differentiating factor in social stratification. In Indonesia, this process of globalization began to be felt from the beginning of the start of development mobility in various metropolitan cities during the New Order period.

The movement of urban space has brought changes to a context of transformation on the scale of public space, which in fact is to start from a conception of the public domain as a democratic space. But in reality the public space is no longer purely a place where all audiences meet freely and belong to everyone. This is a phenomenon that is the link of the rapid and revolutionary movement of urban space change.

This culture of change globally has also resulted in the growth of Market Places in shopping centers, airports, hotels, etc. And bring a very strong influence in the hegemony of the transformation of public spaces in various metropolitan cities in Indonesia. In the 70s this symptom

had not yet appeared, shopping centers really only served as places to transact economic trade, airports were only limited to places to raise or drop off airplane passengers, hotels only as places to stay. The trading center in Makassar City was originally only centered around Karebosi, Central Market, and Entertainer Street, which later experienced polarization and brought about spatial physical changes in urban space caused by the impetus of capitalism to change the structure of urban space from means of production to reproduction of urban space. Then this change was very pronounced in the postmodern era, namely when the penetration of capitalism penetrated market places, then everything experienced the dynamics of movement, including the dynamics of change in the public sphere as a marker of a transformation.

Karebosi Square is one of the famous squares in Indonesia and is a public space that has existed since colonial times. Karebosi was once known as Koningsplein and has its main function as a green open space located in the center of Makassar. As the heart of the city, Karebosi has more than just a green open space, but also has social, economic and ecological functions, and even cultural and historical functions.

In October 2007 the Karebosi field underwent a revitalization aimed at optimizing public spaces in downtown Makassar, with the main function as a sports park, green open space and supporting functions as a parking area (cluster parking) and shopping space (commercial space). After undergoing revitalization, Karebosi is no longer solely an open space place where many people use it to carry out sports activities, hold music concerts and the like, which usually the general public can access and share with each other within the area at no cost. However, the field, which is able to accommodate up to hundreds of thousands of people, is currently undergoing a change in function, apart from being an open space, it is also a business (commercial) land. Although the upper part is still in the form of a field, the underground mall building with an access road in the form of a tunnel that penetrates into the Mtc Karebosi mall has become part of the Karebosi Field area.

Then Panakukang mall which is also currently the most popular shopping center in the city of Makassar and is one part of the pole of business growth in the Panakukang business district.

The dialectic of shifting meaning to changes in the functions of open space in the Panakukang area began with the construction of a residential area by the developer PT. Asindo, then experienced development as a Market Place area with the presence of several shophouse buildings and the Panakukang Mall shopping center which brought a very strong influence in the hegemony of transforming public spaces in Makassar. At first, the developer only prepared housing accompanied by environmental facilities in the form of open spaces in several places. Capitalist penetration then brought the consequences of very rapid change, turning the Panakukang area into the most lucrative business surfshop in the city of Makassar, and of course resulting in several public space zones in the Panakukang area undergoing a change in shape or undergoing a process of transformation.

Public spaces that were previously public domain are now of commercial significance. At first, although it was still needed by the public at a very limited need but now there is a new meaning, the tendency of people to be more interested in utilizing public spaces (central place) such as this Panakukang Mall as a medium where to interact, because the public needs entertainment, although in principle they come there for commercial purposes. This shift occurred after something experienced by the community that he did not find in the context of public spaces in general, but was created in new means of shopping places such as Panakukang mall.

The above explanation reminds us that there has actually been a symbolic change and there is a tendency to change the interpretation of individual social behavior in the public sphere. Humans as actors who respond to physical objects (objects that form a symbol), as well as social objects (in the form of individual actions that describe a behavior). The theory of symbolic interaction explains how the relationship between symbols and interactions arises, when a problem arises about the need for public space, then in fact at that time the determinant of symbols will not only answer a "number dimension" of length, width, height, area, etc. but more than a symbol of social dimensions that can affect the meaning that may be different in each actor.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

The method used in this study is a qualitative descriptive method, where the study focuses on the theoretical analysis of the understanding and meaning that is done in a broad and in-depth. Through this method, the social reality to be studied is a subjective reality in the form of understanding and meaning, aiming to get an interpretation of the subject of study to get meaning. What you want to achieve is an understanding of a social phenomenon (who does what)?, then based on what is constructed in the world of meaning? or the human understanding of the culprit itself. So the qualitative descriptive method in this study seeks to examine the essence, giving meaning to a social phenomenon that develops in the midst of community life regarding social transformations that occur in the arena of public space.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. *Social Space in architectural design paradigms*

George Simmel (1858-1918) was one of the first figures to put forward his thoughts on the "social space". At least two of Simmel's constructs on social space were published in 1903, namely 'the Sociology of Space' and 'on the Spatial Projections of social Forms'. Later in 1908, Simmel revisited and expanded the article into a book *Soziologie*, adding three important essays namely "The social Boundary", 'the Sociology of the Senses' and 'The Stranger' (Fearon, 2007).

Here Simmel does not merely present a theory of social space in an organized manner, but he only links between concepts, contexts and examples of orientation according to history, which is to provide a heuristic 'tool' for approaches to the sociology of social space. It concentrates on five basic frames of space construction; First, the exclusivity of space, truly no two bodies can occupy on the same space. The social space is constructed by being and exclusivity, which the group occupies. Second, Space is a subdivision for social purposes and is framed within boundaries. Thirdly, the concentration or mixing of social interactions in space also affects social formation. Fourth, all social interactions can be characterized by a degree of closeness between individuals and groups. Fifth, the special relationship in a group but has undergone a change of location, such as the community of a tribe but has moved to another place. Simmel's writing of "the Stranger" "is an example, where" the distance of a relationship is determined not only by the condition of the relationship between people, but also by the symbols in the relationship".

In the philosophy of architectural design, the word 'space' always refers to two properties, namely; architecture means space mathematically that is objective and quantitative, in a physical entity and object bounded by three axes: x, y, and z. Psychologically architecture defines space as the locus of mixing, meeting, or even fighting various human needs and wants that are subjective and qualitative. Architecture was originally more about the concept of how we construct space (construction of space) related to the physical aspect and also the philosophical conception of space, but then Henri Lefebvre the French sociologist neo-Marxist make another very essential approach, namely by questioning how the physical and philosophical aspects of the constructed space can be meaningful if it does not exist?.

A radical thought from Lefebvre in his book 'The Production of Space', that there are several levels of space, from the most abstract, visible, natural space (absolute space) to the more complex space whose meaning is socially produced (social space). According to Lefebvre we create space following the way we occupy it in our social life (lived space), where in the reality of life we intersect with the physical material aspects of the space absorbed by our senses (perceived space) and non-material aspects (mental) in the space that is perceived in our minds (conceived space). At least it can be understood that individuals have equality and equal standing in the use of space.

Lefebvre considers that space, in addition to being formed by our minds, is also a manifestation of social relations, and the important thing to emphasize from this meaning is the term ‘production’ used by Lefebvre “space is socially produce” and “we are spatially produced”, therein lies the core and complexity of his theory related to social production related to spatial aspects. In relation to what is produced, space in this case becomes part of a historical production (process), which includes the intersection of time, space and social being, leading to ‘a materialization of social being’



Fig. 1: Space is formed according to the way we occupy it in our social life (lived space) and defines a boundary-the boundaries of space with a comfortable distance himself with others

From this it can be understood how the role of space in human life and how the struggle for discourse in it. The relations of production and capital accumulation discussed by Marxists cannot exist without space. So the relation of production itself also creates a space that is specifically designated for him. Even in the discussion of capitalism further, space is used as a means of capital accumulation. Here it can be understood that social relations create space, but equally important is how to see social space as social production. This makes Lefebvre's belief how he sees social space in a long logic to give meaning about himself.

B. Public space in Indonesia as a social function and political function

According to Jurgen Habermas, public space is a medium to communicate information and views. In the circumstances of society meeting and arguing about something critically, what is called civil society will be formed. In simple terms, civil society can be understood as a society that shares interests, goals, and values without coercion which in theory is opposed to the concept of a coercive state.



Fig. 2. Field karebosi Makassar representation of public space. Until the 1980s in this place Makassar residents used to gather and discuss various things at any time free of charge

The public sphere is an idealized image of Habermas ' thoughts on democracy. The principles that democratic traditions see as good are the values of justice, diversity, freedom, and solidarity. The concepts of justice and diversity mean there is a need for cultural pluralism and representation for so many public opinions, cultural practices, and various geographical and social conditions. Freedom and solidarity mean non-forced forms of sharing and cooperation.

In the Middle Ages in Indonesia, Open Spaces were built by the kingdom that functioned as public facilities, in the form of squares or squares. Public space or field functioned as a location to interact between the king and his people. The field functioned as a gathering place for his people and the Royal soldiers. Until now, public space has always been one of the facilities that must exist in every blueprint for the development of a city in Indonesia.

As well as karebosi Square in Makassar, is a public space or open space in the form of a square that is also commonly found in Java and has existed since the Kingdom stood. The function of the Square is the same principle as public spaces in European cities. In the past, the Square became a gathering place for the people to listen to the advice of the King or Regent. The Square was used to hold the King's trial, against criminals and executions were carried out in the middle of the field and watched by other people.



Fig. 3: Alun-Alun Malang area Kanjuruhan era of the 8th century until the founding of Majapahit in 1293 by” Kera Ngalam " Raden Wijaya or Bhre Wijaya (source: www.jurnalmalang.com)

Michel Foucault (1984) and Henri Lefebvre (1991) argued that space is a dynamic social product and is shaped by people who have control and of course dominance over power. In a political perspective by Jurgen Habermas explains that the term “public space” comes to differentiate it from the concept of private space. Habermas' thoughts on public space are divided into two, namely the concept of bourgeois public space (in his book entitled *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*) and the concept of public space within the framework of deliberative democracy, which appears in the text *Between Facts and Norms*.

The ideal principle in the bourgeois public sphere is: first, in the public sphere the thing that occupies a higher position than others is not status, rank, property, or descent, but a better argument; second, the argument that arises in the public sphere must be based on the general interest and not the particular interest; and third, the public sphere is inclusive [8]. In the context of power, Habermas divides in two types of public space, the first is the public space that is not co-opted by power, that is, the public space that grows out of the life-world and the second is the public space that is co-opted by power. Each of these public spaces is controlled by a specific person.

The actors in the public sphere who are not co-opted by power are the natives, because they come from the public itself and have deep roots in the life-world (*lebenswelt*). While the actors in the public space that are co-opted by power are dominated by user actors, namely actors who do not grow up in public but are present in public and occupy public space where they use the medium of money and power to use the public. They usually have an established social identity and are recognized in society. Habermas' idea of public space implies that the nature of public space is exclusive. It occupies a singular position, that of the bourgeoisie.

In contrast to his first thought, Habermas in *Between Facts and Norms* places public space as a plural space for all groups. Each community and group of people can form its own public space. This thought was in reaction to the criticism of postmodernism, which saw the thought of the first public space (Bourgeois) as a space that tends to be exclusive. While the core formula of this second public space thinking is a variant of democracy that focuses on the issue of political legitimacy. A decision may be legitimate if it obtains rational approval through participation in authentic deliberation by all parties concerned in the decision. According to Habermas, the arena for participation in such deliberations is a public space.

Understanding of public space in the various studies above will be the basis for parsing how the characteristics of society in responding to the dynamics of spatial problems that occur in the public space of Karebosi field and public space of Panakukang Mall in Makassar city, and of course to understand further how the public space itself is transforming in the midst of dynamics and hegemony factors that play a role in the spatial dynamics.

C. *Spatial Problems, Social and Political Functions in the Perspective of Transforming Public Spaces*

The relationship between community groups and their space according to Lefebvre (1991) is a spatial system, which is the result of the thought process of a community group. So, there is a production of space. A space (Social) is not an ordinary object, or a product like other products, but it is a material that is produced and as a whole this process also embodies the existence of space as a social function and political function and the continuity of how it transforms, both regularly and/or irregularly. Or it can be said that such conditions will bring to a new perspective at which time the public space will be transformed.

Space reflects time and vice versa, time changes, resulting in the transformation of space. Explaining about a paradox in the transformation of space, namely the human desire to live together as stated above, seems to be in harmony with his need to live in groups and form his own space. Mastery of space is the main thing that gives rise to such paradoxes. And for Thomas Marcus, there is no power-free space. At first, space was shared, which was based on a shared identity, until at some point, a group of people felt they had 'more' power over one part of the space than another group. For Smith, the paradox of space change has always existed in a space inhabited by a group of people, and supported by unfair conditions (unequal conditions).

So then, shared space turns into divided space, into inclusive space or exclusive space. Or even an inclusive/exclusive space, which Edmund Leach also called. Zone or space of ambiguity. According to Tommy SS. Eisenring that potential land tenure is one of the forms of production forces that are important for urban communities, both those in capitalist social entities, and those in non-capitalist social entities. In urban areas, according to Eisenring, these actors then take on the role of wanting to approach urban economic centers, such as markets, terminals, and ports. The practice of such space is then transformed into a temporary space.

Perspective in the dynamics of the transformation of public space, it seems to change the formulation of the formation in the public space. Until a certain period, it could be that this formation makes the quality of public space very bad. As a result, shared space that accommodates a plural society, ultimately has two different potentials because of its dynamism. The process of transforming this public space into an exclusive space makes it a potentially 'conflict' public space and a potentially 'non-conflict' public space.

Alexander (1987) stated that the process of transformation in the environment can run through planning or not with no possibility of deviation. The transformation process will occur little by little and continuously, while the time it starts and ends is strongly influenced by the background of the process.

Based on some of the above views, it can be said that the process of transformation of public space in the area of Karebosi Square and public space in the mall Panakukang Makassar city occurs based on the planning carried out by

actors who hold control over the two objects of public space. While a period of time can be identified with a period of transformation process with certain characteristics in both objects. When a certain period of time, it will go through a certain period of transformation process that will be influenced by the values brought by the characteristics of the social environment in his time.

D. Capitalist Modes of Production and Public Space Production

The Critical Theory developed by the Frankfurt School theorists has been critical of capitalism. Although in his view of capitalism the theorists of the Frankfurt School agree with Marx's theory of alienation and commodity fetishism born by capitalism, as well as the views of Western Marxists such as Lukacs with his reification terminology and Gramsci with his hegemony stated that Marx did not anticipate the foresight of capitalism in the present era. In view of the changes in the history of society Marx considered too mechanistic that with all its inevitability will give birth to a social revolution with the sharpening of internal contradictions in the body of capitalism that will give birth to a crisis, and at that time the proletariat will automatically carry out the proletarian revolution.

However, according to Western Marxism, which is also included in the Frankfurt School, Marx ruled out the factor of class consciousness that turned out to be able to be manipulated by capitalism in order to prevent social revolution. It is in this aspect that the concepts of reification (Lukacs), hegemony (Gramsci), and domination (Frankfurt) find a loophole in Marx's theory to answer why capitalism has survived to this day.

In the present era the problem of space is also a matter of political economy, which is often associated with the hegemony of capitalist production (mode of production). From this point of view, to study the spatial problem we must go deep into the root of the problem, including related to the criticism of capitalism, the pattern of production that logically and historically has the character of conquering space for the endless accumulation of capital. By the dialectical method, the figures describing the monopolistic control of space must be seen as a surface phenomenon, and its warhead, its hidden epicenter, is capitalism.

Marx, who is associated with capitalism in many of his works, has unraveled the relationship of space with capitalism. For example, in *Grundrisse's* book, he said, while Capital seeks to remove all Spatial Barriers on the entire surface of the planet so that its markets are abundant, at the same time Capital seeks to annihilate space by time, that is, by reducing the amount of time required for movement or circulation (capital, labor, goods and services) from one place to another.

Marx emphasized that the elimination of the spatial barrier is the key to the accumulation of capital. It was Henri Lefebvre who further developed the discussion about space and capitalism, through his theory of the production of space which has been elaborated much above. According to

Lefebvre, the continuous production and reproduction of economic space on a global scale, is the key to the success of capitalism to extend its breath. In line with Kopytoff's (1989) thought, the production and reproduction of economic space will change the formation of use value to something produced by the capitalist system, namely seating and using consumers as a commodity.

The most important starting point of "the Production of Space" is the contribution to an aspect previously unimaginable by Marxists, structuralists and even by Marx himself. That is the role of space, the role of spatialization in human life and how the struggle for discourse that occurs in it. If Marx spoke of the relations of production and the accumulation of capital, they could not exist without space. The relation of production itself also creates a space specially reserved for it. Capitalism goes even further, making space a means of capital accumulation. Land and buildings as assets.

In line with Karl Marx and Frederic Engels' thought on modes of Production, developed by a group of professed Marxists, is the articulation theory of modes of production developed by Pierre Phillipe Rey, Meillassoux, Terry, and Taylor. This theory assumes that the reproduction of capitalism in poor countries occurs in a single simultaneity, where on the side of the poor country there is an articulation of at least two modes of production, namely the capitalist mode of production and the pre-capitalist mode of production. The coexistence of these two modes of production will result in the exploitation of cheap labor and the problem of access for poor groups of people who still remain in the realm of pre-capitalist modes of production. Poverty management strategies offered by the articulation theory of modes of production is known as person in environment and person in situation, this strategy gives access to the loss of dominance of power by the elite in society, but still seeks to expand access and opportunities to enjoy production for the dominated.

As a global system, according to Lefebvre, capitalism forms an abstract space (Lefebvre, 2009). That is, the space of the business world, both nationally and internationally and the space of money and political power of the state (capitalist). Abstract space rests on the giant octopus of banking, commerce, and major capitalist centers of production. Also spatial interventions such as road networks, airfields, and information networks, in order to multiply the production and circulation of capital quickly. Abstract space is the basis of capital accumulation.

Lefebvre then unraveled the contradictions in the capitalist space. The main contradiction is the destruction of space by the regime of property rights (private property) over all other forms of ownership regimes; communal, feudal and so on. Also, creating a hierarchy within a society based on class exploitation. Another form is center-and periphery-based contradiction. And Fraser (1995) criticized this problem specifically in Habermas' bourgeois society, that the practice of public space as a democratic space never really existed. It is precisely social inequality in the context that the mural community never gets equal access to public

space. In reality some rural communities have nothing in common in participating and they have no space to articulate their language, needs and desires. This is the impact of how privatization in public space that gave birth to the attitude of co-optation to commodification that reap the benefits of community contestation rural in utilizing public space.

Spatial physical changes in various urban areas become an inevitable fact of a commodification and representation of space. As has been researched by Batara Surya (2015), the area that was initially dominated by agricultural activities characterized by rural agrarian and homogeneous, then experienced a transfer of function as a new space or spatial physical changes as a determinant of changes in social formations, and also as a sign of shifting means of production towards the reproduction of space dominated by urban commercial functions.

Spatial representations dominate not just spatial practices, but representational spaces. While the representation of space is a creation of the dominant group, representational space comes from the life experiences of people in particular from the lower circles. As we have seen, while the representation of space is perceived as "real space" "by the holder of power, the representation of space then produces" "truth of space". That is, they reflect what is actually happening in the experience of life rather than an abstract truth created by someone like what architects do to achieve dominance. In the contemporary world, however, the representation of space, as is the practice of space, has problems due to the hegemonic factor of the representation of space. In reality, Lefebvre goes on to say, "representational space vanishes within the representation of space."

So the main problem here, according to Lefebvre, is the predominance of elite spatial representations over everyday spatial practices and representational spaces. Furthermore, if the new and potentially revolutionary ideas flowing from the representational space disappear, how can the hegemony of an elite such as urban planning planners be matched, let alone shaken?

Although the way presented above is the ideal way to discuss space, Lefebvre gives a second tripartite distinction that addresses it in a more material, more optimistic point of view. Parallel to Marx's idea of the human species, Lefebvre began with the so-called absolute species, or natural spaces (i.e. "green" areas) that could not be colonized, turned inauthentic, or destroyed by economic and political forces.

Just as Marx did not analyze species-being (and communism) much, Lefebvre did not pay much attention to absolute time. While Marx devoted most of his attention to criticizing capitalism, Lefebvre was interested in critically analyzing what he called abstract space. Like the representation of space, this is space from the point of view of an abstract subject such as a city planner or an architect, although an abstract subject can also be an ordinary person such as a car driver. But, abstract space is not just idealized; it actually replaces historical space (which is established on absolute space). Abstract space is characterized by the

absence of something associated with absolute space (trees, clean air, and so on). It is a repressive space (even involving brutality and violence), authoritarian, controlled, occupied and dominated.

Lefebvre emphasizes the role of the state rather than economic power in exercising power over abstract space, even though the exercise of power is hidden. Furthermore, "abstract space is a tool of power"

That is, not only power is exercised in it, the abstract space itself is power (power). While the ruling party is always trying to control, nothing new here is that "the power is trying to control the space as a whole"

Thus, the ruling class uses abstract space as a tool of power to gain control over increasingly expanding space. While Lefebvre eased the pressure on economic factors and forces, he recognized that power from and over abstract spaces resulted in profit. Namely, it is not only the factories that make a profit, but also the railways and overpasses that provide to the factories for the transport of raw materials and final products.

To illustrate in Indonesia the space organized for the purpose of capital, is the creation of various thematic maps. For example, Urban Land Use Maps, which often collide with other social interests, maps become a tool to displace public interests and sometimes become a debate. Mapping is no longer just a medium to describe the function or land use, but a tool to claim ownership of exclusive property rights. The map became a tool as an extension of the non-capitalist ownership system. Map is an instrument for the transformation of public space related to political economy and with all the derivative risks that may appear bad in the social spatial system in Indonesia.

E. Conclusions of Symbolic Interactionism in the Construction of Social Reality

According to Berger (1967) in his book *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of Sociological Theory of Religion* (see Knepper, 2001), that in public life there is a fundamental dialectic process with three steps, namely externalization (externalization) is a human effort in devoting himself into the world. It is the process by which human beings construct reality, both mentally and physically. Objectification is the process by which reality is constructed as a facticity. The world created by man becomes something that is outside of it (becomes an objective reality) that is why Berger said that society is a dialectical phenomenon. Externalization and objectification are the stages in which the dialectical process takes place, while internalization, according to Berger, is the stage in which the objectified world is reabsorbed into the structure of subjective consciousness.

Signs and symbols of postmodern cultural works (including architectural works) that are so regimented are not easy to interpret. To interpret it there must be an effort to menagguhkan until there is appropriate to bear it. Jacques Derrida referred to this as 'temporization' (see Sachari, 2002). This concept explains that in the context of the work of postmodernism the objectification process of Berger's three steps will be faster if there are actors outside the

individual who first hold the 'objective meaning' of the work of postmodern culture.

Based on what constitutes the basis of the life of a human group or society, some scholars of symbolic interaction point to "communication" or more specifically "symbols" as the key to understanding that human life. Symbolic interaction refers to the special nature of the interaction between people.

This means that humans mutually translate and define their actions, whether in interaction with others or with themselves. The Formed process of interaction involves the wearing of symbols of language, customs, religion, views. According to Joel Charon symbolic Interaction Process formed in a society

Therefore, social interaction requires a lot of time to achieve harmony and Fusion. The close relationship between human life activities with symbols because human life is one of them is in a symbolic environment.

In the work of the famous pragmatic philosopher, John Dewey once said not to view the mind as a thing or a structure, but rather as a thought process that involves a series of stages. This stage involves defining objects in the social world, outlining possible modes of action, imagining the consequences of alternative actions, eliminating those that tend to be less likely, and finally selecting the optimal mode of action. This focus on thought processes has a tremendous effect on the development of symbolic interaction.

David Lewis and Richard Smith consider Dewey and William James to have been more influential in the development of symbolic interaction than Mead. They go so far as to say that, "Mead's work is more peripheral than mainstream Chicago sociology". They distinguish between two main branches of pragmatism: the "philosophical realism" attributed to Mead, and the "nominalist pragmatism" attributed to Dewey and James.

In fact, in their view, symbolic interaction is more influenced by the nominalist approach and is not even consistent with philosophical realism. Nominalist thinking is that although macro-level phenomena exist, they do not have "an independent and decisive effect on consciousness and on individual behavior". More precisely, that view, "understands the individual himself as an existentially free agent who can accept, reject, modify, or otherwise 'assert' the norms, roles, beliefs of society, and so on, according to their own interests and plans at that time". In contrast, in the view of social realism, more emphasis is placed on society and how it can shape and control individual mental processes. More precisely perhaps as free agents; the perpetrators are aware that their behavior is controlled by the wider community.

The symbolic interactionist theory proposed by Blumer, in principle, rests on three main premises, namely: first, humans act on something based on the meanings that something has for them. Second, the meaning is obtained from the results of social interactions with other people.

Third, these meanings are refined when the process of social interaction is underway.

Based on the explanation that has been stated above, it can be concluded that some of the 'basic assumptions' of symbolic interactionist theory by Mead and Blumer are: first, that the individual is rational and the product of social relations (social interaction). The individual is not a structured, passive personality, determined by external factors, but rather the individual as a dynamic figure; secondly, that society is dynamic and evolves, providing for the change and New socialization of the individual. Society and groups are always changing and depend on individual thoughts; third, that social reality is individual and social dynamic. The individual has the 'mind' to interpret situations, assess the actions of others and his own actions; fourth, that social interaction is encompassing 'mind, language and awareness' of oneself; social interaction leads to non-verbal communication; language creates thought and groups; fifth, that individual and group attitudes and emotions are learned through language; Truth of ideas, attitudes and perspectives, all conceptualized as a process of what he observes during interaction; the pattern of social activity itself has a creative and spontaneous aspect (Turner, J., 1982; Kinloch, 2005).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Social interaction can not be separated with the process of human thinking that is formed through a process of dynamic human socialization by means of two-way interaction, as the framework of George Herbert Mead that a person's self-concept develops through interaction with others, a person's self is a social product, that is, a product of social interaction. In this case, the actor arranges and adjusts the information obtained based on the needs of their own environment. So the relationship between the environment of public space and behavior in the social process here can be seen from how certain the behavior of individuals and groups in influencing the formation of the transformation of public space / social interaction space.

Public space and individual behavior in social processes that have a relationship to the cause of the transformation of public space which in this case is not only influenced by government policy issues but also involves the process of social deconstruction. Both bersinerji each other resulted in shifting social values symbolic meaning in a public space. Public space as a social space is developed from the basic assumption of non-physical interaction, in the sense of interaction using certain symbols in the dominance of interests to achieve goals. So the pre-capitalist public space tends to be eroded in the middle of the emergence of artificial space hegemony deliberately created by capitalists making it a commutation of public space. Interests also become one of the main elements that serves as a barrier that affects the transformation of public space and the formation of social interaction space, as well as the similarity of the elements that are used as hooks to say as a common interest, then the dimensions of public space will form a grouping based on certain symbols.

REFERENCES

- [1.] Ritzer, George—*Teori Sosiologi*. Cetakan kedelapan. Yogyakarta. Pustaka Pelajar. 2012
- [2.] Surya, Batara—*Spasial Perkotaan, Gagasan dan Pengalaman Empiris*. Makassar: Fahmi Pustaka. 2015
- [3.] Ardhana, W—*Reformasi Pembelajaran Menghadapi Abad Pengetahuan*. Makalah disampaikan dalam kuliah perdana Program S2 Teknologi Pembelajaran Unepa di Gresik, 19 Mei. 2001
- [4.] Hardiman, F.B. (Ed.)—*Ruang Publik Melacak "Partisipasi Demokratis" dari Polis sampai Cyberspace*. Jakarta: Kansius. 2010
- [5.] Lefebvre, Henri—*The Production of Space—translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith*. Oxford UK: Blackwell Publishing. 1991
- [6.] Barker, Chris—*Cultural Studies; Teori dan Praktik, Terjemahan Nurhadi*. Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana. 2005
- [7.] Prasetyo, Antonius Galih—*Menuju Demokrasi Rasional: Melacak Pemikiran Jurgen Habermas tentang Ruang Publik*. Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Gadjah Mada. p.170. 2012
- [8.] Prasetyo, Antonius Galih—*Menuju Demokrasi Rasional: Melacak Pemikiran Jurgen Habermas tentang Ruang Publik*. Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Gadjah Mada. p.174. 2012
- [9.] Hardiman, F.B. (Ed.)—*Ruang Publik Melacak "Partisipasi Demokratis" dari Polis sampai Cyberspace*. Jakarta: Kansius. 2009
- [10.] Prasetyo, Antonius Galih. 2012. *Menuju Demokrasi Rasional: Melacak Pemikiran Jurgen Habermas tentang Ruang Publik*. Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Gadjah Mada. p.177. 2012
- [11.] Prasetyo, Antonius Galih. 2012. *Menuju Demokrasi Rasional: Melacak Pemikiran Jurgen Habermas tentang Ruang Publik*. Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- [12.] Markus, Thomas A. & Cameron, Deborah. 2002. *The Words Between The Spaces, Buildings and Languages*. London: Routledge.
- [13.] Sibley, David. 1995. *Geographies Exclusion*. London: Routledge.
- [14.] Eisenring, Tommy S.S. 2017. *Sosiologi Perkotaan*. Makassar: Fahmi Pustaka.
- [15.] Manik, I.W.Y. 2007. *Pengaruh Demografi, Gaya Hidup, dan Aktivitas Terhadap Transformasi Tipomorfologi Hunian di Desa Bayung Gede Bali*. Tesis Arsitektur, ITB Bandung: tidak diterbitkan.
- [16.] Agger, B. 2012. *Teori Sosial Kritis*. Kreasi Wacana
- [17.] Nuryatno. 2008. *Mazhab Pendidikan Kritis*. Resist Book
- [18.] Agger, B. 2012. *Teori Sosial Kritis*. Kreasi Wacana
- [19.] Marx, Karl. 1973. *Grundrisse*, New York, London: Penguin Books.
- [20.] Surya, Batara. 2015. *Sosiologi Spasial Perkotaan, Gagasan dan Pengalaman Empiris*. Makassar: Fahmi Pustaka. p.51. 2015
- [21.] Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space—translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith*. Oxford UK: Blackwell Publishing. p.398. 1991
- [22.] Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space—translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith*. Oxford UK: Blackwell Publishing. p.391. 1991
- [23.] Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space—translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith*. Oxford UK: Blackwell Publishing. p.388. 1991
- [24.] Sunarto, Kamanto. 2004. *Pengantar Sosiologi*. Jakarta: Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Indonesia.
- [25.] Charon, Joel M. 1979. *Symbolic Interactionism*. United States of America: Prentice Hall Inc.
- [26.] Soeprapto, Riyadi. 2002. *Interaksi Simbolik, Perspektif Sosiologi Modern*. Yogyakarta: Averrpes Press dan Pustaka Pelajar.
- [27.] Turner, J.C. (1982). *Toward Cognitive Redifination of The Social Group*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.