



URBAN RENEWAL OF THE LUZ REGION IN SÃO PAULO: FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF ESPOLIATION UNDER NEOLIBERALISM AND FINANCIALIZATION TO THE CLASSE STRUGGLE

GUILHERME MOREIRA PETRELLA

Federal University of São Paulo, East Zone Campus - Instituto das Cidades - Av. Jacu-Pêssego, 2630 - Itaquera, São Paulo - SP, 08260-001 - (11) 5576-4848
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3882-2109>
E-mail: guilherme.petrella@unifesp.br

Recebido: 18/02/2019

Aprovado: 07/10/2020

ABSTRACT

The Luz region, in the center of São Paulo, has been the object of urban renewal plans since the 1970s, with a view to reversing socio-spatial degradation. Among these plans, those proposed in the 21st century converge in their ways of acting: spatial restructuring in the real estate and infrastructure overlapping carried out through public-private partnerships, which centralize productive capital (real), unproductive capital (fictitious) and the State (laws, financing, public policies and monopoly on the use of violence). They guide the immediate constitution of the global financial real estate complex. Despite the architectural and urbanistic strategies, with their differentiated formal conceptions, their “truth” is economic viability. In this sense, the “right to housing” appears and is realized as a “right to property”. Thus, property constitutes the structure of this form of urbanization and allows the privatization of social wealth through the arbitrary construction of the price of the real estate product, associated with indebtedness (public and private): a class domination and its proprietary fractions over production and the consumption of space, which, at the limit, indicates the survival of capital accumulation at the expense of the reproduction of life.

Keywords: Luz region, downtown São Paulo; urban renewal; Capitalized income; Financial real estate complex; right to the city

RESUMO

A região da Luz, centro de São Paulo, é objeto de planos de renovação urbana desde os anos 1970, visando reverter a degradação socioespacial. Dentre esses planos, os propostos no século XXI convergem por suas formas de atuação: reestruturação espacial no imbricamento imobiliário e infraestrutura realizada por meio de parcerias público-privadas, que centralizam capitais produtivos (real), capitais improdutivos (fictício) e Estado (leis, financiamentos, políticas públicas e monopólio do uso da violência). Eles orientam para a constituição imediata do complexo imobiliário financeiro global. Apesar das estratégias arquitetônicas e urbanísticas, com suas concepções formais diferenciadas, sua “verdade” é a viabilidade econômica. Nesse sentido, o “direito à moradia” aparece e se realiza como “direito à propriedade”. Assim, a propriedade se constitui como estrutura dessa forma de urbanização e permite a privatização da riqueza social por meio da construção arbitrária do preço do produto imobiliário, associada ao endividamento (público e privado): uma dominação de classe e suas frações proprietárias sobre a produção e o consumo do espaço que, no limite, indica a sobrevida da acumulação do capital em detrimento da reprodução da vida.

Palavras chave: Região da Luz, centro de São Paulo; Renovação urbana; Renda capitalizada; Complexo imobiliário financeiro; Direito à cidade.



INTRODUCTION

This work is part of a set of researches¹ that analyze *immediate* processes of space restructuring, particularly from the urban renewal of the Luz region, in the São Paulo's city center. It seeks to understand its specificities (architectural, urban, political, economic and ideological) by relating them to the restructuring of the metropolis as a whole, whose specificities of each of the situations make up a differentiated set in and of urbanization. However, in this differentiation there is the realization of strategies that are common (although their forms of manifestation can be distinguishable). They can also be observed in other regional and national contexts, which makes understanding the relationship between the local specificities of urban renewal and the global forms of its realization more complex.

Global forms are related to the institutional restructuring of the State and public policies based on the intensification of the neoliberalism agenda, which will extend, among others, the instrumentalization of space production as an economic means of absorbing the financial surplus. This promotes its reproduction from the spatial specificity of capitalist accumulation. Here, the capitalization of income, represented by *ownership*, both real estate and financial, structures the instrumentalization. This is related to the coalition of classes and their fractions that have their means of existence in *property*. They become hegemonic in the domain over the State and public policies, over the wealth socially produced by labor and in the way it is distributed. This is manifested in the predominance of forms of accumulation through dispossession (Petrella, Prieto, 2020), intensified in the production of space, accentuating the precariousness of the reproduction of life.

As an approximation to the level of totality (Lefebvre, 1999; Pereira (org.), 2018), the analysis seeks to emphasize *social reproduction*, which is increasingly subject

to political and economic imperatives, intensified by neoliberalism and financialization. *Political* in the sense that it refers to a class domain, owner of capital and land; *economic* insofar as its reproduction depends on the dispossession of the citizen in general, based on the predominance of capitalized income. Therefore, it constitutes a structure that streamlines the private appropriation of the common, ensured by the new state real estate and financial regulations (Petrella, 2017). And this implies the restructuring of urban plans for urban renewal. This new structure interacts with the social forms that take place in these territories, producing other forms of resistance and fight against it. In this sense, «social movements» become oriented by a socio-spatial problem, a new subjectivity constituted within the dispute for the use and value of space, which must be experienced, recognized and interpreted in the totality of everyday life and reproduction, the totality of life that must take place, speech, action and representation. Thus, from the experience of a “classless class struggle” (Thompson, 1979; Wood, 1983), these agents can restructure and emerge as another political and historical subject, emerging from the everyday experience of living in the metropolis.

ANALYSIS LEVELS AND DIMENSIONS

The real estate and urban restructuring of the São Paulo metropolis is a broad social process, involving political, economic and ideological dimensions that combine and are in motion (cf. Pereira (org.), 2016, 2017, 2018). Part of this set of transformations can be assessed from the particularity of architecture and urbanism as a field of knowledge that emerges from this real estate and urban dimension in the production of space. This specificity illuminates a form of articulation of levels and dimensions of analysis (Lefebvre, 1999). In terms of the *immediate*, there are relations of work, production (of things in

¹ Cf. Petrella, 2017; Pereira (org.), 2018

space and space itself, as social relations) and product, which are carried out based on local conditions and determinations. They are linked to a global dimension, related to broader political, economic and ideological processes of reproduction, which go beyond this strict immediate production, in a dynamic that goes beyond its limits and borders. In turn, this articulation constitutes a specific experience, of a specific historical time. Forms of production and social reproduction. This constitutes the *totality* of the contemporary, to be elucidated by the constant movement of critical, theoretical and practical reflection.

Urban renewal plans can be evaluated based on the overlapping of these levels of analysis. They are structured on public-private partnerships, which articulate the State (laws, financing, plans and public and social policies), producing agents (builders, designers, works) and financial agents (banks, pension and investment funds). Each plan in particular constitutes a Special Purpose Entity (SPE), a contract between public and private partners specific to the urban plan and whose domain is related to the contribution of financial resources from each of the respective agents: equivalent to a «share condominium» and to a «stock company». The purpose of the plan, however, is to ensure the *economic viability* of the set of investments and enterprises, which are distributed in social interest housing, collective facilities, public spaces, infrastructure and services. This feasibility defines the type of product, the forms of production, the social demand to be satisfied and the forms of financing and credit for production and consumption.

It is *modeled* on the assumption of valorization and capitalization that must be carried out after the restructuring of the space as a whole. This presupposition stems a priori from the expectation of «valorization and appreciation» of the region in relation to the difference in real estate offers across the metropolis, constituting (virtually) a local specificity (Petrella, 2017, 2020).

This expectation reduces the reach of public policies and urban forms of space, their various and possible uses, to the private logic of financial return, which takes shape from *real estate valuation*. It is structured to be privatized in these urban operations from the monopolization of real estate and financial property, which belong to the agents of this contract, given that its cost must be replaced at the end of the operation with an increase equivalent to any financial investment: the property price it is constituted by the appropriation of the surplus, although it has not contributed as a productive force. It is in this sense that it subordinates the forms of production and consumption of space, removing from it the presupposition of valorization and capitalization, in addition to intervening in the social metabolism of these territories.

On the other hand, these public-private partnerships incorporate capital that circulates in financial circuits of global composition and that come close to plans based on resources centralized in the agents of these consortia: capital opening of construction companies on the stock exchanges, pension funds of national and international companies that invest there, public debt securities. This fictitious surplus that «creates value without producing value», circulates around the globe in search of real estate and financial platforms of valorization (Paulani, 2008), absorbing the surplus in urbanization (Harvey, 2011) and reproducing it in a larger way through the space production (Petrella, 2017). This global financial composition defines rhythms and forms of production through which they momentarily land, as well as their products, social demands that carry out the investment and public policies. In this sense, the *presence of the State* in these situations is essential, either through the restructuring of the real estate and financial legal milestones, which come closer in this restructuring, or through the restructuring of public policies with urban expression. Therefore, it characterizes the intensification of the *neoliberal* advance that accentuates the presence of the State, but of a presence that is instrumentalized for the privatization of social production.

In this sense, the contemporary experience of urbanization differs from that predominantly carried out in the 20th century, which combined *extensive production in the periphery*, carried out in the absence of *the State* in the provision of housing, equipment and collective public services; with the intensification and verticalization in other regions of the metropolis, with the *presence of the State* in the provision of these facilities and public services (Pereira, 1988). In «peripheral absence», the general conditions for the reproduction of workforce and life are supplied by the work of the workers themselves. This was interpreted as the predominant urban form in industrial capitalist accumulation in Brazil: insofar as these territories are built by the obstinate domestic production of the workers themselves, the costs equivalent to this production, constituents of the consumption basket of the reproduction of the workforce, were removed from wages and, therefore, provided an increase in industrial profit without a proportional increase in the productive force, accentuating the exploitation of the labor force and the dispossession of the citizen (Oliveira, 2003).

In this situation, the social organization around «movements» sought to claim the *presence of the State*, the provision of housing, equipment, infrastructure and public services. Therefore, social struggles that extended from the *factory floor* to the *city floor*, elucidating the role of urbanization in capitalist accumulation not only as a result of typical factory accumulation, but conceiving the production of space as its driving element: the reproduction of relations of production (Kowarick, 1993; Sader, 1988). In the metropolis as a whole, the spatial differentiation in relation to social inequality was accentuated, combining them.

Although this *domestic production* in the periphery persists today, decreasing compared to the growing access to housing through rent, it can no longer be interpreted from the duality of absence-presence of the State: its *differentiated omnipresence* is realized in different territories and reiterates the differential forms of space production and social inequalities (Petrella, 2018). The State acts differently and in accordance with each of

the situations and claims. In parallel, not even the center-periphery duality has explanatory power. Spatial differences and social inequalities extend and intensify, combining at the level of social reproduction. What is highlighted at this moment is that the specifics of each of the situations are appropriated in a different way in this totality. The urban renewals of the 21st century are part of this movement: the omnipresence of the State and the popular occupation of the central area. All sorts of (in)formal or (ir)regular jobs and housing, which constitute a *peripheralization of the center*.

This brings us a *political problem*, in light of the constitution of urban social movements. We found that public provision takes place as an instrument of private appropriation based on partnerships and the emphasis placed on real estate and financial ownership (Petrella, 2017): reproduction based on capitalized income. Therefore, that political experience of claiming the *presence of the State*, as the presence of *sectorial* public policies (housing, health, education, etc.), can now be interpreted as an agent of intensifying worker exploitation and citizen dispossession. Condition exposed by the hegemony of neoliberal political economy and finance. These provisions contribute to the increase in the price of land, buildings and rent, making the reproduction of life precarious, in addition to not adapting to the real social demands present in these spaces and absent from these public (and private) policies. In this case, this form of provision reproduces the differentiation and inequality in principle (the form of distribution of the social product in and of the metropolis), in addition to allowing *particular* benefits and advantages within the differentiation, replacing disputes and conflicts, including, within the working class: by claiming a differentiated share of differentiation without denying *real estate valuation*, which is in itself differentiated, the socio-spatial inequality of origin and arising is naturalized. Thus, the fight for sectoral rights (right to housing, right to health, right to education, etc.), in short, as «rights in the city» carried out by urban renewal projects, although necessary, are not sufficient to reverse the historical process of intensifying the exploitation of the worker and the dispossession of

the citizen. It does not contain the process of *real estate valuation* and the monopoly of property as a means to propel the privatization of socially produced wealth, of the common.

This takes shape from the institutional restructuring of the State itself, dominated by patrimonialist (i)mobilist classes, which exacerbates its instrumentalization, orienting it towards the predominance of forms of accumulation that benefit this *partial* political and economic power, of property. This «instrument State», the result of the advance of neoliberalism, financialization and the hegemony of a new class coalition, restructures public policies, legal milestones, repressive systems in favor of the coalition. The *presence of the State* in these terms means, therefore, the presence of forms of unequal accumulation of socially constituted wealth.

In this real estate and urban production, *production for the market* tends to predominate over other forms of production. It tends to dominate and subordinate *state production* and *domestic production*, which come closer together under this domain: public works (markedly private through partnerships) that are intended for the population that accesses the urban through domestic relations of production (and consumption), become (re)oriented by the logic of reproduction related to economic viability, proposed (and presupposed) by the market. State and *market* act in tune with the same principles.

In this sense, the notion of *urban dispossession* (Kowarick, 1993), characterized in its origins as the dispossession of the citizen who does not have his right guaranteed due to the *absence of the State*, must be reinterpreted as the *dispossession* intensifies with the *presence of State*. It unfolds into two other notions that are exacerbated today: *real estate spoliation* and *financial spoliation*. Although different, they present themselves

as the predominant unit in the current form of space production, in the overlapping between incorporation and infrastructure under real estate and financial logic.

Real estate spoliation stems from the *centralization of property*, which allows for the accumulation of capital with regard to the formation of real estate income (increase in the price of land, buildings and rent). In this case, there is an accumulation of capital even without the presence of new *production*, without a new *valorization* process. And when there is, the cost related to access to the property, its price, must be replaced at the end of production, accumulating «interest»², just like any other financial investment. It is an accumulation that, by not producing more value, privatizes the surplus value that is socially produced. *Financial spoliation* is also not defined by the *absence* of financial resources or the State, but by the harassing presence of credits and forms of financing that expand their field of action through *indebtedness*.

It is seen as a means of dilapidation the conditions of reproduction of the labor force (over long periods, relative of the debt term) and as the expansion of capitalization frontiers to areas not previously taken over by the financial, such as public services (sanitation, energy, housing, etc.) which are privatized. The *credit market* provides *financial* products in place of state policies, appearing and performing as services.

These two approximate dimensions of dispossession take place in *urban renovations*. They allow the «fiction» of capitalization of real estate rent to find «real ballast» in the production of space, which absorbs (Harvey, 2011) and capitalizes on the surplus (Petrella, 2017). In addition to extending the (infernal) frontiers of accumulation by incorporating «marginal» territories and urban fabrics (Kowarick, 1977), deteriorated and obsolete in light of the differentiation of the metropolis.

² Interest is money that increases when invested in a production process. The person who «lends» this amount, receives it, at the end of the period pre-established in the contract, with an addition: interest. In the case of income – and this is why interest is noted here in quotation marks – the financial return does not result from production, but from the «permission» to use a monopolized asset in the form of property. In this way, a financial return is ensured without the counterpart of a real value production process. This increase, therefore, which does not come from a particular production, results from the privatization of a socially produced value, relegating, in this way, to the whole society the «weight of income and property», which benefits only a few. Therefore, although interest and income are similar in their «appearance», they must be differentiated in their «essence».

In these cases, the potential for additional construction exceptionally allowed by the plans (concentration of production forces) is identified with the *potential for real estate income* arising from the restructuring of the distribution of land and buildings (centralization of property forces), increasing when compared real estate income already realized under current conditions. It constitutes an increase in the income differential, a rent gap (Smith, 2007, 2015) whose difference appears as the limit of the assumption of valuation and capitalization of the financial investments to be made in the renovation. This *rent gap* engenders the increase in the general conditions of life reproduction, interfering with the existing socio-spatial metabolism (housing, work, services), eventually expelling the original population: a process of *gentrification* (Idem, ibidem). The reproduction of capital, therefore, takes place at the expense of precarious living conditions, adding *exploitation* and *dispossession*.

This *mercantile production* intensifies the *space commodification*, which unfolds from the private production strategies of *private gated communities* (Tone, 2010) to the domain of production and property in public urban perimeters of the metropolis (defined by urban renewal plans). It seeks to extend the domain over an urban morphology and its social relations of production and consumption, intensifying the notion of an «anti-urban enclave» within the «urban». However, this commodification encounters (and produces) a *counter-march of resistance*, making it necessary to recognize the socio-spatial relationships that experience and eventually escape this march. They appear as the *precariousness* that is aggravated by social inequality, given that parts of the population become invisible in these public-private policies (they are on the «margin» of the assumptions of carrying out the plans), as well as the illumination of the not-incorporated by this capitalist mercantile reproduction (situated as eventual frontiers of expansion). It constitutes, therefore, a double-sense of the *residual* (Lefebvre, 1999): as much leftover as the non-illuminated (blind field) by critical thinking. Both constituted as by-products of the march of commodification.

The *residue* appears, therefore, as the contradiction between the *possible-impossible* of social struggle in the spatial specificity of capitalist production and reproduction. In the residue, new fields of struggle. Initially as *resistance* (negation), later as a project (negation of negation, positive overcoming). In this sense, the question that arises is how the *experience of dispossession* can constitute forms of social resistance and, in the experience of this resistance, how it can constitute class consciousness. It is evident that this «class» can no longer be interpreted along the lines of the classic factory working class. Even though it unfolds from this conception, the daily experience of resistance to dispossession in the metropolis must incorporate the totality of forms of conception of life, other subjectivities that constitute the experience of political subjects. As a possibility, the constitution of a *differentiated unit* of the worker-citizen, as a socio-spatial class constituted against the expansion of commodification that makes the full reproduction of life unfeasible. This commodification is the combination of capital and land (Marx, 1985-1986, L.III, V.5, 269, 317), which dominate labor relations and dispute among themselves the predominance of forms of accumulation. *Capital* and *land* are in contradiction and in it the fissures must be opened by the struggle of *labor*. But this struggle has yet to be constituted as a recognized unit among the workers. As a class struggle that extends to the totality of life, to the space of social reproduction. The meaning of experience.

THE MEANING OF EXPERIENCE: RESISTANCE TO SPOLIATION

As seen, *accumulation by spoliation* differs from the traditional way of understanding *accumulation by exploitation* (although they remain related). As *exploitation*, work and production relations are the essence for its clarification. The economic forms of profit and interest are its manifestations. As *spoliation*, *ownership* relations define them. Ownership of land and capital. The cost paid to use them, to produce or to reproduce them as use and consumption, does not correspond to a direct

production of value, to a production process. The price of using a *monopoly* that constitutes an *income*. This is in line with analyzes of contemporary capitalism that have pointed to the *predominance* of forms of income in capitalist accumulation (Chesnais, 2005; Piketty, 2014; Harvey, 2016), relating to the monopoly of a space or capital.

In relation to space, rents differ according to the *concrete use*, such as *extractive rent* and *land rent* that benefit from the materiality of this space, the «fecundity» of the land and its elements taken from it; or, on the other hand, the *abstract use*, restricted to the spatial perimeter used as the basis for a (re)production, such as *real estate rent*. In this case, the property title acquires a price, a representation of value (although it has no value because it is not a product of labor) that must be replaced in the end without having been a *productive force*. In all these forms of income, they are linked to financial circuits, whose surpluses are created through *production* (interest-bearing capital) or simply through the use and exchange of *financial* properties, which generate «more value without producing value»: stock bonds, debt papers, currency exchange. Financial surpluses that are created detached from any immediate production, intrinsic to its circulation.

This poses a problem of *social reproduction* insofar as the presupposition of particular valorization and capitalization conditions, subordinates and submits broad social relations of reproduction of life (body and environment). On the contrary, it must be constituted, virtually, a *space of becoming*: common opposition to the extension of the infernal frontiers of capitalist accumulation, which extend and intensify to the detriment of the reproduction of life. In this way, the present presence of the State and the market, united, can be interpreted as a «reverse-presence», whose instrumentalization for the reproduction of capital, which discards the surplus that is «inappropriate» for accumulation, constitutes the need for *resistance*.

In this regard, the predominant forms of capitalist accumulation are given by the fictitious dimension of value, with the production of space being a necessary condition for the absorption and capitalization of the surplus. Thus, critical thinking must seek to recognize new social practices and their subjects, which allow for the imposition of barriers to the reproduction of capital, as well as the emergence of a (new) project for the constitution of becoming. A political *subject*, staged in the light of the experience of the class struggle (Thompson, 1979; Wood, 1983), who still forges the consciousness of himself as a class, despite daily experiencing dilapidating processes of dispossession. In this sense, the daily and spatial *experience* of resistance to dispossession can be seen as a moment of «consciousness raising», as a practice and criticism of the subordination of the reproduction of life. An experience that is oriented towards the constitution of the unity of the «socio-spatial subject» as a class. At the same time, this includes the critique and overcoming of *illusions* that reproduce theories and practices that are functional to capitalist reproduction: social struggles guided by the claim of sectoral policies, of acquisition of «rights to the city» predominantly experienced in the 20th century. These practices, although necessary, are taken by the reproduction of capital, becoming insufficient.

What would be the goal? Build citizen worker power as a class. Recognize in the *experience of resistance to dispossession* the differentiated unity of the working class, a socio-spatial class to be constituted. As an object and condition, it can illuminate the dimension of *spatial injustice*, which opens up in the face of the struggle for justice. This experience can provide anguish, revolt, protest and action. Not only for rights in the city, but for the very practical constitution of the *right to the city* (Lefebvre, 1981). Everything in the determined field of *resistance* to the march of commodification, a determined negation, with paths to a positive overcoming, the constitution of its own autonomous, creative project.

The moment of self-recognition as an unjustified worker before the dominant system must overcome the blind spot of space as a *place* of social reproduction and its experience. If the typical 20th century workers' struggles centered their efforts in the *factory* and in the *countryside*, as protagonists of history, today this experience is insufficient. The focus on manufacturing industry obscures the dynamics of spatial specificity, the absorption of economic surplus and its reproduction through property and income (in its different forms). This protagonism is disarticulated to the extent that the contemporary precariousness of work reduces the possibility of worker uprising through the traditional channels of trade unions and peasant movements, as they lose both their legitimacy of representation and, what is worse, their power and efficiency in the face of structuring of contemporary, neoliberal and financial capitalism. This means that other creative means of organizing workers must come to the surface. Theoretical emergence of a practice already experienced in its germ.

Self-recognition as a worker is born from an experience, for example, against the increase in the *price* of conditions for the reproduction of life (urban services such as sanitation, water, energy, spaces and public services). *Assessment* that is carried out with the purpose of financing the assumptions and expectations of financial return (capitalization) of the private companies that manage or dominate them (in light of privatizations, concessions and partnerships). But, it is not restricted to this, given that the *price* paid above the immediate benefits they represent extends to a variety of services and consumer goods. Therefore, «recognizing oneself» includes notions of *community* and *neighborhood* insofar as the daily experience of dispossession takes place in territories and populations located within the differentiated metropolis, not just about the individual. A *self*-recognition that passes through the recognition of the *other*, the «common enemy» that presents itself, as a phenomenon, from the action of the State reverse presence.

In this sense, critical, theoretical and practical action should contribute to extending the «rights in the city» for the constitution of the *right to the city* as a whole. And the difference between these expressions is from the perspective of *real estate valuation*: as long as access to the right remains mediated by property, real estate or financial dispossession, there is no possibility of overcoming it. On the other hand, the *common enemy* is not limited to the practices of the State reverse presence. It is related to «parallel» powers and organizations: organized crime, new forms of religious sociability and intensively experimented non-governmental organizations. They position themselves as a mediating layer in the awareness of the social class, covering their particular economic benefits and subordinating populations through their respective means of subjectivation, but also of power and violence.

The enterprise of self-recognition includes conceptions of life and identities that are manifested in social reproduction and in everyday life. *Class* can no longer be summarized and reduced to its role within *factory production*, which abstracts specificities due to the abstract nature of work. In the virtual constitution of the socio-spatial class, an experience that is based on the diversification of ways of reproducing life, they include different diversities and identities. Their training must start from the recognition of these *differences*. The neglect of these issues only exacerbates the disunity and mistrust among its agents: the *recognition* and *belonging* of the «working class» are conditioned by the *full* acceptance of the subject who recognizes his belonging: subjectivity, social ties, relationships, practices and forms of happiness. Conceptions of life that constitute the *differentiated-unity* – as well as the production of space – insofar as the experience of what is lived, from work to non-work, includes the totality of life and expands the conditions of recognition and belonging as complete human beings. In a word, the differential forms of life, related to the differential forms of production of space, constitute the place of the differentiated-unity of the socio-spatial class.

The great obstacle is the *culture of the merchandise*, which mediates and operates the deviation of the (spoiled) citizen towards the notion of consumer. A deviation that takes place on the understanding that access to rights takes place through the consumption of goods and services, which will also manifest itself as the consumption of the space itself. The centrality of the consumer (which includes the practical experience of the «non-consumer», as the good dialectic tells us), provides the experience of lack and *frustration*. Individual and subjective drives that obscure the (ir) rationality of the capitalist reproduction system as a whole, fictitious and excluding. The need to convert the «individual drives» into a differentiated unit of the workers' struggle is highlighted. A common *struggle*: the resumption of the notion of citizenship for the right to the city, to the detriment of consumption drives.

The commodity culture, the commodification of space (and of life itself), expresses the advance of the objective and subjective domain of capital over labor. The worker-citizen starts to recognize himself as an investor, small owner, entrepreneur, structuring his daily action based on calculation and economic income (Martins, 2000). In this way, *class consciousness* remains bewitched under the fetish of alienation, which stems from real practices (access to rights through consumption, capitalization allowed by property), but not true ones. This has implications for the social production of space: the construction of *needs and desires* that are functional to the reproduction of capital and not necessarily to the integral reproduction of life, in all its differentiated power, humanly adequate production (Lefebvre, 1971). This mystifying layer weakens the notions of *history and collectivity* (social production), as a practice reduced to emblems of buying and selling goods and rights (including those of state origin).

So *ideas and practices* have to become dangerous again. It is not enough to stick to social movements and their current practices, but to try to elucidate the contradiction in order to instruct the movement from the perspective of radical change: not reformist, but revolutionary. This condition can be accessed not by guaranteeing rights in the city, but by the

very constitution of the right to the city through the decommodification of space and life, income and indebtedness, whose daily experience, resistance and project, can call into question the structure of capital reproduction. As it is conditioned by dispossession processes, income and fictitious accumulation, the denial of the *nature of property* must be practically undertaken: the connections and fissures between real estate and financial dynamics, in the light of the neoliberal and financial State, in addition to the hegemony of the owner class. Alongside the recognition of the worker's differentiated unity in its integral re-production, which brings to light the spatial experience. Against the submission of the reproduction of life to the mercantile culture of the reproduction of capital.

Dispossessed of the world, unite!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHESNAIS, François (org.). A finança mundializada. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2005.

HARVEY, David. O enigma do Capital e as crises do Capitalismo. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011.

HARVEY, David. 17 contradições e o fim do capitalismo. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2016.

KOWARICK, Lúcio. Capitalismo e marginalidade na América Latina. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1977.

KOWARICK, Lúcio. A espoliação Urbana. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1993.

LEFEBVRE, Henri. El materialismo dialectico. Buenos Aires: Pleyade, 1971.

LEFEBVRE, Henri. O direito à cidade. São Paulo: Moraes, 1981.

LEFEBVRE, Henri. A revolução urbana. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 1999.

MARTINS, José de Souza. A sociabilidade do homem simples. São Paulo: Hucitec, 2000.

MARX, Karl. O Capital: crítica da economia política. São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1985-1986.

OLIVEIRA, Francisco. Crítica a razão dualista: o ornitorrinco. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2003.

PAULANI, Leda. Brasil delivery: servidão financeira e estado de emergência econômico. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2008.

PEREIRA, Paulo Cesar Xavier. Espaço, Técnica e Construção: o desenvolvimento das técnicas construtivas e a urbanização do morar em São Paulo. São Paulo: Nobel, 1988.

PEREIRA, Paulo Cesar Xavier (org.). Reconfiguração das cidades contemporâneas: contradições e conflitos. São Paulo: FAUUSP, 2016.

PEREIRA, Paulo Cesar Xavier (org.). Produção imobiliária e reconfiguração da cidade contemporânea. São Paulo: FAUUSP, 2017. Disponível em: <http://www.livrosabertos.sibi.usp.br/portaldelivrosUSP/catalog/book/284>

PEREIRA, Paulo Cesar Xavier (org.). Imediato, global e total na produção do espaço: financeirização da cidade de São Paulo. São Paulo: FAUUSP, 2018. Disponível em: <http://www.livrosabertos.sibi.usp.br/portaldelivrosUSP/catalog/book/302>

PETRELLA, Guilherme Moreira. A fronteira infernal da renovação urbana em São Paulo: região da Luz no século XXI. São Paulo: Tese de Doutorado FAUUSP, 2017. Disponível em: <https://teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/16/16137/tde-29062017-132232/pt-br.php>

PETRELLA, Guilherme Moreira. A construção arbitrária do preço do produto imobiliário e a natureza da renda na condominialização da cidade de São Paulo. arq.Urb, (28), 155-175. Disponível em: <https://revistaarqurb.com.br/arqurb/article/view/443>

PETRELLA, Guilherme Moreira. Aprendendo com a São Paulo delirante: reestruturação imobiliária, movimentos sociais e espoliação. In: PEREIRA, P.C.X. (org.). Imediato, global e total na produção do espaço: a financeirização da cidade de São Paulo no século XXI. São Paulo: FAUUSP, 2018, p. 163-195.

PETRELLA, Guilherme Moreira; PRIETO, Gustavo Francisco Teixeira. Os fantasmas se divertem: propriedade privada, expropriação e interdição ao direito à cidade. Revista Direito e Práxis, [S.l.], v. 11, n. 1, p. 562-590, mar. 2020. ISSN 2179-8966. Disponível em: <<https://www.e-publicacoes.uerj.br/index.php/revistaceaju/article/view/48291/32643>>.

PIKETTY, Thomas. O capital no século XXI. Rio de Janeiro: Intrínseca, 2014.

SADER, Eder. Quando novos personagens entraram em cena: experiências, falas e lutas dos trabalhadores da Grande São Paulo, 1970-80. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1988.

SMITH, Neil. Gentrificação, a fronteira e a reestruturação do espaço urbano. São Paulo: Revista GEOUSP, Espaço, Tempo, Nº 21, pp. 15-31, 2007.

SMITH, Neil. Gentrificación urbana y desarrollo desigual. Barcelona: Icaria Editorial, 2015.

THOMPSON, Edward. Tradición, revuelta y consciencia de clase: estudios sobre la crisis de la sociedad preindustrial. Barcelona: Editorial Crítica, 1979.

TONE, Beatriz. Notas sobre a valorização imobiliária em São Paulo na era do capital fictício. São Paulo: FAUUSP, Mestrado, 2010.

WOOD, Ellen Meiksins. El concepto de clase en E. P. Thompson. Publicado en Cuadernos Políticos, número 36, Ediciones Era, México, pp.87-105, 1983.

This article stems from the doctoral research defended in 2017 at the Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism of the University of São Paulo, under the guidance of prof. Dr. Paulo Cesar Xavier Pereira.