

The city and the citizen: for a political-territorial approach to the concept of citizenship from an emancipatory perspective

A cidade e o cidadão: por uma abordagem político-territorial do conceito de cidadania a partir de uma perspectiva emancipatória

La ciudad y el ciudadano: por un enfoque político-territorial del concepto de ciudadanía desde una perspectiva emancipadora

La ville et le citoyen: pour une approche politico-territoriale du concept de citoyenneté à partir d'une perspective émancipatrice

Raique Lucas de Jesus Correia 

Universidade Salvador
Salvador, Bahia, Brazil
raiquelucas@hotmail.com

Waldemar Almeida de Oliveira Filho 

New York University
New York, New York, United States of America
wa2120@nyu.edu

José Euclimar Xavier de Menezes 

Universidade Salvador
Salvador, Bahia, Brazil
menezesjex@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article proposes an analysis of the concept of citizenship based on a territorial anchoring that highlights an articulating perspective between law and geography. Through exploratory research, it seeks to shift the discussion of citizenship as a legal-normative category to conceive it within a broader political framework, grounded in territorial-based struggles and social movements of resistance. The journey begins by locating the forms of understanding citizenship in different periods of western history, analyzing the changes, continuities, and contradictions that have established themselves over time. After that, the relationship between citizenship and territory is discussed, invoking the territorial component as the material content of the exercise of

citizenship itself. Finally, it seeks to link the concept of citizenship to the notion of territorial resistance, primarily from a critical perspective of the constituent power of human rights. In conclusion, it affirms the importance of insurgent movements and territorial dynamics in the processes of realizing citizens' rights and human emancipation.

KEYWORDS: citizenship; human rights; territory and territoriality; social movements.

RESUMO

O presente artigo propõe uma análise do conceito de cidadania a partir de uma ancoragem territorial, que confere relevo a uma perspectiva articuladora entre Direito e Geografia. Mediante pesquisa de viés exploratório, procura deslocar a discussão da cidadania como categoria jurídico-normativa para concebê-la dentro de um quadro político mais amplo, alicerçado nas lutas e movimentos sociais de resistência de base territorial. O percurso começa localizando as formas de apreensão da cidadania em diferentes períodos da história ocidental, analisando as mudanças, continuidades e contradições que foram se estabelecendo ao longo do tempo. Após isso, discute-se a relação entre cidadania e território, invocando o componente territorial como conteúdo materializador do próprio exercício da cidadania. Finalmente, busca-se atrelar o conceito de cidadania à noção de resistência territorial, partindo sobretudo de uma visão crítica do poder constituinte dos Direitos Humanos. Com isso, conclui-se atestando a importância dos movimentos de insurgência e da dinâmica territorial nos processos de efetivação dos direitos dos cidadãos e emancipação do homem.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: cidadania; direitos humanos; território e territorialidade; movimentos sociais.

RESUMEN

El presente artículo propone un análisis del concepto de ciudadanía a partir de un anclaje territorial que confiere relevancia a una perspectiva articuladora entre el Derecho y la Geografía. Mediante una investigación de sesgo exploratorio, busca desplazar la discusión de la ciudadanía como categoría jurídico-normativa para concebirla dentro de un marco político más amplio, fundamentado en las luchas y movimientos sociales de resistencia de base territorial. El recorrido comienza localizando las formas de aprehensión de la ciudadanía en diferentes períodos de la historia occidental, analizando los

cambios, continuidades y contradicciones que se han ido estableciendo a lo largo del tiempo. Después de esto, se discute la relación entre ciudadanía y territorio, invocando el componente territorial como contenido materializador del propio ejercicio de la ciudadanía. Finalmente, se busca vincular el concepto de ciudadanía a la noción de resistencia territorial, partiendo, sobre todo, de una visión crítica del poder constituyente de los Derechos Humanos. Con esto, se concluye atestiguando la importancia de los movimientos de insurgencia y de la dinámica territorial en los procesos de efectivación de los derechos de los ciudadanos y la emancipación del hombre.

PALABRAS CLAVE: ciudadanía; derechos humanos; territorio y territorialidad; movimientos sociales.

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article propose une analyse du concept de citoyenneté à partir d'un ancrage territorial qui met en évidence une perspective articulant le Droit et la Géographie. À travers une recherche exploratoire, il cherche à déplacer la discussion de la citoyenneté en tant que catégorie juridico-normative pour la concevoir dans un cadre politique plus large, fondé sur les luttes et les mouvements sociaux de résistance de base territoriale. Le parcours commence par localiser les formes de compréhension de la citoyenneté à différentes périodes de l'histoire occidentale, en analysant les changements, les continuités et les contradictions qui se sont établis au fil du temps. Après cela, on discute de la relation entre la citoyenneté et le territoire, en invoquant le composant territorial comme contenu matérialisant l'exercice même de la citoyenneté. Enfin, on cherche à lier le concept de citoyenneté à la notion de résistance territoriale, partant surtout d'une perspective critique du pouvoir constituant des Droits de l'Homme. En conclusion, on affirme l'importance des mouvements d'insurrection et de la dynamique territoriale dans les processus de réalisation des droits des citoyens et de l'émancipation de l'homme.

MOTS-CLÉS : citoyenneté ; droits de l'homme ; territoire et territorialité ; mouvements sociaux.

INTRODUCTION

The exercise of citizenship, in the strict sense, includes the possibility of the subject recognizing and being recognized as a citizen, being able to enjoy rights and actively participate in the political process of his/her country (DALLARI, 1998). In broader terms, according to Covre (1998, p. 9), “[...] being a citizen means having rights and duties, being a subject and being sovereign”. Evidently, such meanings ignore certain deeper aspects of the concept of citizenship, although they are sufficient for a minimum characterization of its most generic attributes.

In this sense, Hannah Arendt’s (1989) reflections in *The Origins of Totalitarianism* offer us an excellent starting point for a more complex view of citizenship. According to Celso Lafer (1988), in Arendt’s sense, citizenship is not only a means of ensuring individual rights, but also, fundamentally, a substantive principle of the human condition itself. In Arendt’s conception, citizenship can be defined, in summary, by the expression “right to have rights” (ARENDR, 1989, p. 332), that is, it is a right from which all others derive; a basic prerequisite for an individual to belong to a community of equals and, in this way, have “[...] full access to the legal order that only citizenship offers” (LAFER, 1988, p. 166).

In this direction, several documents such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) are concerned with ensuring minimum conditions of citizenship, so that basic rights, such as the right to life, can be guaranteed. In the same sense, the 1988 Brazilian Federal Constitution included, in its Article 1, the principle of citizenship as one of the pillars of the Brazilian Democratic State of Law, in addition to listing, in Title II, a significant set of fundamental rights and guarantees associated with the materialization of this institution.

It is known, on the other hand, that the mere institutionalization of rights, no matter how legitimate and fundamental they may be, is not a solid guarantee that they will be duly enforced. As Norberto Bobbio (2004, p. 32) points out, “one thing is to talk about human rights, rights that are always new and increasingly extensive, and to justify them with convincing arguments; and another thing is to guarantee them effective protection”. At this point, it is necessary to consider that there is a categorical difference between “legal effectiveness” and “social effectiveness”. While legal effectiveness is related to (formal) suitability, that is, the legal norm being applied to specific cases, social effectiveness encompasses both compliance with the due process of

jurisdiction for applying the norm, as well as the concrete result and the factual repercussions arising from this application (SARLET, 2012). Therefore, in terms of social reality, it is not enough for norms to be formally valid or legally in force; they must also be socially recognized, that is, incorporated into the collective way of being and acting (REALE, 2001).

This process, in turn, brings together not only a legal-normative dimension, but, substantially, a political-geographical dimension, because, as Milton Santos (2007, p. 81) points out, “it is in the territory as it currently is that citizenship takes place as it is today, that is, incomplete”. Thus, if we want to create a new type of committed citizenship as a new civic model of fair distribution of essential goods and services, the organization and management of space must be considered as indispensable components to achieve this end. According to Santos (2007, p. 81), the full realization of man, material and immaterial, depends on the conjunction of economic and cultural processes: “both have to do with the territory and this does not only have a passive role, but constitutes an active fact, and must be considered as a factor and not exclusively as a reflection of society”.

Based on exploratory research, this paper proposes a critical reflection on the concept of citizenship, not only from a legal-normative point of view — as it is conventionally addressed in the main law manuals — but in its inseparable articulation with geography. According to Gil (2008), exploratory research has the main purpose of providing a greater understanding of the topic under analysis, exploring in an unstructured way, concepts, ideas, perspectives and heated discussion within a given field of study. For this work, it involved a bibliographic survey of works, articles and other materials that could support the discussion with concepts and approaches relevant to a critical analysis of citizenship and its articulation with territorial dynamics.

Therefore, this journey begins with a brief overview that seeks to locate the ways in which citizenship was understood in different periods of western history, analyzing the changes, continuities and contradictions that have been established over time. After that, the relationship between citizenship and territory is discussed, invoking the territorial component as a materializing content of the exercise of citizenship itself. Finally, the aim is to link the concept of citizenship to the notion of territorial resistance, starting above all from a critical view of the constituent power of human rights. With this, the conclusion is attesting to the importance of insurgency movements and territorial dynamics in the process of realizing citizens’ rights and human emancipation.

BETWEEN THE POLIS AND THE CIVITAS: A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF CITIZENSHIP AND ITS HISTORICAL CONSTITUTION

The etymological root of the word “citizen” comes from the Latin word “civitas” (city), demonstrating, from the lexicon, the inherent relationship between the two. In fact, from this perspective, the “citizen”, *lato sensu*, can be defined as someone who lives in the city. Although this concept is not entirely wrong, since, as Covre (1998, p. 18) observes, “the origin of citizenship [...] is related to the emergence of life in the city”; even in antiquity, whether in the greek *pólis* or in the roman *civitas*, the expression conigned much more than mere housing, since not all those who actually lived in the city or who were there for reasons beyond their control could hold the title of “citizen”. In this regard, Aristotle (1998, p. 185) had already demonstrated in Book III of Politics: “[...] no individual is a citizen simply because he lives in a certain place, for, just like citizens, metics and slaves also have a place to live”. Being a citizen, therefore, already at that time expressed a political meaning that sought to establish certain distinctive criteria. Not everyone was a citizen and, as such, not everyone could enjoy the prerogatives associated with this condition. Despite this, in Rome, unlike what occurred in Greece, with the overwhelming growth of the empire and the conquest of new cities, citizenship began to assume a more abstract and autonomous dimension, expanding its scope and scale of influence beyond the borders of the *urbis* itself (OLIVEIRA, 1999). Thus, even someone who was not a Roman citizen from birth could later acquire Roman citizenship. An emblematic case is that of the poet Licinius Archias, who, having been born in Antioch, managed to acquire Roman citizenship. Later, this citizenship would be contested in one of the most famous lawsuits in history, immortalized by Cicero’s defense in the speech *Pro Archia Poeta* (CÍCERO, 1986).

The Greeks, less permissive than the Romans, only considered citizens those born in the *pólis*, because the *pólis* represented a unity of people of the same *génos*. As Cacciari (2010, p. 12) explains, in Greek civilization, the principle of “I belong to that *pólis* because that is where the same *génos* is based” prevailed. Thus, Greek citizenship included an ontological and genealogical specificity that was not present in Roman citizenship. Furthermore, while in Greece citizenship was expressed rigidly in the citizen/non-citizen binomial, in Rome it was divided into more than one type, types of gradation of citizenship that guaranteed more or less rights according to each category of citizen (FUNARI, 2006; OLIVEIRA, 1999). Thus, Roman citizenship, although equally restrictive and selective as Greek citizenship, “[...] became differen-

tiated and more complex [...] assuming distinct levels among social classes and incorporating a symbolic value that [extended] its geographic dimension beyond the territory of the reference city [...]" (OLIVEIRA, 1999, p. 98).

Therefore, according to Comparato (1993, p. 24), "with the decline and disappearance of Greco-Roman civilization, the western world went through several centuries of suppression of citizenship". During the middle ages, the preponderance of the church and the feudal mode of organization led to a kind of privatization of power, weakening the state's dominance and, consequently, fragmenting political relations. Thus, as Bobbio (2000, p. 71) explains, feudal society became a society made up of several oligarchic centers of power; pluralistic, but not democratic, which explains, on the other hand, the unequal and hierarchical structure on which the political, social and economic order of that period was based. According to Marshall (1967, p. 64):

In feudal society, status was the distinctive mark of class and the measure of inequality. There was no uniform code of rights and duties with which all men – nobles and commoners, free and serfs – were invested by virtue of their participation in society. There was, in this sense, no principle of equality of citizens to contrast with the principle of class inequality.

Only in the modern age, with the end of feudalism and the emergence of nation states, would citizenship gradually recover the political nexus originating in antiquity under the new foundation of sovereign power:

In the nation-state, each citizen finds himself in a direct relationship with the sovereign authority of the country, in contrast to the medieval state, in which this direct relationship is enjoyed only by the great men of the kingdom. Consequently, an essential element of nation-building is the codification of the rights and duties of all adults who are classified as citizens (BENDIX, 1996, p. 109).

Of course, this process did not happen instantly. The transition from the feudal age to the era of nation states did not immediately change the division of the feudal estates, so the regime of privileges and social distinction remained. It was only around the 17th century, in England, France and the North American colonies, that the revolutionary ideas arising from the Enlightenment would penetrate this structure deeply, extinguishing the *Ancien Régime* and establishing a new political order, founded, at least in theory, on the mantle of equality and universality of rights. These movements, inspired mainly by natural law and liberal premises, also resulted in the promulgation of two fundamental documents in the historical process of affirming human rights: the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen (1789) and the United States Bill of Rights (1789).

For Fábio Konder Comparato (2003), the United States Declaration of Rights, together with the French Declaration of 1789, symbolized the historical liberation of the individual in relation to the social groups to which he had always been subordinated: the family, the clan, the social class, and religious organizations. It is important to emphasize that this ground was prepared more than two centuries earlier, on the one hand by the Protestant Reformation, which emphasized the primacy of individual conscience in matters of morality and religion; and, on the other hand, by the culture of the “exceptional personality,” of the hero who shapes his own destiny and that of his people, as seen especially in Renaissance Italy (COMPARATO, 2003). However, this rise of the individual in history also resulted in greater vulnerability due to the loss of family, social, and religious protection, which, according to Comparato (2003), was compensated in liberal society by the security provided by legality, guaranteeing equality for all before the law¹.

From then on, national constitutions would also emerge, not only in France and the United States, but in several other countries, influenced by the French and American revolutions. The constitutional charters, in turn, paved the way for the creation of the rule of law, of the supremacy of the law over all acts of public life. In this transformation, citizenship was directly associated with the ideas of political participation and popular sovereignty, of the individual's belonging to the nation-state and of the defense of individual freedoms:

1 Lynn Hunt (2009, p. 16), in a critical tone, draws attention to the fact that “[...] those who so confidently declared in the late eighteenth century that rights are universal came to demonstrate that they had something much less inclusive in mind”. According to the author, “we are not surprised that they considered children, the insane, prisoners or foreigners to be incapable or unworthy of full participation in the political process, because we think the same way” (HUNT, 2009, p. 16). Furthermore, “[...] they also excluded those without property, slaves, free black people, in some cases religious minorities and, always and everywhere, women” (HUNT, 2009, p. 16). Due to all these imposed restrictions and limitations on the scope of these rights, in recent years many scholars have been questioning whether such statements really had a genuine meaning of emancipation (HUNT, 2009). Consequently, the liberal ideal of “universality” of human rights has been the subject of critical observations, mainly by the group of thinkers gathered around the Modernity/Coloniality Group (M/C), such as Enrique Dussel, Aníbal Quijano, Walter Dignolo, Nelson Maldonado-Torres, Ramon Grosfoguel, Santiago Castro-Gomez, Catherine Walsh, Boaventura de Sousa Santos, among others, who emphasize the contradictions associated with the fact that the principles of universal rights were shaped within a historical context marked by colonial expansion and European domination over non-western peoples and cultures. For these authors, as Bragato (2014) explains, since coloniality is constitutive of modernity, the dominant discourse on human rights reflects only the perspective of colonizing societies and, therefore, cannot be dissociated from the relations of power and domination that mark colonialism. Thus, a decolonial approach to human rights implies the need to recognize multicultural aspects and the diversity of experiences and agents, especially subjects who have historically been marginalized and silenced throughout the process of creating/affirming these rights (BRAGATO, 2014).

The rule of law stands as the opposite of the state of birth, the despotic state, which until then existed under the rule of the aristocracy. In the latter, the fate of men could be decided arbitrarily; there was no way to oppose death or other impositions. This was also the case, in a different but tyrannical way, in the Middle Ages. In feudal society, serfs and peasants were treated like cattle, aggregated to the land; they had no choice over their destinies or free will over their values. If, under the monarchical state, peasants and workers already enjoyed a certain freedom of movement and some control over their lives, they were nevertheless subject to the wishes of the monarch and had no way of defending their personal security. All this changed with the emergence of the liberal bourgeois state, when the bourgeoisie established the rule of law (COVRE, 1998, p. 23-24).

On the contrary, as Covre (1998) points out, the bourgeois and liberal conception of citizenship did not fail to bring with it inescapable contradictions, perpetuating, even in the European context and despite the discourse of abstract and universal equality, material and class inequalities. With the Industrial Revolution and the emergence of the factory worker, the exploitation that had previously been practiced through servitude took the form of wage labor. Thus, while the proletariat was forced to sell its labor force, traded as a commodity and therefore subject to the law of supply and demand, immense fortunes began to accumulate in the hands of the bourgeoisie, which owned the means of production. In effect, “[...] exploitation, carried out through capitalist relations of production, [was] hidden under a double appearance: that of the equality of the parties and that of the free will with which they may or may not enter into the contractual relationship” (ANDRADE, 1993, p. 59).

It is precisely from the criticisms of Marx and Engels (2005) that one can understand the depth of these contradictions, as they denounce the machine of oppression sustained by the liberal state, as well as the insufficiencies of a legal regime oriented towards maintaining the relations of exploitation of capitalism. For them, the liberal-bourgeois ideology of citizenship, by proclaiming formal equality, masks the material and structural inequalities inherent to the capitalist system. Thus, the notion of freedom in the capitalist context is illusory, since exploitation is disguised by the appearance of legal equality and contractual freedom, when, in fact, the relationship between capital and labor remains profoundly asymmetrical and coercive². As Padilla (2009, p. 45-56) explains:

2 Evguiéni Pachukanis (2017) would deepen this discussion by examining the relationship between law and economics in his work *General Theory of Law and Marxism*, originally published in 1924, in which he defends the thesis that law is an expression of mercantile relations and a product of the contradictions of capitalist society. For Pachukanis (2017), law should be understood as a “form of capital” that organizes

[For Marx] citizenship was a concept that the bourgeoisie brought from antiquity and from the practice of medieval cities, denaturalizing it and making it functional for the necessary seizure of power by this emerging class. The citizen of Marx's time was the bourgeois property owner, subject to all political rights and who presented himself as the depositary of the general will. Since representatives were elected by citizens, they now presented themselves as legitimized by society. The concept of citizen was yet another weapon to distort reality; it was also, and consequently, another of the objects to which Marxist criticism pointed. [...] Marx, by criticizing domination within the capitalist mode of production, criticized all of its theoretical and ideological constructions, including citizenship.

Later, these criticisms would be nuanced by reformist socialists and also by progressive liberal thought itself, giving rise to the genesis of the welfare state, in which the negative role of the state in protecting individual freedoms would be added to the positive function of promoting social and economic rights, such as the right to housing, work, health, education, etc. At this point, it is important to mention the classic succession of T. H. Marshall (1967) regarding the constitutive rights of citizenship: civil rights, political rights, and social rights. According to Marshall (1967), each of these sets also corresponds to a specific historical period in which such freedoms developed. In the 18th century, civil rights emerged in order to guarantee individual freedom, freedom of expression, contract, property, etc. This is also where other freedoms arose, such as freedom to work and the inviolability of the home, all of which are related to the protection of private life in the face of unjustified or arbitrary external interference. In the 19th century, the right to political participation was added, giving rise to the second generation of citizens' rights, which sought to ensure the right to vote and association, as well as the right to be elected. Finally, in the 20th century, social rights emerged, in order to enable, through more effective action by the state, adequate conditions for a dignified life.

For Marshall (1967, p. 76), these rights are pertinent to the status of citizenship, so that "all those who possess the status are equal with respect to

the circuit of exchange of goods. In this sense, as Naves (2008) explains, in Pachukanis' analysis, social relations are not merely regulated by norms created by legal-political authorities; they emerge from the very dynamics of production relations, and since law is structured in two dimensions — the relational, which refers to the legal relationship itself, and the normative, which concerns the regulation of these relations — with the former having primacy over the latter, the "genesis" of the form of law resides in the exchange relationship, with the legal form being the "inevitable reflection" of the interactions between owners of goods. Thus, the specificity of law ceases to be understood solely by its normativity and begins to be seen by the social form it assumes. In a famous passage of his work, Pachukanis (2017, p. 85) even states that the legal sciences "[...] in their apparent universality, express, in reality, an isolated aspect of the existence of a specific historical subject: the bourgeois society that produces goods".

the rights and obligations pertinent to the status". In this way, Marshall (1967) proposes that social disparities can only be addressed through an equalization of this legal-political status, with this equality of status, in his view, being more important than equality of income. Thus, although Marshall shifts the discussion of citizenship to the prism of social inequalities, his propositions remain reduced to narrow notions of institutionalization of rights and linear evolution of history, ignoring the setbacks and disruptions interposed throughout the process of affirmation/creation of these rights, as well as the ideological aspects that involve the social dynamics on which they are based (COELHO, 1990; GIDDENS, 1982; SAES, 2003).

According to Bello (2011), the modern concept of citizenship, based on a strictly legal meaning (as a status of rights), has only served to produce a process of alienation of citizenship and a constitutional fetishism: firstly, citizenship was transferred from the concrete political individual to the abstract figure of the "citizen" projected onto state institutions; secondly, citizenship ceased to be practiced socially and began to be applied judicially through legal norms. As a result, state institutionality was prioritized to the detriment of the active participation of citizens (subordinated to a passive position), in addition to creating the illusion that the full realization of citizenship would only be possible by entrusting it to the law (especially the constitution) and to the actors of the judicial system (BELLO, 2011).

In this line of reasoning, overcoming a limiting view of citizenship must predispose the active participation of civil society, since only collective action can set in motion the revolutionary process of human emancipation. As Bello (2011, p. 21) advocates, a new meaning for the concept of citizenship must be conceived from the theoretical-practical perspective of dialectics and "disalienation", that is, "[...] through the reunion between man and politics, theory and practice, legal norms and social praxis [...], in order to recognize the spaces and actors that effectively and legitimately produce and practice citizenship, beyond the state-institutional structure [...]". Thus, "achieving citizenship is not about possessing a status, as Marshall says, but rather advancing in the state of social consciousness that is the core of the collective" (COELHO, 1990, p. 24).

To this end, the new citizenship must be perceived beyond the static and abstract nature of a current legal order, as well as from other political and epistemological assumptions that challenge the dominant liberal/eurocentric vision. It is necessary to (re)think of citizenship as an emancipatory exercise, that is, as a praxis of social liberation. That is why, as Roberto Lyra Filho

(2006) asserts, human rights cannot be seen merely as a set of static norms, but as rights that are acquired in social struggles and throughout history until they are concretized as an “advanced model of legitimate social organization of freedom”. In the words of the author:

Justice is social justice, above all: it is the updating of guiding principles, emerging in social struggles, to lead to the creation of a society in which the exploitation and oppression of man by man ceases; and law is no more, nor less, than the expression of those supreme principles, as an advanced model of legitimate social organization of freedom. But even injustice, as well as anti-law (that is, the establishment of illegitimate norms and their imposition in poorly organized societies) are part of the process, because neither a just society, nor justice correctly seen, nor law itself, the legitimate kind, are born from a metaphysical cradle or are a generous gift from the gods: they spring forth in oppositions, in conflict, in the arduous path of progress, with advances and retreats, solar moments and terrible eclipses. Law is a process, within the historical process: it is not something done, perfect and finished; it is that becoming that enriched in the liberation movements of the ascending classes and groups and that withers in the exploitations and oppressions that contradict it, but from whose very contradictions will spring new conquests (LYRA FILHO, 2006, p. 56).

This dialectical and emancipatory exercise, in turn, is directly associated with a territorial component that cannot be ignored, since it is in the lived territory that social relations materialize, giving shape and meaning to life in its concreteness (SANTOS, 2007; CÔRTEZ; ARAÚJO, 2022). Territoriality not only defines physical spaces, it establishes spaces of identity, belonging, and resistance, where different social groups articulate and fight for their rights, resources, and ways of life. Thus, as Côrtes and Araújo (2022) point out, it becomes imperative to abandon the essentialist and abstract view of space and law, prioritizing an approach centered on the concreteness of conflicting social relations of spatial and normative production, rooted in social struggles. The territory is the point of tension where these factors come together and, therefore, the starting point for any concrete analysis of citizenship; because the exercise of citizenship is shaped by the territorial context, and this territorial context, in turn, results from complex and dynamic interactions between political, economic, cultural and social structures.

THE TERRITORY OF THE CITIZEN AND THE TERRITORIALIZATION OF CITIZENSHIP

To understand citizenship from an approach that considers the territorial component, it is first necessary to arrive at an appropriate definition

of “territory”. In the field of geographical sciences, the term gained important prominence from the work of Friedrich Ratzel (1990), particularly in texts such as *Anthropogeography and The Laws of Spatial Growth of States*, published at the end of the 19th century. In his work, Ratzel (1990) defines territory as the political and moral expression of the nation-state, emphasizing the intrinsic relationship between geographic space and the formation and action of political entities. For him, as explained by Machado (1997, p. 4-5), “the power and action of the national state defined territoriality [...], the territoriality of space, which was given [...] through the fixation of capital and labor materialized in the soil, which in turn marked the political-territorial limits”.

From the 1970s onwards, with the phenomenon of “globalization” and the accentuation of global forces acting on local systems, the concepts of territory and territoriality began to take on a new focus. It was within this context of conceptual renewal that Claude Raffestin’s work *Pour une géographie du pouvoir* (1980) emerged. In this seminal work, Raffestin (1993) shifts the issue of territory from discussions around the power of the state to those around the multiple power relations that come together within society, thus giving rise to new territorial configurations. In his view, “territory is formed from space, it is the result of an action led by a syntagmatic actor (actor who carries out a program) at any level” (RAFFESTIN, 1993, p. 143). In this new scope, the power that shapes the territory is no longer, as in the classical current, one-dimensional and exercised exclusively by the state; “to varying degrees, at different times and in different places, we are all syntagmatic actors that produce ‘territories’” (RAFFESTIN, 1993, p. 147).

From this perspective, power is not only exercised from top to bottom, in a centralized and verticalized manner, but is also produced and reproduced through social interactions that occur within and from territories, as a set of multilateral power relations. Thus, within this conception, as Haesbaert (2006, p. 93) explains, “we can affirm that the territory, relationally speaking, as a spatial mediation of power, results from the differentiated interaction between the multiple dimensions of this power [...]”.

From this, according to Raffestin (1993, p. 158), “territoriality acquires a very particular value, as it reflects the multidimensionality of the territorial ‘experience’ of the members of a collective [...]” and corresponds, in these terms, to the actions established by the subjects within the territory. In this regard, it is worth emphasizing that these relationships encompass not

only the production process, but also invoke an ontological dimension that modifies the subjects themselves:

[...] the territory must be seen from the perspective not only of a politically structured domain or control, but also of an appropriation that incorporates a symbolic, identity-based dimension and, why not say, depending on the group or social class to which we are referring, an affective one. [...] The territory always involves, at the same time but in different degrees of correspondence and intensity, a symbolic, cultural dimension, through a territorial identity attributed by social groups, as a form of “symbolic control” over the space where they live (and therefore also a form of appropriation), and a more concrete dimension, of a political-disciplinary nature: the appropriation and ordering of space as a form of domination and disciplinization of individuals (HAESBAERT, 1997, p. 41).

This results in a complex geography, what Haesbaert (2002) calls “multiterritoriality”, referring to the diversity of territories that overlap, articulate and interconnect at different levels of action. Thus, instead of a world characterized by the total loss of fixed territories and the creation of a new absence of territoriality, Haesbaert (2006) points out that we are living in a time of territorial explosion, where different forms of territorial organization coexist. This coexistence of “multiple territorialities” always implies disputes, not only by the different agents that act in their (re)production, but also by the capillarity of the power networks that are constituted territorially, which is why “the territory, as a dominated and/or appropriated space [...] can only be properly apprehended within a conception of multiplicity, of a multiterritoriality” (HAESBAERT, 2004, p. 19). As Zambrano (2001, p. 31, our translation) states, “territory is conquered, [...] it is a social struggle converted into space”, therefore, in Haesbaert’s (2002, p. 121) synthesis, “[...] the product of an unequal relationship of forces, involving the political-economic dominance or control of space and its symbolic appropriation, sometimes combined and mutually reinforced, sometimes disconnected and contradictorily articulated”.

In this way, more than a physical and material entity, territory must be interpreted in terms of its relations, inserted in a context of social interactions (economic, political, cultural and socio-environmental) that constantly transform it and are transformed by it, in a continuous and dialectical movement between territorialization, deterritorialization and reterritorialization (HAESBAERT, 2023). Therefore, as Haesbaert (2023, p. 3) emphasizes, “[...] it is essential to understand the territory from the multiple social subjects involved in the dynamics of de-re-territorialization, especially considering the distinctions and overlaps between hegemonic classes or groups and subalternized classes or groups”. This means that territorial analysis must take into

account not only “spatial objects”, but also the complex networks of social relations and processes that shape and are shaped by the territory. Therefore, returning to an important Milton Santos concept, instead of being simply an absolute space or a “system of isolated objects”, the territory must also be conceived as a “system of actions” interconnected and defined by its use (SANTOS, 2006). In the words of the author:

The territory is not only the set of natural systems and systems of overlapping things. The territory must be understood as used territory, not just the ground itself. The used territory is the ground plus the identity. Identity is the feeling of belonging to that which belongs to us. Territory is the foundation of work, the place of residence, of material and spiritual exchanges and of the exercise of life. Territory in itself is not a category of analysis in historical disciplines, such as Geography. It is used territory that is a category of analysis (SANTOS, 2011, p. 14, author's emphasis).

Thus, if, as Santos (1998, p. 15) points out, “it is the use of the territory, and not the territory itself, that makes it the object of social analysis”, there are at least two questions that arise in the reflection proposed here: i) how do the different ways of using the territory reflect and reproduce social relations?; ii) in what way is the exercise of citizenship manifested through the use of the territory?

To answer these two questions, it is first necessary to consider that territorial practices are not neutral; they express and reinforce structures of power, inequalities and class relations. In this sense, the previously mentioned distinction between “domination” and “appropriation”, proposed by Henri Lefebvre (2001), helps us to understand that the production of space, especially urban space, involves the interaction between the way it is planned and controlled by hegemonic agents (domination) and the way it is experienced and given meaning by its true users (appropriation). To appropriate is, in the wake of Lefebvrian thought, to endow space with “use value”, that is, with a meaning that contemplates the needs and desires of those who live and (re) produce their daily lives; space as a work, not as a product; space as a place, not as a thing; in short, space to be collectively appropriated by the heterogeneous masses and not exclusively dominated by market forces.

In this way, citizenship as a territorial exercise denotes the possibility of creating, from space and movements of appropriation, of re-territorialization — if we wish to define it that way — the necessary conditions that allow us to assume power over our (re)production as social groups/classes and as autonomous individuals. To this end, as Milton Santos (1998, p. 18) endorses, it is necessary to reflect “on the conflict between the act of producing

and living, a function of the direct process of production, and the forms of regulation linked to other instances of production". These "other instances" to which Santos (1998) refers are the networks formed by the global forces of the market that increasingly discipline, command and standardize territories:

There is a conflict that is worsening between a local space, a space lived by all neighbors, and a global space, inhabited by a rationalizing process and an ideological content of distant origin that arrives in each place with the objects and standards established to serve them. Hence the interest in resuming the notion of banal space, that is, the territory of everyone, often contained within the limits of everyone's work; and in contrasting this notion with the notion of networks, that is, the territory of those forms and standards at the service of some. Thus, the entire territory and some of its parts, or points, that is, the networks, are contrasted. However, it is the World that produces, commands, disciplines, regulates, and imposes a rationality on the networks. This world is that of the universal market and world governments. [...] When we talk about the World, we are talking, above all, about the market, which today, unlike yesterday, permeates everything, including people's consciousness. The market of things, including nature; the market of ideas, including science and information; the political market. Precisely, the political version of this perverse globalization is market democracy. [...] For this very reason, the great contradictions of our time involve the use of territory (SANTOS, 1998, p. 18-19).

In "market democracy", as Santos (1998) reveals, the territory functions as a support for networks that transport utilitarian, partial and partialized rules and norms to "verticalities"; while "horizontality", the domains of contiguity, local coexistence, and heterogeneity, are weakened, subjected to a homogenizing process of control by external forces over lived reality. As Bauman (1999) explains, this process of homogenization gives rise to a contradictory movement of fragmentation of space itself. This is because, for him, "globalization divides as much as it unites; it divides while it unites — and the causes of division are identical to those that promote the uniformity of the globe" (BAUMAN, 1999, p. 7). Thus, according to Bauman (1999, p. 7), "along with the planetary dimensions of business, finance, trade and the flow of information, a 'localizing' process of fixation in space is set in motion". In other words, if for some globalization is a sign of freedom and shortening of distances, for others it is a sign of confinement, of territorial exclusion:

In other words: instead of homogenizing the human condition, the technological annulment of temporal/spatial distances [globalization] tends to polarize it. It emancipates certain human beings from territorial restrictions and makes certain meanings that generate community extraterritorial — while at the same time stripping the territory, in which other people continue to be confined, of its meaning and its capacity to give identity. For some people, it augurs an unprecedented

freedom in the face of physical obstacles and an unheard-of capacity to move and act at a distance. For others, it portends the impossibility of domesticating and appropriating the locality from which they have little chance of freeing themselves to move elsewhere (BAUMAN, 1999, p. 25).

It is within this scenario that territories are configured today as an arena of tension between the global and the local, between the market and civil society, between the center and the periphery, between the state and social movements; between the vertical forms that impose capital domination and the horizontal forms that, even if weakened, unite social actors in a continuous (and contiguous) movement of (re)appropriation of this disputed space. As Milton Santos (1998, p. 19-20) explains:

The current trend is for places to unite vertically and everything is done to achieve this, everywhere. International credits are made available to the poorest countries to allow networks to be established for the service of big capital. However, places can also unite horizontally, rebuilding that basis of common life capable of creating local norms, regional norms... [...] We must bear this in mind when thinking about the construction of new horizontalities that will allow, from the base of territorial society, to find a path that will free us from the curse of the perverse globalization that we are experiencing and bring us closer to the possibility of building another globalization, capable of restoring man to his dignity.

In this context, as Oliveira (2012, p. 198) argues, “the territory [...] imposes itself as a condition that contains the political content of citizenship and at the level of the social, cultural and economic organization that exists in each space-time, not only on a national scale, but also and necessarily on a local scale”. Without this territorial base, without this base where the materiality of life is (re)produced and where needs are felt and satisfied, the content of citizenship would be emptied, since “[...] the interests of the most impoverished sectors are realized in the neighborhood, in the favela, in the community” (FLEURY, 2004, p. 24), in short, in the territory itself. Thus, ultimately, “the phenomena related to socio-territorial disputes that occur in today’s world gain new relevance, putting into play the space that is a condition of the environment and exercise of this citizenship” (GOMES, 2006, p. 141). Milton Santos (2007, p. 144) also corroborates this:

It is impossible to imagine a concrete citizenship that does not require a territorial component. [...] The value of an individual depends on the place where he or she is and [...] the equality of citizens presupposes, for all, similar accessibility to goods and services, without which life will not be lived with the minimum dignity that is required. In other words, this means a territorial arrangement of these goods and services in which, according to their hierarchy, the places are support points, taking into account the demographic and economic density of the area and its fluidity.

In such a case, for Santos (2007), it is necessary to think of a model of citizenship that considers at least two types of franchises to be open to all individuals: “territorial rights” and “cultural rights”, among which the “right to the surroundings” itself is included. For him, since the territory is defined as a set of places and the state as a set of locations, the territorial distribution of public spending (which includes, among others, spending on culture, education, health, housing, transportation, leisure, etc.) must be established according to flexible rules, according to the needs of each territorial sphere. In his opinion, for these services to constitute a right intrinsic to the exercise of citizenship itself, constitutional regulation must be imposed:

The constitution must establish the conditions for each person to become a full and complete citizen, regardless of where they are. To this end, it must establish standards so that public goods cease to be the exclusive preserve of the best located. The territory, through its organization and instrumentation, must be used as a way to achieve an egalitarian social project. Civil society is also a territory, and cannot be defined outside of it. In order to overcome the vagueness of the concept and advance from abstract citizenship to concrete citizenship, the territorial issue cannot be ignored. There are social inequalities that are, first and foremost, territorial inequalities, because they derive from the place where each person is located. Their treatment cannot be alien to territorial realities. A citizen is the individual in a place. A republic will only be truly democratic when it considers all citizens as equal, regardless of where they are (SANTOS, 2007, p. 151).

On the other hand, as he makes a point of warning, “the fight for citizenship does not end with the creation of a law or the constitution, because the law is just a concreteness, a finite moment of a philosophical debate that is always unfinished” (SANTOS, 2007, p. 105). Thus, “just as the individual must be watching himself so as not to be alienated by the surrounding alienation, so the citizen, based on the achievements obtained, must remain alert to guarantee and expand his citizenship” (SANTOS, 2007, p. 105). In this sense, as Covre (1986, p. 186) understands, “the fight for the satisfaction of goods (which must increasingly be about the socialization of material goods) must be accompanied by the socialization of politics [...]”, that is, the effective appropriation of political power by disadvantaged groups and classes, in order to create a truly participatory democracy committed to the real demands and needs of the community.

However, the predominance of a dominant scenario of poverty and widespread denial of rights, in addition to the recurring lack of cohesion and unification of social movements, make the population’s relationship with the very notion of real citizenship very tenuous (JACOBI, 1986b). For Harvey (2014, p.

65), although it is common knowledge that many urban social movements and struggles, in the broadest sense, including rural ones, are underway, “[...] they still need to focus on the sole objective of acquiring greater control over the uses of surplus (not to mention the conditions in which its production takes place)”. In Harvey’s (2014) view, one of the steps towards unifying these struggles would be to focus on moments of creative destruction, in which the “economy of wealth accumulation” violently transforms into an “economy of plunder”. In these moments, the oppressed must demand, on behalf of the dispossessed, the “right to the city” — the right to change the world, transform their lives and reinvent the city according to their deepest desires (HARVEY, 2014). For this very reason, especially in view of the reality of large Brazilian cities and metropolises, where inequalities and deficiencies are accentuated and reinforced and where contradictions are exacerbated, the struggle of the dispossessed for citizenship increasingly needs to be linked to processes of political-territorial resistance. Only in this way will we be able, in fact, as Jacobi (1986b) emphasizes, to build new spaces of citizenship, capable of nurturing a new emancipatory citizen consciousness and driving structural changes in the dominant political system.

CITIZENSHIP, TERRITORY AND RESISTANCE

According to Oliveira Filho and Menezes (2019), the notion of resistance applied to human rights incorporates at least two meanings. The first, within the liberal paradigm, is associated with the use of institutional channels to realize individual rights. The second, in turn, within a more critical bias, links “resistance” to the exercise of constituent power coming from organizations and social movements. Regarding this last approach, the authors explain that “more than the empowerment of communities, the new ‘resistance’ seeks to reverse the very notion of power within the scope of human rights theory” (OLIVEIRA FILHO; MENEZES, 2019, p. 3), thus contributing to the strengthening of local emancipatory practices and the empowerment of collective actors in the promotion of citizenship:

Contrary to what the deliberative school of thought assumes, human rights are not restricted to the monotonous relationship (mediated by law) between citizens and the state. If today, binomial civil society and state institutions set limits on human rights, in the past it was different. A brief analysis of the revolutions that marked the history of human rights is enough to understand the central role of the excluded multitude in the creation of alternative societal models. [...] The common narratives of human rights and democracy hide the spontaneous action of the

multitude throughout history in order to promote the centrality of the state. In this sense, recovering the silenced past and the rebellious side of human rights is vital; it allows us to unveil the multiplicity of human rights practices and resist their transformation into ideology. Furthermore, these experiences bring together common principles and values to form an alternative pattern of resistance that reconciles human rights with structural changes and social justice (OLIVEIRA FILHO; MENEZES, 2019, p. 8-9).

Based on the political theory of Illan Rúa Wall and Toni Negri, Oliveira Filho and Menezes (2016) argue that the exercise of creating rights is in fact the exercise of a constituent power, in which people overcome the passive role imposed by the state-centered discourse and lead the construction of a community life, guided by processes of self-organization and collective action that challenge and redefine the established power structures, promoting a form of citizenship that transcends mere adherence to state norms and manifests itself in the daily practice of rights. This perspective is in line with the Miltonic formulation of citizenship, according to which “being a citizen [...] is being like the state, being an individual endowed with rights that allow him not only to face the state, but to confront the state” (SANTOS, 1996/1997, p. 133).

It turns out that in a context such as Brazil, where the masses are made up of “mutilated citizenships,” the potential for these alternative movements to succeed is limited to the masses’ own awareness, which is made even worse by the fact that our middle class, as Santos (1996/1997) attests, is not concerned with rights, but with privileges. And that is why, Santos (1996/1997, p. 134) continues, there are almost no citizens in Brazil: “there are those who do not want to be citizens, who are the middle classes, and there are those who cannot be citizens, who are everyone else, starting with the black people [...]”.

As an example, Santos (1996/1997) describes a long list of “mutilated citizenships,” highlighting, among them: citizenships mutilated at work, through denied opportunities; citizenships mutilated in remuneration and promotion opportunities; citizenships mutilated in terms of location, lack of access to housing and mobility; citizenships mutilated in terms of education and even citizenships mutilated in terms of differential treatment by the police and the justice system. Furthermore, according to Santos (1996/1997, p. 135-136), the central point of this situation of inequalities is closely linked to the historical process of slavery and its impact on the constitution of our civic model:

The Brazilian civic model is inherited from slavery, both the cultural civic model and the political civic model. Slavery marked the territory, marked the spirits and still marks the social relations of this country today. But it is also a civic model subordinated to the economy, one of the misfortunes of this country. Countries

in which the civic model runs hand in hand with the economy and in many manifestations of collective life is placed above it. In Brazil, the economy decides what of the civic model can be installed. The civic model is residual in relation to the economic model and worsened during the years of the authoritarian regime and is dangerously worsening in this so-called Brazilian democracy. Territorialization itself is corporate, metropolitanization is corporate, national resources are used mainly in the service of corporations, the remainder being used for the rest of society. Economic calculations do not show how cities are organized to be used by some companies, by some people. Corporations are the ones that use most of the public resources, and this is one of the reasons why other layers of society do not have access to the essential conditions of life, to the so-called social services. In the case of black people, this is what happens.

Incidentally, in the view of Jéssé Souza (2003), within the specificity of the capitalist modernization process undertaken in Brazil, there was a reproduction of social inequalities and the creation of a structure of “sub-citizenship”, in which certain groups were marginalized and excluded from the category of “citizens”. This is how Souza (2003) identifies “sub-citizenship” as a kind of structural “rabble” naturalized by the characteristic reproduction of Brazilian peripheral inequality, pointing out that the historical abandonment of black people and “free” men belonging to the “rabble” was the fundamental cause of their lack of adaptation to modern productive and social life, condemning these groups to a precarious life devoid of rights, both from a material and spiritual point of view, as well as from a sociopolitical point of view (SOUZA, 2003). In this way, the “rabble” would reproduce itself in its own abandonment, as it could not integrate into the dominant structure, since it bears a “precarious *habitus*” of inability to adapt to Brazilian modernization, a selective and exogenous modernization, which did not incorporate these groups effectively (SOUZA, 2003). As the author explains:

The modernity of countries like Brazil is “deficient”, selective and peripheral because there has never been a directed and reflected social and political effort to effectively equalize the social conditions of the lower classes. The inclusion of the lower classes in Brazil has always been perceived – even by the best like Florestan Fernandes – as something that the expanding market would end up including as if by magic. The welfare efforts of yesterday and today, which are fundamental (it is better that they exist than not), but insufficient, never reach the main point because they are initiatives condemned to the short term (SOUZA, 2009, p. 401).

In such a case, overcoming this structure requires much more than the institutionalization of formal rights or the implementation of programs that attack the symptom but do not solve the problem. Not that these measures are not important; they are undoubtedly necessary steps to mitigate the im-

mediate effects of inequality and provide some relief to the disadvantaged classes. However, to truly overcome the structure of “sub-citizenship” and promote a deeper social transformation, it is necessary to go further. To go beyond the “ornamental speeches” in defense of human rights, formal equality of rights or any other precept that may be included in international declarations, regulations and pacts. This is why it is said, as José Geraldo de Sousa Junior (2011) argues in the wake of the “*O Direito Achado na Rua*” movement, that human rights are not to be confused with the declarations that proclaim them, nor with the philosophical ideas that support them, and much less with the values to which they refer or even with the institutions that represent them; “human rights are the concrete social struggles of the experience of humanization. They are, in short, the attempt to make freedom conscious and conquered in the process of creating societies, in the emancipatory trajectory of man” (SOUSA JUNIOR, 2011, p. 148).

As Marilena Chauí (1990 apud SOUSA JUNIOR, 2011, p. 170) points out, based on the notion of democracy as an invention of Claude Lefort, only

[...] active citizenship is that which is capable of making the leap from interest to rights, which is therefore capable of placing in society the existence of a new subject, of a subject that is characterized by its self-position as a subject of rights, that creates these rights and in the movement of creating these rights demands that they be declared, whose declaration opens up reciprocal recognition. The space of active citizenship, therefore, is that of the creation of rights, of the guarantee of these rights and of intervention, of direct participation in the space of political decision-making.

In these terms, as Sousa Junior (2011) proposes, it is essential to understand that social protagonisms are intrinsically linked to the struggles for the satisfaction of needs and the conquest of autonomy, as well as the recognition of rights, which are expressed through citizenship actions that point to strategies and methods of organization, aiming to defend forms of coexistence, establish alliances, ensure rights and build life projects. The current constitution itself, which represents one of the main milestones in this process of building citizenship, is the result of an experience that demonstrates awareness of social protagonism (SOUSA JUNIOR, 2014). However, if on the one hand, “the current constitution, called the citizen constitution, alludes to this process in which the active core of law is established, subjective rights, social rights, fundamental rights” (SOUSA JUNIOR, 2014, p. 40), and on the other hand, the understanding of rights as a fixed set of norms is insufficient, it is necessary to understand that they are products of a democratic experiment in constant mediation (as Lefort argues), which

shapes and reaffirms new subjectivities, new reciprocities, new rights over time (SOUSA JUNIOR, 2014).

As Douzinas (2019) states, if the contemporary history of human rights can teach us anything, it is that bridging the gap between the “abstract man” and the “concrete citizen” will most likely not be achieved solely through the action of formal rights. We therefore need to establish a new praxis of human rights based not on generic idealisms or rational metaphysical plans, but on a return to the very utopian and revolutionary nature of these rights, linked to the freedom to resist, to contest and to imagine new political and existential arrangements (DOUZINAS, 2009). According to Warat (1997, p. 77), “the expansion of the political practice of human rights requires that we transcend the juristic imaginary, overcome its dependence on the ideal of the rule of law and recognize its transformative power”. This means that the fight for human rights, for the realization of citizenship and the full exercise of justice involves, above all, political action and social mobilization, and not just the formalization of a set of abstract norms without any penetration into local reality and lacking the principles of legitimacy that come from historical awareness.

It is precisely in this area of struggle for rights and affirmation of human rights as a dialectical vector of the process of liberation of dispossessed and oppressed groups and classes that social movements and “collective subjects of law”³ are inserted, notably those with an urban base, such as community movements and organizations that emerge from the reality of favelas and popular settlements (SOUSA JUNIOR *et al.*, 2019; LIMA; CAFRUNE; MARQUES, 2021; CORREIA; SOUZA; MENEZES, 2023). As Gohn (1997) explains, social movements represent socio political actions that emerge from the actions of collective social actors from different classes and social strata. These actors articulate themselves in specific contexts of the socioeconomic and political

3 According to José Geraldo de Sousa Junior (2011), the category “collective subject of rights”, one of the fundamental categories of “*O direito achado na rua*”, designates social groups that organize themselves around specific demands and that seek to construct new rights, often in spite of and in opposition to the state. For the author, “[...] the emergence of the collective subject operates in a process by which social deprivation is perceived as a denial of a right that provokes a struggle to conquer it” (SOUSA JUNIOR, 2002, p. 59-60). Thus, when dispossessed and oppressed classes and groups organize themselves into social movements to demand rights, this mobilization also sets in motion a process of redefining the social and political order itself, where individuals recognize each other and actively participate in the construction of new paradigms of citizenship (SOUSA JUNIOR, 2002). These are, therefore, subjects with “conscious collective identities, [...] coming from different social strata, with the capacity for self-organization and self-determination, interconnected by ways of life with common interests and values” (WOLKMER, 1997, p. 214) who share conflicts and daily struggles, legitimized as a field of tension for the transformation of power and the institution of a new social order, plural, decentralized and, above all, egalitarian.

situation of a country, giving rise to a political field of social force in civil society. The structuring of these actions occurs based on repertoires developed around themes and conflicts experienced by the group in society. These actions are not limited to isolated events; on the contrary, they develop a social, political and cultural process that culminates in the construction of a collective identity for the movement. This identity is forged by solidarity and based on cultural and political values shared by the group, predominantly in non-institutionalized collective spaces.

Under the designation of “urban social movements”, Bello (2011) explains that these social groups are linked to conflicts and interests specific to cities, dialectically connecting the perspective of class struggle (socioeconomic distribution) with new identity and cultural demands (struggle for recognition). This understanding takes into account the central importance of urban space as the main site of political disputes in the late 20th and early 21st centuries (BELLO, 2011). According to Castells (1999), these new social movements, organized in a given territory and aiming at common objectives, are capable of fostering processes of social mobilization with a pre-established purpose, such as meeting urban demands and living conditions and collective consumption, reaffirming local cultural identity, as well as seeking political autonomy and citizen participation. In other words, it is, as Lefebvre (2001, p. 7) pointed out, the search for the practice of a right: the “right to the city”, that is, the right to urban life, in particular, and to an authentic existence in broader terms; “a condition for a renewed humanism and democracy”. In Harvey’s view (2012, p. 14):

The question of what kind of city we want cannot be divorced from the kind of social ties, relationships with nature, lifestyles, technologies and aesthetic values we desire. The right to the city is far removed from individual freedom of access to urban resources: it is the right to change ourselves by changing the city. Moreover, it is a common right before an individual right, since this transformation inevitably depends on the exercise of a collective power to shape the process of urbanization. The freedom to build and rebuild the city and ourselves is, as I seek to argue, one of the most precious and neglected of human rights.

In this sense, according to Jacobi (1986a), the right to the city, the democratization of local power and popular participation ultimately become a common denominator, as an expression of a collective will of citizens, based on the territorial expression of their needs and desires. As Holston (1996, p. 249) reiterates, “citizenship changes as new members emerge to make their demands [...]”, only in this way can its scope be extended, overcoming “diffe-

rential citizenship” for the emergence of “insurgent citizenship”. In this shift, the city, popular neighborhoods, and favelas must be perceived not only as receptacles for insurgency movements, but also as their object, as spaces of emerging identities and revolutionary effervescence (HOLSTON, 2013). Thus, “the new spaces of citizenship that result from this are mainly a product of the compaction and reterritorialization of so many new residents with histories, cultures, and demands that break with the normative and accepted categories of social life” (HOLSTON, 1996, p. 249).

Therefore, as Lojkine (1997, 324) asserts, “there is no analysis of urban social movements independent of the analysis of the articulation with ‘social movements linked to production’ and which directly evokes the issue of political power”. In other words, the revolutionary possibilities arising from the action of these movements are based on the unsociable articulation of local issues with the general political struggle. Thus, since the “urban” is the privileged place, according to Lojkine (1997), of the socialized reproduction of human and material productive forces, there also resides “the possibility [of these movements] to directly contest not only the economic power of the dominant class, but also the mode of reproduction of the whole, of social formation, both economic and social” (LOJKINE, 1997, p. 323, author’s emphasis).

The example of the Calabar community in Salvador, Bahia, corroborates the perspective defended here that the affirmation of citizenship, triggered from a territorial anchorage, is constituted from demands and strategies of a claim generated in the struggles of collective subjects and social movements (CORREIA; SOUZA; MENEZES, 2023). Since its origin, Calabar has been a place of resistance and struggle for survival. The lack of public policies and investments in infrastructure transformed the place into a precarious cluster of improvised housing, without basic sanitation, running water or electricity. Over the following decades, the population of Calabar grew and organized itself around common demands, such as the creation of a residents’ association, the construction of a school, a daycare center and a community library. These struggles were marked by police repression, the criminalization of social movements, and violence against residents (CONCEIÇÃO, 1986; GIUDICE; SOUZA, 2000; FREITAS, 2020). The history of the people of Calabar is, therefore, the history of a community that, by rising up against inequalities and socio-racial injustices, sought to build new ways of living, coexisting, learning, teaching, living, working, fighting, in short, of existing and resisting. According to Ana Cláudia de Jesus Barreto (2020, p. 164-165):

Calabar's trajectory reaffirms this resistance against the racist, hierarchical, segregationist society that excludes the undesirables who live in the cities and who have "color" and a geographic address. However, the residents of Calabar were against the urban order planned to serve the hegemonic classes. They challenged the interests of the real estate market and the government by organizing a residents' association and confronting public managers at meetings. They pushed for urban improvements in the community through demonstrations and the implementation of study and theater groups. In addition, they built the open school, a health center, and a community daycare center, with the active participation of women, who were the creators of these public facilities.

As Ana Alessandri Fani Carlos (1994, p. 189) argues, "social movements have challenged the forms of production and appropriation of wealth, forms of elitism and imperiousness present in the relationships and structures of power and spatial reproduction". The experience of the Calabar community supports this perspective, insofar as these mobilizations for the realization of rights in the community also gave rise to new strategies and forms of resistance and political organization in the face of the hegemonic forces that govern the capitalist pattern of space production. Thus, the case of Calabar stands as a concrete example of this political effervescence and the possibilities for social transformation that emerge from it. The struggle of these residents, as well as that of other communities, is a sign that new forms of socio-spatial organization are being created in our cities, forms that go beyond the limits of traditional organizations, because they are produced by the struggles and demands of the new "collective subjects of law"⁴.

This is why "favelas" emerge as places of great revolutionary potential, because at the same time that they expose the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production of space, they also articulate new spatialities or, as Lefebvre (2001) would say, new centralities. As Roberto Lobato Corrêa (1989, p. 30) states, "it is in the production of the favela, on invaded [occupied] public or private lands, that excluded social groups effectively become shaping agents, producing their own space, in most cases independently and in spite of other agents". In this sense, as these excluded subjects engage in these struggles to claim and conquer spaces and rights within the city, their actions go beyond the satisfaction of local demands and enter a broader political

4 The centrality of the role played by social movements and collective subjects in the processes of social and urban transformation can be observed in different works, among which we highlight: Sader (1991), Gohn (1997), Lojkin (1997), Wolkmer (1997), Castells (2000), Bello (2011), Sousa Junior (2011), Holston (2013), Harvey (2014), Santos (2015), Lima (2019), Viveiros (2020).

sphere of resistance and transformation. In other words, the emergence of new political subjects in marginalized territories not only reflects the capacity of these subjects to conquer and enforce basic rights, but also highlights the capacity of these movements for political mobilization and articulation around common objectives, which can promote significant changes in the social and urban space:

The favela, a space for peripheral citizens, is understood within the circuits of the hegemonic city as a territory averse to civility and urbanity. This leads us to understand that the ways in which city inhabitants relate to each other and the spatial divisions that arise from this dynamic involve not only the geographic segmentation of this space, but a symbolic structuring of the uses and discourses that permeate it. This structure is based on the capitalist mode of production, which not only commodifies space (transforming urban land into a commodity), but also articulates the ideological processes of domination and plundering of disadvantaged urban areas. Thus, speaking of the right to the city means speaking not only of the need to enforce human and fundamental rights, but of the need for a real and radical change in the way we relate to space and produce new spatialities. In this sense, the political experience of the Calabar neighborhood and the actions of the social movements present in this community point towards new strategies for the production of space and urban life that oppose the hegemonic capitalist pattern. Through political mobilization and collective action, these movements have challenged traditional power structures, demanding not only individual and collective rights, but also redefining community relations and the way in which urban spaces are used and (re)constructed (CORREIA; SOUZA; MENEZES, 2023, p. 146).

This is why the struggle of the residents of Calabar is so important and represents an example of resistance and engagement in the search for spatial justice. This struggle is not limited to resistance against violent actions by the state or the market, but also involves the conception of new forms of organization and citizen participation that can contribute to the integral transformation of everyday life and urban reality, which is its most radical and profound meaning. This is also why it is crucial that the struggle for the right to the city be seen as a collective political praxis that involves the active and conscious participation of all citizens-city dwellers in the construction of new spatialities, new centralities, new ways of living and producing the city. Only in this way will it be possible to overcome the capitalist mode of production of space that defines the contemporary city — fragmented, unequal, exclusionary and transformed into a commodity — in order to build the “space of people” as a vector for the affirmation of human freedom that develops in history and in social struggles.

In these terms, as Ani Fani Alessandri Carlos (1994, p. 263) reiterates, “the formulation of urban issues is not limited to the city, but refers to people,

their lives, their struggles, their world, and opens up perspectives for thinking about transformations". And it is, therefore, at the heart of this emancipatory project that the fight for the right to the city must be understood as part of the political-territorial dialectic of the exercise of citizenship. Only social struggle can challenge the immobility of the positivist/dominant discourse of human rights, transforming the discourse into substantive practices of conquest, implementation and renewal of these rights from an emancipatory perspective. In fact, the territory is the ground where these practices are driven, it is the terrain where they materialize and, as Gomes (1997) emphasizes, often the very condition for their existence.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Citizenship is not simply a representation of individuals within the state (or even limited to the state); rather, it is a much more complex phenomenon that affects the context of everyday socio-territorial dynamics (GOMES, 1997). In this sense, if we want to establish a new civic model, based on the equitable distribution of social wealth and the equal promotion of citizenship rights, then, more than ever, social inclusion policies and strategies need to incorporate the political-territorial dimension as a founding core for achieving these purposes. Furthermore, the political-territorial self-affirmation of citizens implies not only the demand for rights, but also, as Jacobi (1986b) asserts, the construction of a collective and class consciousness that values diversity and desires and promotes the active participation of individuals in the very process of (re)producing space and everyday life.

As we have seen, exclusion has a territorial materialization, so the restructuring of urban space as a space of inclusion and full access to essential goods and services and everyday life itself is a condition for the radicalization of citizenship and human rights. Social movements and collective subjects play a central role in this process. If citizenship is an exercise — and, more than that, a territorial exercise — then the political struggle that takes place in order to perform its emancipatory function, must predispose the subjects themselves, with their multiple identities and experiences, aware of themselves and their rights, to collectively rise up against the ideological structures of plunder and control sustained by the capitalist mode of production of space and everyday life. Only in this way will these movements be able to move towards a dialectical and emancipatory process of social transformation; with the creation of a "new space", as Lefebvre (2006, p. 86) would say,

“a revolutionary transformation [that] is verified by the creative capacity of works in everyday life, in language, in space [...]”.

In this sense, what can be inferred from the path taken is that citizenship cannot be reduced to a set of formal rights; it manifests itself in everyday practice and in the territorial dynamics that permeate people’s lives. Thus, the relationship between citizenship and territory is fundamental to understanding how rights are experienced, claimed and implemented. The territory is understood here as a field of political and symbolic struggles and arrangements; of (re)production of the material and existential conditions of the subjects, who exercise their citizenship in the territory and, also in the territory, perceive themselves as subjects in the world. Therefore, thinking about new forms of citizenship also requires always and increasingly rethinking new territorialities.

The struggle of the residents of Calabar, mentioned as a specific case in this work, is a fragment in the totality of the struggles that erupt, every minute, at every moment, in the most confined areas of our cities. The actions of these social movements and political collectives demonstrate how popular mobilization can be effective in transforming spaces and building active citizenship. Thus, by invoking a new form of citizenship — an “insurgent citizenship”, as Holston (2013) would say —, these subjects seek a form of political participation that goes beyond traditional forms of representation. Furthermore, these displacements also promote a redefinition of the values and social relations that permeate the city and traverse its space, seeking new ways of coexistence and socio-spatial organization, pointing to the need for a change in the city’s political culture, in order to contemplate the interests and needs of the dispossessed and oppressed classes and not just the economic power and the dominant classes.

The political mobilization of social movements is essential for the construction of this new urban paradigm, as it allows for the expansion of the debate on urban issues, the creation of new forms of political participation, the demand for public policies that meet the demands of the most vulnerable populations, and the realization of citizenship rights. Furthermore, the political mobilization of social movements can also be an important tool for the creation of new spatial meanings and forms in cities. This is because these movements are composed of groups that are often on the margins of the hegemonic process of production of urban space, such as residents of favelas, occupations, and other territories of exclusion. By mobilizing, these groups can demand a new city model and demand changes in urban policies.

It can be concluded, therefore, that the political and social cartography of citizenship, from an emancipatory perspective, requires not only the recognition and defense of individual and collective rights, but also the “right to resist”; to resist in the territory, from the “horizontality” created in solidarity in the daily struggles against the “verticalized” structures that perpetuate inequalities and that manifest themselves in the very social stratification of space. As Roberto Lyra Filho (2006, p. 6) reminds us, paraphrasing Ernst Bloch, “there is no true establishment of human rights without the end of exploitation; there is no true end to exploitation without the establishment of human rights”. Likewise, there is no true establishment of citizenship without an equitable territorial distribution of the goods and services indispensable for a dignified life; there is no equitable distribution of these goods and services without the establishment of a citizenship that fully incorporates the territorial component. ●

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

ANDRADE, V. R. P. **Cidadania: do direito aos Direitos Humanos**. São Paulo: Acadêmica, 1993.

ARENDR, H. **Origens do Totalitarismo: antisemitismo, imperialismo, totalitarismo**. Companhia das Letras, 1989.

ARISTÓTELES. **Política** (Livro III). Tradução de António Campelo Amaral e Carlos de Carvalho Gomes. Lisboa: Vega, 1998.

BARRETO, A. C. de J. Kalabari, Calabar e a releitura contemporânea dos quilombos. *In*: BARCELLOS, W. de S.; DUARTE, M. J. de O. (orgs.). **Políticas sociais brasileiras em contextos de crise: desafios contemporâneos**. Belo Horizonte: EDUEMG, 2020.

BAUMAN, Z. **Globalização: as consequências humanas**. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar, 1999.

BELLO, E. **Teoria Dialética da Cidadania: política e direito na atuação dos movimentos sociais urbanos de ocupação na cidade do Rio de Janeiro**. 445 f. Tese (Doutorado em Direito) – Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2011.

BENDIX, R. **Construção Nacional e Cidadania: estudos de nossa ordem social em mudança**. São Paulo: EdUSP. 1996.

BOBBIO, N. **A Era dos Direitos**. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2004.

BOBBIO, N. **O Futuro da Democracia**: uma defesa das regras do jogo. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2000.

BRAGATO, F. F. Para além do discurso eurocêntrico dos Direitos Humanos: contribuições da descolonialidade. **Novos Estudos Jurídicos**, Itajaí, v. 19, n. 1, p. 201-230, 2014.

CACCIARI, M. **A Cidade**. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili, 2010.

CARLOS, A. F. A. **A (Re)produção do Espaço Urbano**. São Paulo: EdUSP, 1994.

CASTELLS, M. **A Questão Urbana**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 2000.

CASTELLS, M. **O Poder da Identidade**. São Paulo/Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1999.

CÍCERO. **Em Defesa do Poeta Árquias**. Trad. Maria Isabel Rebelo Gonçalves. Lisboa: Editorial Inquérito, 1986.

COELHO, L. M. C. da C. Sobre o conceito de cidadania: uma crítica a Marshall, uma atitude antropofágica. *In*: COELHO, L. M. C. da C. *et al.* **Cidadania/Emancipação**. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1990.

COMPARATO, F. K. **A Afirmação Histórica dos Direitos Humanos**. São Paulo: Saraiva, 2003.

COMPARATO, F. K. A Nova Cidadania. **Lua Nova**: Revista de Cultura e Política, São Paulo, n. 28/29, p. 85-106, 1993.

CONCEIÇÃO, F. **Cala a Boca Calabar**: a luta política dos favelados. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1986.

CORRÊA, R. L. **O Espaço Urbano**. São Paulo: Editora Ática, 1989.

CORREIA, R. L. de J.; SOUZA, G. B. G. de; MENEZES, J. E. X. de. Movimentos sociais urbanos e cidadanias periféricas insurgentes: a luta dos moradores do Calabar (Salvador, BA) pelo direito à cidade. **Revista Cidades**, Chapecó, v. 15, n. 24, p. 112-152, 2023.

CÔRTEZ, S. da N. Q.; ARAÚJO, C. dos S. Dialética social no rastro do pensamento de Roberto Lyra Filho e Milton Santos: aportes teóricos no campo do Direito e Geografia. **Direito.UnB – Revista de Direito da Universidade de Brasília**, Brasília, v. 6, n. 2, p. 251-267, 2022.

COVRE, M. de L. M. Capital Monopolista: da cidadania que não temos à invenção democrática. *In*: COVRE, M. de L. M. (Org.). **A cidadania que não temos**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1986.

COVRE, M. de L. M. **O Que é Cidadania?**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1998.

- DALLARI, D. de A. **Direitos Humanos e Cidadania**. São Paulo: Moderna, 1998.
- DOUZINAS, C. **O Fim dos Direitos Humanos**. São Leopoldo: Editora Unisinos, 2009.
- DOUZINAS, C. Sete teses sobre os Direitos Humanos. **Hendu – Revista Latino-Americana de Direitos Humanos**, Belém, v. 7, n. 1, p. 206-218, 2018.
- FLEURY, S. Espaço, Território e Cidadania: a cidade dos cidadãos. *In*: CONGRESSO LUSO-AFRO-BRASILEIRO DE CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS, 8, 2004, Coimbra, **Anais...** Coimbra: Centro de Estudos Sociais da Universidade de Coimbra, 2004, p. 1-29.
- FREITAS, S. S. **Jovens Unidos do Calabar (JUC):** experiência de um movimento de bairro de Salvador (1977-1985). 147 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em História) – Faculdade de Filosofia e Ciências Humanas, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Salvador, 2020.
- FUNARI, P. P. A Cidadania entre os Romanos. *In*: PINSKY, C. B.; PINSKY, J. **História da Cidadania**. São Paulo: Editora Contexto, 2006.
- GIDDENS, A. Class division, class conflict and citizenship rights. *In*: GIDDENS, A. **Profiles and critiques in social theory**. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University Of California Press, 1982.
- GIL, A. C. **Métodos e Técnicas de Pesquisa Social**. São Paulo: Atlas, 2008.
- GOHN, M. da G. **Teorias dos Movimentos Sociais: paradigmas clássicos e contemporâneos**. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 1997.
- GOMES, P. C. da C. **A Condição Urbana: ensaios de geopolítica da cidade**. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2006.
- GOMES, P. C. da C. A dimensão ontológica do território no debate da cidadania: o exemplo canadense. **Revista Território**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 1, n. 2, p. 43-62, 1997.
- GIUDICE, D. S.; SOUZA, R. C. de A. O processo recente de favelização em Salvador: o exemplo do Calabar. **Revista de Desenvolvimento Econômico**, Salvador, v. 2, n. 3, p. 87-93, 2000.
- HAESBAERT, R. **Des-territorialização e Identidade: a rede “gaúcha” no Nordeste**. Niterói: EDUFF, 1997.
- HAESBAERT, R. Dos múltiplos territórios à multiterritorialidade. *In*: Seminário Internacional sobre Múltiplas Territorialidades, 1, 2004, Porto Alegre, **Anais...** Porto Alegre: UFRGS, 2004, p. 1-20.

HAESBAERT, R. **O Mito da Desterritorialização**: do “fim dos territórios” à multiterritorialidade. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2006.

HAESBAERT, R. Território. **GEOgraphia**, Niterói, v. 25, n. 55, p. 1-7, 2023.

HAESBAERT, R. **Territórios Alternativos**. Niterói/São Paulo: EDUFF/Editora Contexto, 2002.

HARVEY, D. **Cidades Rebeldes**: do direito à cidade à revolução urbana. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2014.

HARVEY, D. **O Direito à Cidade**. Lutas sociais, São Paulo, n. 29, p. 73-89, 2012.

HOLSTON, J. **Cidadania Insurgente**: disjunções da democracia e da modernidade no Brasil. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2013.

HOLSTON, J. Espaços de Cidadania Insurgente. **Revista do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional**, Brasília, n. 24, p. 243-253, 1996.

HUNT, L. **A Invenção dos Direitos Humanos**: uma história. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2009.

JACOBI, P. A Cidade e os Cidadãos. **Lua Nova**: Revista de Cultura e Política, São Paulo, v. 2, p. 22-26, 1986a.

JACOBI, P. Equipamentos de consumo coletivo, demandas sociais e conquistas da cidadania. *In*: COVRE, M. de L. M. (Org.). **A cidadania que não temos**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1986b.

LAFER, C. **A Reconstrução dos Direitos Humanos**: um diálogo com o pensamento de Hannah Arendt. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1988.

LEFEBVRE, H. **A Produção do Espaço**. Trad. Doralice Barros Pereira e Sérgio Martins (do original: *La Production de L'Espace*. 4. ed. Paris: Ed. Anthropos, 2000). Primeira versão: início – fev. 2006.

LEFEBVRE, H. **O Direito à Cidade**. São Paulo: Centauro, 2001.

LIMA, A. N. V. **Do Direito Autoconstruído ao direito à cidade**: porosidades, conflitos e insurgências em Saramandaia. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2019.

LIMA, A. N. V.; CAFRUNE, M.; MARQUES, S. D. Direito à Cidade: desafios e insurgências. *In*: SOUSA JUNIOR, J. G. de *et al.* (Org.). **O Direito Achado na Rua**: introdução crítica ao Direito como Liberdade. Brasília: OAB Editora/Editora da Universidade de Brasília, 2021.

- LOJKINE, J. **O Estado Capitalista e a Questão Urbana**. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 1997.
- LYRA FILHO, Roberto. **O que é Direito?**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2006.
- MACHADO, M. S. Geografia e Epistemologia: um passeio pelos conceitos de espaço, território e territorialidade. **GeoUERJ**, Rio de Janeiro, n. 1, p. 17-32, 1997.
- MARSHALL, T. H. **Cidadania, Classes e Status**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 1967.
- MARX, K.; ENGELS, F. **Manifesto Comunista**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2005.
- NAVES, M. B. **Marxismo e Direito: um estudo sobre Pachukanis**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2008.
- OLIVEIRA FILHO, W. A. de; MENEZES, J. E. X. de. Resistência e Poder Constituinte dos Direitos Humanos. **Diálogos Possíveis**, Salvador, v. 17, n. 2, p. 2-16, 2019.
- OLIVEIRA, M. P. de. Para Compreender o “Leviatã Urbano” – a cidadania como nexos político territorial. *In*: CARLOS, A. F. A.; SOUZA, M. L. de; SPOSITO, M. E. B. (orgs). **A Produção do Espaço Urbano: agentes e processos, escalas e desafios**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2012.
- OLIVEIRA, M. P. de. Um conceito de cidadania para se trabalhar a cidade. **GEOgraphia**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 1, n. 1, p. 93-120, 1999.
- PACHUKANIS, E. B. **Teoria Geral do Direito e Marxismo**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2017.
- PADILLA, J. P. La Filosofía Marxista Sobre la Política y los Conceptos de Ciudadanía, Derechos y Libertades. **REDHES - Revista de Derechos Humanos y Estudios Sociales**, San Luis Potosí, n. 1, p. 37-47, 2009.
- RAFFESTIN, C. **Por uma Geografia do Poder**. São Paulo: Editora Ática, 1993.
- RATZEL, F. As Leis do Crescimento Espacial dos Estados. *In*: MORAES, A. C. R. (org.). **Ratzel**. São Paulo: Editora Ática, 1990.
- REALE, M. **Lições Preliminares de Direito**. São Paulo: Saraiva, 2001.
- SACK, R. **Human Territoriality: its theory and history**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- SADER, E. **Quando Novos Personagens Entraram em Cena: experiências, falas e lutas dos trabalhadores da Grande São Paulo, 1970-80**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1991.
- SAES, D. A. M. de. Cidadania e Capitalismo: uma crítica à concepção liberal de cidadania. **Crítica Marxista**, Campinas, n. 16, p. 1-47, 2003.

- SANTOS, B. de S. **O Direito dos Oprimidos: sociologia crítica do direito**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2015.
- SANTOS, M. **A Natureza do Espaço: técnica e tempo, razão e emoção**. São Paulo: EdUSP, 2006.
- SANTOS, M. As Cidades Mutiladas. In: LERNER, J. (Org.). *O Preconceito*. São Paulo: IMESP, 1996/1997.
- SANTOS, M. O Dinheiro e o Território. In: SANTOS, M.; BECKER, B. (Orgs.). **Território, Territórios: ensaios sobre o ordenamento territorial**. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina, 2011.
- SANTOS, M. **O Espaço do Cidadão**. São Paulo: EdUSP, 2007.
- SANTOS, M. O Retorno do Território. In: SANTOS, M.; SOUZA, M. A. de; SILVEIRA, M. L. (orgs.). **Território: globalização e fragmentação**. São Paulo: HUCITEC, 1998.
- SARLET, I. W. **A Eficácia dos Direitos Fundamentais: uma teoria geral dos direitos fundamentais na perspectiva constitucional**. Porto Alegre: Livraria do Advogado Editora, 2012.
- SOUZA JUNIOR, J. G. de. **Direito como Liberdade: O Direito Achado na Rua**. Porto Alegre: Sergio Antonio Fabris Editor, 2011.
- SOUZA JUNIOR, J. G. de *et al.* (Org.). **O Direito Achado na Rua: introdução crítica ao Direito Urbanístico**. Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília, 2019.
- SOUZA JUNIOR, J. G. de. O direito à Assistência Social na normativa internacional e no Direito Constitucional Brasileiro. In: ALBUQUERQUE, S. A.; OLIVINDO, K. A. F.; ALVES, S. M. C. (Org.). **Direito e Assistência Social**. Brasília, DF: Fiocruz/Ministério do Desenvolvimento Social e Combate à Fome, 2014.
- SOUZA JUNIOR, J. G. de. **Sociologia Jurídica: condições sociais e possibilidades teóricas**. Porto Alegre: Sergio Antonio Fabris, 2002.
- SOUZA, J. **A construção social da subcidadania: para uma sociologia política da modernidade periférica**. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2003.
- SOUZA, J. **A ralé brasileira: quem é e como vive**. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2009.
- VIVEIROS, L. **Direito à Cidade e Hegemonia: movimentos, articulações e disputas no Brasil e no mundo**. Belém: ANPUR/Salvador: EDUFBA, 2020.

WARAT, L. A. **Introdução Geral ao Direito III: o direito não estudado pela teoria jurídica moderna.** Porto Alegre: Sergio Antonio Fabris Editor, 1997.

WOLKMER, A. C. **Pluralismo Jurídico: fundamentos para uma nova cultura do direito.** São Paulo: Alfa Omega, 1997.

ZAMBRANO, C. V. Territorios Plurales, Cambio Sociopolítico y Governabilidad Cultural. **Boletim Goiano de Geografia**, Goiânia, v. 21, n. 1, p. 9-50, 2001.

AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS

Raique Lucas de Jesus Correia: Conceptualization, research, formal analysis, writing – first draft.

Waldemar Almeida de Oliveira Filho: Research, writing – review, editing, and translation.

José Euclimar Xavier de Menezes: Supervision, research, formal analysis, writing – review and editing.

ARTICLE EDITOR

Cláudio Luiz Zanotelli.

Received: 07/31/2024

Accepted: 10/14/2024

Available online: 10/21/2024