

**The production of urban space in the contemporary city and its resulting
urban phenomena**

Pâmela Fernanda Rodrigues Bezerra

Masters in Territorial Development and Planning, PUC Goiás, Brazil
arquitetapamelafernanda@gmail.com

Lúcia Maria Moraes

Doctor, PUC-GO, Brazil
Lucia.dhescmoradia@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The article aims to discuss the production and reproduction of urban space, demonstrating how these socio-spatial dynamics occur and that urban phenomena can occur on consolidated land. Contemporary medium-sized cities undergo growing urbanization and among these occurrences generate segregation, a spreading out, gentrification and witness both land and real estate speculation. Most of these occur as a function of capital or with some kind of intervention by it. It seeks to demonstrate how the production of urban space takes place and which agents are involved in it, in addition to looking at what the relationship between them is: namely capitalist social relations and relations of production. Urban land is a product considered a commodity, and this is the object of a struggle between social classes for access to land. Urban space, considered central and endowed with infrastructure, is, in most cases, appropriated by those who have the greatest amount of capital, leaving the lower social strata with less purchasing power to purchase in peripheral areas often with little or no infrastructure. The methodology used was exploratory with a qualitative approach, with reference to authors with scientific mastery of the subject.

KEYWORDS: Urban Segregation. Appropriation of space Commodity Space.

1 INTRODUCTION

An understanding regarding the production and appropriation of space in capitalist society has become an element of fundamental importance such that it can conceptualize, describe and analyze the contemporary city. This includes elements such as capitalist social relations and relations of production.

The production and reproduction of urban space occurs due to the relationship between dominant and dominated. The ruling class, in partnership with the State, produces and reproduces space, determining where and how a portion of the population will appropriate it. The dominated also produce areas, but are subordinate to the ruling class.

Space is the object of class struggle, and whoever has the most capital wins this dispute. The ruling classes, in which there are large industrialists, large companies and developers, are generally at the top of the dispute for land grabbing.

Thus, the following questions are necessary: How is urban space produced? Are there disputes over access to urban land? What is the relationship between dominant and dominated?

2 OBJECTIVES

In view of this, the objective is to describe how the production and reproduction of space occurs, so that the reader understands the relationship between the classes and their struggle for access to land in the contemporary city.

3 METHODOLOGY

Initially, how the construction and formation of space in the contemporary city take place will be explained. Then, how spatial dynamics are in this new period will be outlined. Finally, the processes and agents that produce space in the contemporary environment will be identified.

The methodology used is exploratory, using a qualitative approach, during which books and articles were used to develop this article.

They served as a theoretical contribution to the considerations to be presented by authors of international and national importance, namely Harvey (1980), Arantes (1998), Caldeira (2000), Carlos (2011 and 2013), Corrêa (1989 and 2013), Serpa (2013), Sposito (2013), Vainer (2000) and Villaça (2001).

4 THE CONSTRUCTION AND FORMATION OF SPACE

One of the most striking characteristics of cities today is the transformation of space into a commodity; it is the space consumed. In the words of Carlos (2011, p. 91), “the production process, under capitalism, transforms space into a commodity... earning it value”. The urban environment is treated as a commodity sold to those who own capital, which can be, for example, the private sector as the large developers, which produce and reproduce the place, often making it speculative.

Referring to land as a commodity, Ribeiro (2015, p. 39) states “[...] that land is an unproduced good that, therefore, has no value, but acquires a price”. Now if the land was not produced, then it is not a commodity, but it is considered as one, and has a price.

The capitalist city can be thought of as an object of capital accumulation. Around this object, there are disparities and inequalities. The capitalist city is the object of speculation.

It is noted that the city is fragmented, segregated, irregular in form and content. This division can occur according to socioeconomic criteria, which produce and reproduce the space of the contemporary city. These characteristic peculiarities are produced by factors such as the processes of formation of space and also by social agents who produce space. Corrêa (1989, p.12) explains that there are 5 agents: the owners of the means of production; landowners; real estate developers; the state; and low-income social groups.

The owners of the means of production are the industrial owners and the owners of large enterprises. The landowners are the property owners. Real estate developers are all agents involved with property that assist in some way in the production and reproduction of space and maybe developers, financing agencies, civil engineers and architects, construction companies, and marketing companies. The State is the government institution, such as municipalities, that institute and legislate how space is produced, the State itself is represented by the ruling classes, among others. The excluded social groups are the people with the lowest purchasing power.

Socioeconomic and socio-spatial relations will determine how the production and reproduction of space in today's cities will occur. As pointed out by Carlos (2011, p. 13), “social relations take place in the condition of spatial relations, which means that geographical analysis reveals the world as a socio-spatial practice”. The production of space is linked to the historical period in which it occurs, and there is also no way to dissociate the social from the spatial (since these are interrelated) when discussing the production and reproduction of space.

4.1 THE SPATIAL DYNAMICS

Understanding the dynamics of the contemporary period is an investigative process into this subject. In the incessant search for understanding on this object of study, reference theorists such as Harvey (1980), who emphasizes the contributions of Karl Marx, were consulted for a better understanding of the influence of capital in cities. Corrêa (1989), Carlos (2011), Serpa (2013), Vainer (2000), Sposito (2013), make up this theoretical contribution.

According to Carlos (2013, p. 95), “the production of urban space is thus based on the contradiction between the social production of the city and its private appropriation”. Thus, the urban dynamics of the new period is formed by inequalities and contradictions. Space has become a product of capital accumulation. Thus, it can be noted that it is constituted by contradictions formed by dominants and dominated, that is, by relations of domination.

The author (2011, p. 17) states that “the production of space is part of the production of the material and objective conditions of the production of human history”. The existence of the land monopoly ensured the control of access to and land use. In this way, the profit of these landowners would be secured through the rent of the land.

In urban centers, one can observe the presence of large empty areas, without any

investment by the owner, certainly waiting for real estate appreciation, a remarkable feature in the city of Rondonópolis. This difference in value that the owner profits from buying the property and selling it when urban benefits and infrastructure are deployed by the State is what consolidates land income. For Singer (2017, s.p.),

The "appreciation" of the land is anticipated due to changes in the urban structure that are still to happen, and therefore the speculator is willing to wait a certain period, which can be quite long until these favorable conditions have been fulfilled.

Land income can be classified into monopoly income, differential income, and absolute income.

Monopoly income, as explained by Harvey (1980, p. 153), "arises because it is possible to record a monopoly price". This price is determined by the market and the price of the goods or even the urban benefits and infrastructure to be installed in the future. All these factors influence the monopoly income of urban land. Thus, Carlos (2011, p. 99) points out that "the ownership of urban land as a monopoly allows not only the realization of the value of a fragment, but also the appropriation of all the work that is synthesized in the production of the city", which highlights the land rent.

Harvey (1980) describes how this type of income in the city has become fundamental in the process of obtaining land income, which allows the maximum profit to the urban landowner, a factor that clearly shows the difficult access for the low-income population to buy a plot for the construction of their house. Real estate developers also appropriate this type of income.

Referring to the action of real estate developers, Singer (2017, s.p.) clarifies that "the differential rent is paid by companies, in view of the higher profits that each specific location provides them."

For Ribeiro (2015, p. 58), "differential income originates from the higher productivity of labor carried out under conditions of 1) greater fertility of the land; 2) better location in relation to the consumer market; and 3) application of a greater amount of capital". Also, according to the author (2015), these conditions are advantages, which allow the emergence of a supplementary profit in relation to the average profit, transforming it into land rent. This differential income stems from the discrepancy between the individual production price and the general production price.

Differential income sometimes arises from the institution of private property; its consolidation occurs in three aspects. The first refers to soil fertility when it comes to the field; the second refers to the location of the land and the distance between its consumer market, in this case, the distance can be used as an advantage by the landowner; and, finally, the productive infrastructure and transport cost relations that demonstrate the capital applied in the productive capacity (HARVEY, 1980); the latter provided that it has been amortized in the soil.

The author (1980, p.162) clarifies that "income is the part of the exchange value that is intended for the owner and possessor of the land". Understanding the concepts of exchange-value use-value is of fundamental importance in the process of understanding land income. In Harvey's understanding (1980, p. 132), "Marx gave a lot of attention to the meaning of use value and exchange value in capitalist society". Thus, the insights mentioned by the author that the use value is only a value in exchange, becomes evident, and it is consolidated in consumption, and these are used as means of existence.

The exchange value is determined by the amount of labor applied in the production process of the commodity intended for human consumption. As pointed out by Harvey (1980), "the commodity has value when used by its owner only to the extent that it is an exchange

value". Thus, Carlos (2011, p. 115) clarifies that "the inhabitant buys the house for his use" (use value), and "the investor buys a property for rent" (attributing it an exchange value). Thus, income is generated for the investor. The use of this example demonstrates the use value and exchange value in practice.

Income also has the role of designating land use. Soil income is determined by the value of soil productivity added to the cost of transportation and the proximity of consumer markets. Soil is therefore considered a commodity, but not just any commodity. In Harvey's words (1980, p. 159), some aspects must be taken into account. Among these aspects, we highlight (1) "the rents of the soil are determined by the price of the basic commodity". Thus, (2) the value of the soil is determined by the supposed improvements to be implemented in the future. Carlos (2011, p. 99) categorically clarifies that (3) "the price of urban soil appears as a finished expression of the work process, that is, as time accumulated in its morphology".

This demonstrates that urban space, that is, urban land, has been transformed into a commodity and the city is sold in a fragmented way in subdivisions. The concept of commodity began to be used as a concept by the new urban planners. Vainer (2000, p. 78) states that "the city is a commodity to be sold, in an extremely competitive market, in which other cities are for sale". This urban marketing has been used as a strategy by the market, thus being used as a guideline for urban planning and managers of contemporary cities. For Carlos (2013, p. 100),

..the movement towards the reproduction of space, founded on the fragmentation of the city plots, gains a broader dimension: what is for sale, in addition to its plots is the metropolis itself through strategic planning and urban marketing.

In the contemporary city, the submission of urban planning to the capitalist logic of the market becomes noticeable. By promoting the sale of a city such as the municipality of Rondonópolis-MT, the image of this city is produced through the use of City Marketing. Vainer (2000, p. 81) states that the image that is deployed is of a "fair and democratic" city, but, in reality, what one has are cities full of contradictions.

In fact, what is perceived is that the city is considered a commodity of high added value, destined for a population with greater powers of economic acquisition, which generates an increase in real estate speculation, shown in chapter 5.

The process of construction and formation of space, a contemporary period, occurs due to the dynamics of capital accumulation. Carlos (2011, p. 15) states that "the production of space opens up, therefore, as a possibility of understanding the contemporary world". Thus, it is noted that these are characterized as physical places of social struggle. According to the thoughts of Corrêa (1989, p.11), the capitalist urban space is "fragmented, articulated, reflective, social conditioned, full of symbols and a field of struggles".

Carlos (2011, p. 91) states that "space presents itself as one of human productions". Therefore, this understanding leads us to believe that, if space is a human production, then it consists of contradictions to be understood according to a more detailed analysis of the processes and agents that form space in the contemporary city.

In order to understand spatial dynamics, it is necessary to understand, strictly, the concepts related to the processes that form space and, consequently, the agents that form it.

4.2 THE PROCESSES AND THE AGENTS PRODUCING SPACE

The spatial processes that constitute the urban space of the contemporary city were initially addressed earlier in this discussion and, also later, as the theme relating to the producing agents of this urban area today. Corrêa (2013, p. 44) clarifies that "social processes and social agents are inseparable, fundamental elements of society and its movement", which highlights

the city as a living organism.

The research carried out by Carlos (2013, p. 103) concludes that “socio-spatial inequality deepens, by the incorporation of all space as a condition of the extension of the world of commodities”. Capitalist cities, especially contemporary ones, are characterized by great socioeconomic inequalities, which are promoted by the accumulation of capital and by different processes of production of places.

The process of surface production can occur by different modes and thus result in different spatial forms in cities. To understand this dynamic is to understand the contemporary city.

Corrêa (1989) produced analyzes of great scientific relevance regarding the processes and agents that produce space and also about the science of urban studies, which contributed to the enrichment of this article.

The analyzes carried out by the author (1989) demonstrate that there are six types of spatial processes and forms, namely: centralization and central area; decentralization and secondary nuclei; cohesion and specialized areas; segregation and social areas; spatial dynamics of segregation and, finally, inertia of crystallized areas.

Centralization and the central area have as characteristics the main activities of the cities. Corrêa (1989, p. 38) states that “it focuses on the main commercial activities, services, public and private management, and inter-regional and intra-urban transport terminals”. Centralization is now considered an urban phenomenon by scholars in the 20th century.

Capitalist cities are characterized by the connection they have with the outside world. These centralities emerged together with the rise of capitalism. The author (1989, p. 38) states that centralities arose due to “the flow of capital, commodities, people, and ideas”. In this regard, Sposito (2013, p. 73) says that centrality “is not a place or an area of the city, but rather the central condition and expression that an area can exercise and represent”. The researcher also states that the centrality is abstract, as it can hardly be mapped or mapped via satellite; it can be displaced according to the conduct of the State's economic policies.

Due to the concentration of existing activities in the centralities, it is noted that properties located in these regions are more valued in relation to those located in the peripheral areas of the cities. Corrêa (1989, p. 40) says that “the central location was a crucial factor in capitalist competition”.

After World War II, there was considerable decentralized growth in the central areas of cities. These began to host activities that were centrally located. Corrêa (1989, p. 44) makes it clear that the tendency of the central area goes through a “functional redefinition, becoming the main focus of management activities and specialized service offices, while retail trade and certain services are dispersed throughout the city”.

Therefore, the central area possesses the main management activities and specialized services, and the dispersion of other services and businesses remains. Sposito (2013, p. 73) says that the central areas of cities, where they locate “commercial activities and services, can, on the contrary, be empirically apprehended, in a much more direct way; therefore, we work in them, we walk along these paths” [...], we live the day of the city, functioning as living organisms acting in an influential manner on other areas.

This decentralization is a production process carried out by the State and capital. In the words of Arantes (1998, p.138 and 139):

Everything happens as if the ideology of the public space, saving the rhetorical moment of the sentence (official or diffusely oppositional), were enunciated directly by the physiognomy of the cities, now defined by a business strategy of a new type, which determines with its own logic the parameters of its intervention, relocating populations and equipment according to the great fluctuations of the market.

Decentralization is a phenomenon that occurs due to several locational factors such as the high cost of taxes and rents, high transport and communication costs, and limited horizontal growth, among others.

For the phenomenon to occur, other locations in the cities need to offer advantages that generate new areas of attraction. The advantages are land and taxes at low cost, implementation of infrastructure carried out by the government, accessibility to the transport network and control of land use.

A fact linked to decentralization is urban growth. The expansion of urban centers along with population and demographic growth encourages competition in the consumer market. Corrêa (1989, p. 47), in his studies, states that “decentralization becomes a means of maintaining a rate of profit that the exclusive central location is no longer able to provide”.

For Singer (2017, s.p.),

As the city grows, secondary service centers emerge in neighborhoods, which form new focuses of valorization for urban space. Urban growth necessarily implies a restructuring of the use of already occupied areas. So, for example, the main center has to expand as the population it serves increases. This expansion comes up against the "exclusive" residential neighborhoods that surround it, determining the displacement of its inhabitants to new "exclusive" residential areas, providentially created by real estate developers. The residential ring that surrounds the main center is devalued and becomes occupied by inferior services: nightlife and prostitution venues, second-class hotels, hostels, and – in more advanced stages of decay – by tenements, marginals, etc. Once the main center of an area is caught up in social decomposition it creates conditions for real estate speculation to offer the city's central services a new area of expansion. Thus a “new center” emerges in contrast to the “old center”.

Decentralization is characterized by the emergence of several secondary nuclei throughout the city. Thus, the urban and economic dynamics of the city are renewed, giving rise to places for new investments; thus, new spaces are produced in the city with polycentralities. According to the author's understanding (2013, p. 101), "the center deteriorates with the displacement of economic activities and services, leisure centers, party places in the metropolitan space as a movement of centrality that spreads".

Sposito (2013, p. 72) points out that:

..the implementation of urban transport systems, firstly by rail (suburban trams and trains, followed by the subway) and then, above all, the automotive matrix (buses, cars, trucks, motorcycles, etc.) generate technical and functional conditions for a city in expansion.

The process of spreading the centralities can give rise to a process of cohesion of activities in spaces differentiated by the city. Several centralities may occur and these are objects of dispute for access to land. As pointed out by Villaça (1929, p.329 and 330),

With regard to intra-urban locations, all activities – no matter how different their locational requirements – have a common interest: accessibility to the center. This interest in centrality is the very *raison d'être* of the city as a spatial organism. Without it, the cities wouldn't exist. Therefore, however different they may be – as they really are - the locational requirements of residence, secondary and tertiary, all compete for proximity to the urban center, even if they are located on the most distant periphery.

Cohesion is characterized as a functional set of activities that are located together.

Typical examples of this process are shopping malls or streets, avenues, and neighborhoods with services specialized in providing services. This phenomenon can occur in central areas, but also in other areas of the cities.

The phenomena resulting from the spatial processes of centralization and the central area, decentralization and the secondary nuclei and cohesion, as well as the specialized areas are related to commercial and industrial issues of the cities, that is, the economic division of space.

For Carlos (2013, p. 95), segregation is “a fundamental characteristic of the production of contemporary urban space”. The phenomenon of segregation and social areas are part of the social problems of urban centers. According to Corrêa (1989, p. 59), segregation defines “the social division of space”. Residential segregation means the concentration of a certain portion of the population in a territory. It can be spontaneous, a process resulting from the domination of different social groups that control access to space, such as closed condominiums, and/or planned by the State, such as the construction of housing complexes in peripheral areas of cities.

Alvarez (2013, p. 113) notes in one of his statements that “segregation is the product and condition of capitalist urbanization, it is more profoundly so in countries on the periphery of capitalism”. Segregation is more noticeable in the peripheral countries and in the metropolises of these countries, but this does not mean that it does not exist in small and medium-sized cities, such as the municipality of Rondonópolis-MT.

The term segregation, reading between the lines, acknowledges its link to income. In the societies of Latin American countries, the cheapest lands are usually located on the peripheries, in neighborhoods with little or no infrastructure, and their sale is destined to that part of the population that has lower incomes. The real estate market acts in a perverse way, reaching the point of creating peripheral areas for its own future processing. Singer (2017, s.p.) uses as an example of one that occurred in the city of São Paulo:

In São Paulo, the promoters attract poor families to these lots, assuring them of the long-term payment of the land and modest installments and also providing them with construction material for free so that they can raise their huts in a joint effort regime, on weekends. It will be this population that, once installed on the site, will pressure the government to obtain urban services, which to reach them must necessarily pass through the unoccupied part of the glebe, which is thus valued.

There is also self-segregation. This type of thing occurs voluntarily. The ruling class has begun to occupy closed horizontal condominiums, surrounded by walls, characterized by their own surveillance systems, and composed of an entire infrastructure. Rodrigues (2013, p. 147) demonstrates in his contributions that closed condominiums “should be understood as a single form of socio-spatial segregation and as a specific real estate product”.

According to Caldeira (2000, p. 259), speaking of the closed horizontal condominiums, “the fortified enclaves confer status. The construction of a status symbol is a process that elaborates social differences and creates means for affirming distance and social inequalities”.

For the author (2000, p. 258), “closed condominiums are the most desirable type for the upper class”. The success of the fortified enclaves brings in its conception the valorization of the private, the devaluation of the public space of the city, and the social separation by walls; it represents the highest level of capital accumulation in the process of production and reproduction of space in the contemporary city. According to Singer (2017, s.p.),

The functioning of the real estate market makes the occupation of these areas a privilege for the different levels with the highest income, capable of paying a high price for the right to live. The poorest population is relegated to the most underserved areas and is therefore cheaper.

It is undeniable that the implementation of these horizontal condominiums in cities has produced impacts on space and the perception of use of space in cities. Its implementation promoted the redefinition of the form and content of cities, as well as the redefinition of the production and reproduction of urban space in the contemporary city. Rodrigues (2013, p. 148) states that “the resulting segregation of the walls has to be understood according to the economic, social, cultural and political processes”.

According to Caldeira (2000, p. 259), the fortified enclaves “are controlled by armed guards and security systems, which impose the rules of inclusion and exclusion”. The high rates of violence in cities are used as an element for the expansion of these condominiums, because, according to the conception of Real Estate developers, violence exists only outside the walls of these condominiums, which are called fortified enclaves.

A considerable amount of these fortified enclaves are located far from the center of the cities, being located in areas close to the peripheries, and of course, surrounded by walls and armed guards and far from the poorer occupations (CALDEIRA, 2000).

Spaces such as closed horizontal condominiums, intended for the dominant classes, can be located close to public spaces that have investments, such as in parks, which often function as places of social control. Serpa (2013, p. 171) argues in one of his statements that “the public park is a means of social control, especially for the middle classes, the final destination of public policies”. Thus, the process of production and reproduction of space in the contemporary city is perceived.

The implementation of parks began to occur more intensely in the contemporary period, especially in areas destined for the middle classes; this is a demonstration of urban soil valorization in these locations. According to Serpa (2013, p. 173), “the public park is above all a space with high patrimonial value”; it is a space managed under the logic of the market, in which the sale of a beautiful landscape is explicit.

Thus, what is perceived is that the ruling class has control of the urban lands of cities; thus, it controls access to urban land, thus promoting social discrimination. Carlos (2011, p. 116), in one of his reflections, states that “access to the city is through the mediation of the market”. Therefore, the market has control of city spaces and controls them through power relations.

The segregation imposed occurs when the State or the ruling class selects the social class that will occupy certain regions or spaces of the city in different temporalities. Corrêa (1989, p. 69) states that “segregation is dynamic, involving space and time”. This type of process is characteristic of the capitalist system, as it results from the implications of economic inequalities on space.

The author (1989, p. 76) makes it clear that inertia and crystallized areas are defined “by the permanence of certain uses in certain places”. In this case, there is no change either in form or content, since these areas crystallize. The local strength that these subjects have in staying in these places creates a movement of local attraction in the neighborhood that reinforces the crystallization of these areas by the cities.

In order for all these processes of production of space to be consolidated in the contemporary city, the performance of social agents producing space is also perceived. Corrêa (2013, p. 44) states that “it is the social agents who materialize social processes in the form of a built environment”.

As pointed out by the author (1989, p. 11), social agents “produce and consume space”, and promote the transformation of the place through concrete actions, which are interconnected with the accumulation of capital, thus promoting the production and reproduction of capital.

The same author (1989, p. 11), in his research on urban space, presents five types of social agents, namely: the owners of the means of production; the landowners; the real estate

developers; the State; and, finally, the excluded social groups. As can be seen, most of these agents act on behalf of the ruling class. It is clearly noted that these act in the name of a capitalist, neoliberal ideology. According to the conceptions of Corrêa (2013, p. 43), the production of urban space is

...a consequence of the action of concrete, historical social agents, endowed with their own interests, strategies and spatial practices, carriers of contradictions and generators of conflicts between themselves and other segments of society.

The actions of social agents are regulated by regulatory frameworks, such as laws, decrees, statutes, and master plans, which mainly favor the ruling class. The adoption of neoliberal policies in the urban planning of cities contributes to the process of consolidation of space in commodity form. Alvarez (2013, p. 120) demonstrates that “in the course of the development of the capitalist crisis and the adoption of neoliberal measures, the State has increasingly transferred to the private initiative the conduct of urban intervention processes”. Thus, the owners of the means of production now have control of production and over the reproduction of space.

Carlos (2013, p. 103) provides us with food for thought with the following statement: “the reproduction of urban space signals, in its unfolding, the production of the metropolis subordinate to the particular interests of big capital”. This statement is used as a guiding axis in the planning of cities and a path to be followed by the owners of the means of production.

The owners of the means of production can be defined as social agents who consume large portions of space as a result of their activities. Included in this group are the big industrialists and traders. These agents seek spaces that have good logistics, usually with complete urban infrastructure. According to Corrêa (1989, p. 13), they need “ample and cheap land that meets locational requirements pertinent to the activities of their companies”. In some cases, landowners seek to make maximum profit in these negotiations, which can impact the price of goods and products.

Landowners promote land speculation in the urban space of cities. They raise the price of urban land, thus consolidating the process of obtaining land income as much as possible with land income, in addition to controlling the supply of land in cities. It should not be forgotten that landowners control the space of the city through their actions. In this regard, the author (1989, p. 16) states that landowners

are particularly interested in the conversion of rural land into urban land, that is, they have an interest in expanding the city's space to the extent that urban land is more valued than rural land. This means that they are fundamentally interested in the exchange value of the land and not in its use value.

The conversion of rural lands into urban lands is consolidated by the occurrence of pressure directed at the State and the legislative power in the municipal chambers of the cities. In several Brazilian urban centers, landowners carry out the subdivision of their lands located in the rural areas of the cities, with the view to maximizing their profits with the sale of irregular lots located on the outskirts of the cities, in order to force the State to authorize the urban expansion of the cities. These lots are sold with few demands on the consumer and with the provision of minimal infrastructure. The real estate appreciation caused by the arrival of urban infrastructure in these neighborhoods is responsible for the heating in the real estate market.

Corrêa (1989, p. 18) states that “it is possible for landowners to also become real estate developers”. They carry out activities such as buying, selling, incorporating, building and financing real estate. It can be observed that, due to the range of operations, this group is formed by several operators. They are the social agents who are directly connected to real estate

capital.

These actors promote transformations throughout the urban space of cities. In this way, they produce and reproduce the places. According to studies by Corrêa (1989, p. 23), “the performance of real estate developers is unequal, creating and reinforcing the residential segregation that characterizes the capitalist city”. Therefore, it is clear that real estate developers are one of the main social agents that promote socioeconomic segregation in the contemporary city.

With the monopolization of urban lands by these negotiators, they use real estate speculation as a strategy of action, since they acquire idle lands in cities, which are usually located in places that have little urban infrastructure, but which can be strategic for the development of cities, according to their interests. This strategy is used for profit, as the investment is minimal since the negotiators await the implementation of urban improvements, such as the implementation of urban equipment and better accessibility through transport routes. However, it is important to mention that these benefits are provided by other social agents. Singer (2017, s.p.) states that:

The changes in the price of land brought about by the action of the State are taken advantage of by speculators when they have the possibility of anticipating the places where the various networks of urban services will be expanded. However, this anticipation is not always feasible, and when competition between speculators arises, it can force the price to rise before the planned improvement takes place, greatly increasing the future gains of the operation.

The urban intervention promoted by real estate capital in urban centers generates spaces differentiated by the city. Thus, there are some places with complete infrastructure and other regions with little or no infrastructure. These punctual interventions in the space of the city promote the valorization of urban land, which, in fact, can hinder the access of excluded social groups to urban land. Therefore, the layers of the excluded population are crowded in the peripheries of urban centers. The existence of urban gaps between the central regions and the outskirts of the cities burdens the state's public spending with the implementation of urban equipment on the outskirts and the extension of public transport lines.

The State has consolidated itself as one of the main social agents that act directly in the spatial organization of cities. According to Corrêa (1989, p. 24), it acts as a “large industrialist, consumer of specific space and locations, land owner and real estate developer”. Another fundamental function exercised by the State is that of regulating the use of urban land, which makes it a fundamental element in the process of production and reproduction of space.

As can be seen, the State is a producer agent of space that relates to all other producers of space. However, it is concluded that these relationships are marked by several conflicts. Corrêa (1989, p. 26) clarifies that “their action is marked by the conflicts of interest of the different members of the class society, as well as the alliances between them”. In the capitalist city and in the production process of the urban space of the contemporary city, the State in its actions proposes to favor the ruling class.

According to the author (2013, p. 45), “the capitalist state plays multiple roles in relation to the production of space. This multiplicity stems from the fact that the State constitutes an arena in which different interests and conflicts are faced”. This demonstrates the proportion and dimension of its performance in relation to the spatial organization of contemporary cities.

The role of the State in the process of the spatial organization of contemporary cities occurs in the political-administrative sphere; such action can take place through the federal, state and municipal spheres. Thus, the author (2013, p. 45) states that the “capitalist state plays multiple roles in relation to the production of space”.

In the political-administrative sphere, the State's action occurs through the elaboration of master plans, urban mobility plans, elaboration of statutes, such as the statute of cities and metropolises, regulation of land use, code of works, and postures, among others. Corrêa (1989, p. 26) shows that

..the action of the state is undertaken, ultimately, in order to create conditions of realization and reproduction of capitalist society, that is, conditions that enable the process of accumulation and reproduction of social classes and their fractions.

All this regulatory power, created through the gears and mechanisms in the hands of the State, demonstrates that this social agent is the primary element of intersection in the production and reproduction of social classes in the urban space of contemporary cities.

State intervention in the production and reproduction of urban space in response to the interests of the ruling class sometimes aims to raise the price of land in certain regions of the city, while producing socioeconomic segregation, intensifying real estate speculation, and gentrification, among others. These State interventions have the purpose of favoring the use of space by the dominant class in relation to those dominated.

The dominated are part of the population excluded from capitalist society. Corrêa (1989) calls the dominated class a group of excluded socials. As pointed out by Corrêa, the socially excluded occupy the most economically devalued portions of available space, usually with little or no infrastructure, with insufficient urban equipment for the use of the population, places where violence is greater and distant from the centers of the cities, that is, on the peripheries.

This group of low-income social strata is subjected to the logic of reproduction of capital, including landowners and the State as modelling agents of space in the contemporary city.

Even if they are subjected to the logic of reproduction of capital, they are also characterized as space-producing agents. The production of space for this group occurs when an area of the city is irregularly occupied in search of the right to housing. According to Carlos' ideas (2011, p. 120), "housing is an essential commodity for the reproduction of life". This reproduction of life has as its guiding axis the social relations and power relations existing in society.

Again, according to Corrêa (1989, p. 30), "the production of this space is, above all, a form of resistance and, at the same time, a strategy of survival". This makes it clear that the search for housing can occur through regular or irregular occupations, by subjects who have capital or not.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The production and reproduction of urban space comes about through the actions of the State together with the owners of the means of production, the landowners, and the real estate developers. The space is shaped according to the relationship between these agents. Only those with the largest capital appropriate spaces with infrastructure and privileged locations. Excluded social agents are left with peripheral areas with little or no infrastructure.

The growing existence of urban voids on consolidated soil causes real estate and land speculation, which consequently endures the wide sprawl of cities. This speculation is evident in areas close to public spaces and centralized areas, in which those who have less capital are conditioned not to appropriate these spaces.

REFERENCES

ALVAREZ, Isabel Pinto. A segregação como conteúdo da produção do espaço urbano. In: VASCONCELOS, Pedro et al. (Org.) **A cidade contemporânea: segregação espacial**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2013.

ARANTES, Otília (1998). **Urbanismo em fim de linha**. 2. ed. São Paulo: Edusp, 2014.

CALDEIRA, Tereza Pires do Rio. **Cidade de muros: Crime, segregação e cidadania em São Paulo**. Editora: 34 Ltda./ Edusp – Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 2000.

CALDEIRA, Teresa Pires do Rio. **Enclaves fortificados: erguendo muros e criando uma nova ordem privada**. São Paulo: Edusp, 2000.

CARLOS, Ana Fani Alessandri. **A condição espacial**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2011.

_____. A prática espacial urbana como segregação e o “direito à cidade” como horizonte utópico. In: VASCONCELOS, Pedro et al. (Org.) **A cidade contemporânea: segregação espacial**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2013.

CORRÊA, Roberto Lobato. **O espaço urbano**. São Paulo: Ática, 1989.

_____, Roberto Lobato. Sobre agentes sociais, escala e produção do espaço: um texto para discussão in **A produção do espaço urbano: agentes e processos, escalas e desafios** / Carlos, Ana Fani Alessandri; Souza, Marcelo Lopes de; Sposito, Maria Encarnação Beltrão (Orgs.). 1 ed., 2ª reimpressão, São Paulo: Contexto, 2013.

HARVEY, David. **A Justiça Social e a Cidade**. Editora: Hucitec, São Paulo, 1980.

RIBEIRO, Luiz Cesar de Queiroz. **Dos cortiços aos condomínios fechados: as formas da moradia no Rio de Janeiro**. 2ª ed. Rio de Janeiro: Letra Capital, 2015.

RODRIGUES, Arlete Moysés. Loteamentos murados e condomínios fechados: propriedade fundiária urbana e segregação socioespacial. In: VASCONCELOS, Pedro et al. (Org.) **A cidade contemporânea: segregação espacial**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2013.

SERPA, Ângelo. **O espaço Público na Cidade Contemporânea**. 2ª Ed. São Paulo, Contexto, 2014.

SINGER, Paul. **Economia Política da Urbanização**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1973.

SPOSITO, Maria Encarnação Beltrão. Segregação socioespacial e centralidade urbana. In: VASCONCELOS, P. A et al. (orgs.). **A cidade contemporânea: segregação espacial**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2013. p. 61-93.

VAINER, Carlos. Pátria, empresa e mercadoria in ARANTES, Otília et al. (Org.). **A cidade do pensamento único: desmanchando o consenso**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2000.

VILLAÇA, Flávio. Reflexões sobre as cidades brasileiras. São Paulo: Studio Nobel, 2012

SERPA, Ângelo. Segregação, território e espaço público na cidade contemporânea. In: VASCONCELOS, Pedro et al. (Org.) **A cidade contemporânea: segregação espacial**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2013.