

Explorations of anti-value in Francisco de Oliveira and David Harvey

Explorações do antivalor em Francisco de Oliveira e David Harvey

Exploraciones del antivalor en Francisco de Oliveira y David Harvey

Explorations de l'antivaleur chez Francisco de Oliveira et David Harvey

Paulo Cesar Xavier Pereira 

Universidade de São Paulo
São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil
pcxperei@usp.br

Vinicius Kuboyama Nakama 

Universidade de São Paulo
São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil
vinicius.nakama@usp.br

Kamir Freire Gemal 

Universidade de São Paulo
São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil
kamirgemal@gmail.com

Tales Fontana Siqueira Cunha 

Universidade de São Paulo
São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil
tales.cunha14@gmail.com

Luis Andrés Cevallos Serrano 

Universidad Central del Ecuador
Quito, Ecuador
andrescevallos@outlook.com

ABSTRACT

This study examines the notion of anti-value in the works of Francisco de Oliveira and David Harvey, in dialogue with Marx, aiming to expand the theoretical understanding of the value in motion. The qualitative approach discusses and advances the conceptual elaboration of the authors, highlighting convergences and divergences in their conceptions. As a result, the triad of value, anti-value, and non-value is proposed as a contribution to the critical debate.

KEYWORDS: triad; value; non-value.

RESUMO

Este estudo examina a noção de antivalor nas obras de Francisco de Oliveira e David Harvey, em diálogo com Marx, visando ampliar a compreensão teóri-

ca dos movimentos do valor. A abordagem qualitativa discute e avança sobre a elaboração conceitual dos autores, destacando aproximações e distanciamentos em suas concepções. Como resultado, propõe-se a tríade valor, anti-valor e não-valor enquanto contribuição ao debate crítico.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: tríade; valor; não-valor.

RESUMEN

Este estudio examina la noción de antivalor en las obras de Francisco de Oliveira y David Harvey, en diálogo con Marx, con el objetivo de ampliar la comprensión teórica de los movimientos del valor. El enfoque cualitativo discute y avanza en la elaboración conceptual de los autores, destacando convergencias y divergencias en sus concepciones. Como resultado, se propone la tríada valor, antivalor y no-valor como una contribución al debate crítico.

PALABRAS CLAVE: tríada; valor; no-valor.

RÉSUMÉ

Cette étude examine la notion d'antivaleur dans les œuvres de Francisco de Oliveira et David Harvey, en dialogue avec Marx, visant à approfondir la compréhension théorique des mouvements de la valeur. L'approche qualitative discute et développe l'élaboration conceptuelle des auteurs, en soulignant les convergences et divergences dans leurs conceptions. En conclusion, la triade valeur, antivaleur et non-valeur est proposée comme une contribution au débat critique.

MOTS-CLÉS: triade; valeur; non-valeur.

INTRODUCTION

The Anthropocene has led society to a multidimensional crisis involving economic, ecological, and social aspects, which manifest in various areas of life, including employment, education, and the reproduction of daily life. These overlapping crises are rooted in the movement of capital valorization, which concentrates power and wealth in the ruling classes. The intensification of inequalities, the impairment of social metabolism, and spatial degradation, when understood as a consequence of the (re)production of capital, imply a double challenge: to understand the new meaning of the dynamics of value in its movement and the relationship between the class struggle and the valorization of capital.

To face this critical situation for civilization, which is not necessarily a crisis for capital, propositions must no longer be focused on the pursuit of continuous growth or sustainable development nor be limited to attempts at degrowth. Critically and radically challenging the society of surplus value requires rethinking the movement of capital in the light of the theory of value:

- i. considering the strategic possibility of the term *anti-value*, which, articulated with the theory of value, can clarify the meaning of contemporary social reproduction;
- ii. by the interconnection of the latter term with *non-value* in capital valorization movements, and, finally;
- iii. presenting the hypothesis of the *triad* – value, anti-value, and non-value – which can guide practice and establish a new way of discussing and sustaining criticism to overcome the aforementioned crises.

Before moving forward with this discussion, the concept of value must be explained. In his critique of political economy, a central contribution of Marx is conceiving value as a social relation that emerges from production through exchange between *producers* and is different from the exchange value of the commodity. The value of commodities allows, in essence, all of them to be exchanged on the market and equate one another as a “socially average unit of labour-power” (Marx, 1976 [1867], p. 129). However, due to the need for an expression of value, money objectively represents and balances such exchanges. At a higher level, value expresses the social and historical conditions of commodity production and the distribution of social labor. In circulation, this is present in two dimensions of the commodity: use value and exchange value. Although the theoretical status of these categories is not established

here, they are worth mentioning, especially due to the recurrent *confusion* between the notions of value and exchange value.

From the necessary understanding of the value in motion, the importance of continuing the critical analysis of political economy is reinforced in contemporary times. One front for advancing this analysis is the study of its negative forms – those that, although commodified, do not constitute value, oppose it, or are not even produced as true commodities carrying surplus value. In this sense, the concept of value should be reiterated as a social form. Thus, the classical theories of labor value and value-utility, both positivist, are rejected because they do not advance the understanding of the “real abstraction” imposed by the law of value.

This text seeks to explore the intermittent moments of the negation of value, which interrupt the long movement of commodity valorization. Through critical dialogue and the tactics based on it, the negation of surplus value can be found in all aspects of life, along with the necessary harmonization for the positivity of social (re)production to signify the overcoming and emancipation of the world-ecology of capital. In addition, the presence of “valueless” things stands out, which, although connected to the proposed triad, should be explored more deeply in future studies.

The value, anti-value, and non-value triad can be used to advance a critical discussion. Based on the contributions of Francisco de Oliveira and David Harvey, pioneers in applying the notion of anti-value, we seek not only to explore their propositions but also to update them and, based on them, expand their theoretical construction. As intended in the Marxist notion of value, anti-value will be reconstructed in a triad with non-value. The objective is to broaden the theoretical understanding of value movements to provide instruments and build perspectives for analyses that contribute to social emancipation.

The qualitative methodology is based on critical reading and the conceptual elaboration of terms derived from the theory of value, inspired by the insights of the aforementioned authors, aiming at the construction and identification of the potentialities of the proposed triad. The exploratory approach of these terms in the work of these researchers supports the discussion presented here. From Oliveira's work we selected *The Rights of anti-value* (1998) and *Critique to Dualistic Reason: The Platypus* (2013). The main works by Harvey used were the books *Marx, Capital, and the Madness of Economic Reason* (2018) and *The Limits of Capital* (2013 [1982]). In addition, whenever necessary to demonstrate the triad and for the original foundations and

references, Marx's main works were consulted: *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. (2013 [1867]; 2016 [1894]) and *the Grundrisse* (2011 [1858]).

The proposal to rethink the movements of capital, extending the theory of value by exploring the negative terms based on it, is organized into three sections. The first contextualizes the considered authors and their works, characterizing their thoughts according to the theory of value and highlighting certain points that advance the proposed objectives. Next, we discuss the anti-value and non-value terminology suggested by the authors, clarifying their dialogue with Marx. Finally, an exploratory synthesis indicates developments of these concepts and contributes to the critique of value in motion.

CONTEXTUALIZING THE EMERGENCE OF ANTI-VALUE

Francisco de Oliveira on the periphery of capitalism

Francisco de Oliveira (1933–2019) was a prominent Brazilian sociologist. His production boasts a remarkable diffusion in several areas of the humanities, including Economics, the discipline he taught for several years. His prestige in economics is due, in part, to his experience as a State technician, collaborating with Celso Furtado at Sudene in the 1960s. In 1970, he joined the Brazilian Center for Analysis and Planning and, at the same time, he established a brief but productive collaboration with Marxist professors at FAU-USP, which helped consolidate his work in Brazilian urban and regional studies.

In his research, Oliveira favored the “Brazilian matter,” i.e., the understanding of the specificity of capital at the periphery of capitalism. He is an intellectual who engaged with the great interpreters of national formation, helping to understand the concrete forms of capital in Brazilian society. His concern with totality, which often led him to reject orthodox Marxist formulations, allows us to highlight points of convergence between his approach and that of Harvey (2018), especially in relation to one of the focuses of this work: to broaden the discussion on the notion of anti-value.

Since the early 1970s, Oliveira strived to interpret the close relationship between economics and politics. He aimed to elucidate the relevant aspects of value in the sphere of capitalist relations, and he especially sought to demonstrate the links between apparently non-capitalist aspects and the value in motion. In this perspective, his reading of the links between the “archaic” and the “modern,” or “pre-capitalist” and “capitalist,” demonstrates how the initially established terms influenced the later ones, as well as mutually substantiate each other throughout history.

In pioneering research with architects and urban planners on precarious housing in São Paulo, Oliveira emphasized the process of self-construction as a dynamic that reduces the cost of the workforce. This episode highlights his long-standing quest to understand the reason for the different forms of the manifestation of value and its negative forms. The latter initially emerged from the notion of non-value and, later, was reinforced by that of anti-value, mainly in the study of the use of public funds to sustain capitalist reproduction.

Oliveira's (1998; 2013) thinking on the value in motion exceeds that of valorization, favoring its contradictory movements that, in turn, illuminate the distinctiveness of Brazilian peripheral capitalism. The author gave little prominence to the exposition of *value* as a concept, not due to negligence (as some may assume) but by privileging a Marxist analysis that intends to go beyond "the strict and formidably broad limits of what Marx thought" (Oliveira, 1998, p. 11). To explore this author's proposal, he questions the meaning of negation movements in his work.

David Harvey at the heart of capitalism

The British geographer David Harvey (1935-*) dedicates much of his intellectual production to updating the thoughts in Marx's writings. In particular, this author explores a universal interpretation of capital, while presenting a critical perspective of the United States, given that he considers it the most significant center of capital in recent decades. The manifestations of the immanent crisis of productive capital prompted Harvey to elaborate a series of proposals providing continuity to the categorical analysis of Marxist thought of the twentieth century and, subsequently, its ramifications in the twenty-first century.

Harvey's perspective about the center of capitalism elucidates the links between the State, capital, and the territories from which hegemonic powers collect the various forms of social wealth. In this sense, the imperialist character that US financial domination has managed to reinforce stands out, always empowering "money, productive capacity, and military might" (Harvey, 2003, p. 42). The notion of the *periphery* in his work designates the territory where the strategies to overcome the crises of capital reside. This understanding contributes to the construction of a complex world scenario, in which rentism resurfaces under a new, now financial, guise.

In *Marx, Capital, and the Madness of Economic Reason*, Harvey (2018) bases his understanding of the central and all-encompassing nature of capital on his conception of the *value in motion*. The functioning of markets and global

productive relations, led by a hegemonic bloc, are driven and perpetuated through different forces. What is new in Harvey's argument (2018) is that some of these forces are negative and derive from the negations inherent in the movement of value itself.

The emphasis given to totality stresses that every action, opposition, control, domination, capture, or threat to the motion of capital presents itself as necessary and inevitable determinations of the negation of value. This perspective leads him to propose a renewal of Marxist ideas. Harvey (2018) structures the discussion on the totality of motion of capital from three moments – valorization, realization, and distribution – which, not by chance, organize the volumes of “The Capital”. In the development of his reflections, he proposes anti-value as a theory of devaluation, dialectically placing it in relation to Marx's theory of value, which will be explored in this article.

The topicality of Marx

Marx discovers *value* as a social form and a critical category of the surplus-value-producing society. This foundation constitutes the theoretical and conceptual basis around value in motion that supports this investigation on the triad – value, anti-value, and non-value – to envision emancipatory paths. The Marxist notion of value can transcend obstacles of nineteenth-century political economy to (de)mystify the relations of production and reproduction, in immediacy and totality, in concreteness and abstraction, in the reproduction scheme of capital. Without it, thought is limited to just the appearances and abstractions of the market that enable the unequal accumulation of wealth, while impoverishing living conditions.

On the one hand, the criticisms of Oliveira (1988) and Harvey (2018) address society itself in its forms of private appropriation of unpaid work through market mediations. However, this theoretical affiliation prevents abstentions when critical considerations are necessary about the proposals of what these authors called, each in their own way, anti-value. Marx's dialectic is not only in his effort to understand the genesis and development of capital as a social force in the condition of a historically and spatially determined phenomenon but also emerges in theoretical care of dialectically articulating his thoughts through categories, concepts, and notions to expose social reality.

Conceptualizations of anti-value initially presented require adjustments, as they lack consistent connections with the complementary concepts of the triad – value, originally, and non-value. Although the authors leave the nec-

essary transpositions in their proposals open, the law of value is not reduced to a hypothesis. It is not entirely theoretical or logical because it also results from a historical process. Many detractors forget this double logical-historical condition for the establishment of the theory of value.

The additional problem is that capitalist development has made it harder to know how value is determined. This impasse, inherent in the fetishism of capital itself, "arises from the fact that *commodities* are not exchanged simply as *commodities*, but as *products of capitals*" (Marx, 1981 [1894], p. 275). In exchange, for example, the dispute over the surplus value distributed appears in the forms of profit, interest, and other (property) rents. On the surface (appearance), the difficulties of understanding what is fundamental in the competition for the slices of circulating wealth take root, as can be seen in the pressure that leads to the impoverishment of the working class. The current moment of capitalist development, marked by the transition to financial dominance, exacerbates the fetishism about the distribution of part of the surpluses under the smokescreen of property rents that remunerate any and all assets (from finance to the ownership of natural resources).

Fetishistic difficulties have always generated crises and, due to the way they operate, confuse the interpretation and feed the detractors of the theory of value. The current moment of transition is no exception. However, this is not the argument presented in this text. We do not intend here to advocate in favor of a Marxist theory of value but rather to develop it based on the considered authors, highlighting the negative forms (anti-values and non-values) that emerge in the production of value in different contemporary contexts.

In the production of urban space – because this argument is of interest – the triad opens rich paths of discussion. The production of the city is uniquely related to the movements of valorization of capital, given by its characteristics (such as land), and the class struggle. These elements cannot be separated, as the city is the main *locus* of contemporary social reproduction. Thus, the critique of space, if based on the notions of anti-value and non-value, enhances the immanent critique of capitalist value, of the "possible-impossible" (Lefebvre, 1991 [1974]) that can constitute another path of social reproduction.

The city is concomitantly a product, means, and condition of production (Lefebvre, 1991 [1974]). In it, the determinations of capital are evident in the competition for the distribution and appropriation of a large part of the total mass of realized social labor. In the dispute for the appropriation of social wealth, the positive and negative of capital are not excluded from the move-

ments of its circulation, nor does its dissolution escape the horizon (as can be thought of in the terms of the triad). Marx analyzed the elements and processes inherent and essential to capital and the exploitation it leads to, which were contradictory and threatening to its own reproduction. Nonetheless, he did not systematize them into specific categories to level and oppose them.

The reading of Oliveira and Harvey's texts reveals approaches that seek to expand critical thinking. However, privileging one idea over another impoverishes theory, because the excessive rigidity of classifications with neither ties nor borders prevents following the movement of its historical-social reality. This commitment to precision restricts thought and sterilizes the horizon of transformation. Therefore, Marx's work must be revived to enable new readings to be integrated into the totality of capital.

THE REVIVAL OF ANTI-VALUE NOTIONS

Anti-value in Francisco de Oliveira

Oliveira formulated the idea of anti-value in the late 1980s as a response to the historical and political changes of capitalism from the 1930s onwards. This author indicates that the *public fund*, under the authority of the social State, acts with a presupposition of two processes: the financing of capital accumulation and the financing of the reproduction of the workforce. After World War II important transformations intensified, giving rise to what he called the "pattern of public financing" (Oliveira, 1998):¹

what is called the Welfare State, as a consequence of the originally counter-cyclical policies of Keynesian theorizing, constituted the pattern of public financing of the capitalist economy. This can be summarized in the systematization of a public sphere where, based on universal and agreed rules, the public fund, in its various forms, assumed financing the accumulation of capital, on the one hand, and, on the other, the financing of the reproduction of the workforce, broadly reaching the entire population through social spending (Oliveira, 1998, p. 19).

Oliveira (1998) evaluates that both Marxists and liberals, in different ways, but for similar reasons, were frustrated in their attempts to theorize the changes in capitalist development. Both failed to identify the concrete ways in which capitalism manifests in Brazil.

Aware of the "contradictory relationship" between the State and the economy, Oliveira (1998) emphasizes the public fund. This notion illuminates how

¹ This is the article "O surgimento do Antivalor. Capital, força de trabalho e fundo público", published in *Novos Estudos Cebrap*, n. 22, 1988 and, after ten years, in the book *Os direitos do antivalor* (1998).

public spending became crucial in the capitalist dynamics of the period, acting both in the sphere of production (as financing for capital accumulation) and in the sphere of consumption (as support for the reproduction of the labor force). The public fund is not limited to exclusively monetary resources, collected through fees and taxes. It thus distances itself from purely accounting-financial typologies of a social nature and limited to specific government programs. Its different features also include tax measures (exemptions, subsidies, waivers) and a set of assets (land, real estate, properties, etc.) that the State can employ to intervene in society.

The public fund addresses the relationship between support for production and social reproduction in its contradictory nature. This *mix* is formed dialectically and represents, in the same unity and movement, the motivation of the State, which is sociopolitical (public), and the motivation of capital, which is private (Oliveira, 1998).² Thus, the public fund aimed to explain the constitution and formation of another support for the production and reproduction of value, dialectically integrating value and anti-value into a single unit. Anti-value, by not seeking to value itself *per se*, sustains the valorization process when merging with capital. It thus avoids the determinations of the commodity form and the insufficiencies of profit as a support for expanded reproduction (Oliveira, 1998).

For capitalists, the public fund “streamlines the circulation of capital, fulfilling, in many cases, the role of the famous Keynesian invisible bridge between those who save and those who invest” (Oliveira, 1998, p. 28). This dynamic has multiple repercussions, distinguishing the rudimentary sectors (without access to the public fund) and another oligopolist. In the latter, through cutting-edge research, special programs, and national security, the competition became segmented, placing each private capital in a direct relationship with the public fund, in addition to the competition between the capitals (Oliveira, 1998).

Strictly speaking, it is an *ad hoc* relationship between the public fund and each individual capital. This *ad hoc* relationship leads the public fund to behave as an anti-capital in a very important sense: this contradiction between a public fund that is not *value* and its function of sustaining capital destroys the self-reflective character of value, central to the constitution of the capitalist system as a system of valorization of value. Value, not only as a central category but as praxis of the

2 This is the article “A Economia Política da social-democracia” published in Revista USP, n. 17, 1993, p. 136–143 and later in the book *Os direitos do antivalor* (1998, p. 49–61).

system, can no longer report solely to itself: it must, necessarily, report to other components, in this case, the public fund, without which it loses its ability to carry out its own valorization (Oliveira, 1998, p. 29).

Anti-value elucidates the elements of the public fund in financing capitalist reproduction. Economists refer to these components as “indirect compensation” because they comprise various social expenditures, from education and health to leisure and entertainment. These public products and services are considered social anti-commodities, because their purpose, by reducing investment in labor, is not just to generate profit, and their production does not produce surplus value (Oliveira, 1998). This implies that due to the political and more *transparent* determination of the components to remunerate the workforce, its partial decommodification helps erase its fetish as a commodity (Oliveira, 1998). This would shift the class struggle from the sphere of private relations to the public sphere.

To understand Oliveira, one must also consider the role of labor parties, trade unions, and other forms of workers’ organization. In some advanced capitalist countries, these entities helped increase the indirect wage to about a third of the real wage. On the one hand, this increase resulted in the release of direct wages, boosting mass consumption. On the other hand, it enabled the growth of constant capital, by relieving capital of costs related to the reproduction of labor, resulting in unprecedented technical innovations. The public fund assumes a structuring condition:

It is now an *ex-ante* of the conditions of reproduction of each particular capital and the conditions of life, instead of its *ex-post* character typical of competitive capitalism. It is the primary *assumed* reference, which, in current jargon, *signals* the possibilities of reproduction (Oliveira, 1998, p.21).

In summary, both from the point of view of capital and social reproduction, the public fund led to a “double deparametrization” of the law of value (Oliveira, 1998). Instead of the rate of profit and wages being determined by the relationship between constant capital and variable capital, in the new “*social-democratic mode of production*” (Oliveira, 1998, p. 58), its determination depends on the relationship of each private capital with the public fund. On the labor force commodity side, wages would also go through a similar process by becoming the basic parameter of the production of public goods and services, would also go through a similar process.

Value is no longer self-referenced. Anti-value reveals the *emergence of other logics* that gain importance in the crisis of value. What is their relevance to urban struggles? How do they impact the valorization of urban space and the

role of non-value, given their significant presence in the formation of peripheries? The importance of these questions lies in the anti-value of establishing a clear dialectic with the commodity form, instituting in the market a form of distribution that allows contrapositions to its value.

For Oliveira (2006), self-construction lacks relevance as a public policy, as it reinforces exclusion and employment. He states that it is necessary to “address the construction of housing to its character as a commodity” (Oliveira, 2006, p. 73), given that “in anti-value, you necessarily pass by the commodity and create the form of distribution that opposes it. Self-construction is not opposed to anything – that is the question” (Oliveira, 2006, p. 75). Contradictorily, he argues that housing solutions produced by the resident himself, outside the market and considered by him as non-value, must be incorporated into the law of value. Interestingly, he also claims that the anti-value would have altered the laws of value.

Table 1 – Negatives of value in Oliveira

Idea	Definition	Expression
Anti-value	Portion of the public fund intended to guarantee social rights and well-being, contrary to the market logic by redistributing surpluses to the working class.	Social policies and public spending that offer essential goods and services as rights, including indirect wage components, promoting the decommodification of the workforce.
Non-value	Forms of work that do not fit into the production of value relations.	Self-construction and other forms of subsistence economics.

Source: created by the author.

In addressing the aforementioned issues, manifestations of “uneven and combined development” hamper thinking, revealing Brazilian specificities in the advancement of capitalist relations, both at the regional and urban levels. The forms of non-value serve the indirect accumulation of capital and promote, in a precarious way, industrialization and urbanization in peripheral countries, such as Brazil. The problem is that although they have similar economic meanings for capital as forms of negation of value, politically, they are distinct. Non-value does not promote anti-value rights, which would ultimately be part of labor rights. It is “another process, different from what I called anti-value, because in anti-value you do not give anything away, you use an instrument to capture [...] part of the profit produced by the system and redistribute this profit within the working class” (Oliveira, 2006, p. 75).

Politically, the author points to a radical difference. However, does emphasizing economics make this author an economicist? Perhaps. This question will be considered in Part III.

Anti-value in David Harvey

Anti-value, as the *negation of value*, is everything that paralyzes or slows down the movement of capital. However, the various circumstances that interrupt (as well as guide or drive) motion of value should not be understood as mere unforeseen events but rather a “deep and abiding feature of what capital is.” (Harvey, 2018, p. 105).

Harvey (2018), like Oliveira (1998), draws on analogies from the natural sciences, such as matter and antimatter, to contemplate anti-value. Thus, he searches for a theoretical meaning for the “evolutionary laws of capital,” similar to what happens with the ‘laws of physics,’ in which fundamental processes develop from an oppositional relationship. Because the value incorporates “within it the possibility for its negation.” (Harvey, 2018, p. 72), negativity is an immanent condition to the value in motion.

In Harvey’s (2018) exposition, the negation of value (devaluation) takes different *forms* in the processes of valorization and realization of capital. He illustrates anti-value as: (i) the barriers to the continual production and circulation of capital; (ii) a field of anti-capitalist struggle (through strikes, boycotts, etc.); (iii) unproductive (but socially necessary) labor and, mainly; (iv) debt economy.

En passant, the first meaning put forward by the author is related to barriers to be fundamentally overcome by capitalist producers. These obstructions to the movement of value are conditioned by multiple determinations (supply, demand, exchange, interest, etc.) that internally accommodate a potential devaluation. If, for example, a capital commodity is not realizable at a given time, it is negated capital. In view of this, “Anti-value has to be overcome – redeemed as it were – if value production is to survive the travails of circulation.” (Harvey, 2018, p. 74), because, in another way (and in greater proportions), its accumulation triggers potential crises in the capitalist system.

As an anti-capitalist battlefield, the form of anti-value metamorphoses. There is a potentially emancipatory perspective on class division and struggle. The worker, due to the resistance to precariousness or the simple “refusal to work is the anti-value personified” (Harvey, 2018, p. 77). As resistance to the dispossession of the common and to human alienation in the production

and consumption of commodities, this mobilization of anti-value foresees other social forms that deny the capitalist social mode.

Thus, we can infer that Harvey (2018) also views Oliveira's *anti-value* (1988). During the period between 1945 and 1980, under the authority of the Welfare State, "Competitive capitalism ceded ground to state monopoly capitalism while Keynesian state policies arranged market incentives along quite different lines" (Harvey, 2018, p. 80). As a consequence of the financing of social reproduction, "significant segments of the working class were empowered whose anti-value and anti-capitalist sentiments became all too clear as the 1960s wore on." (Harvey, 2018, p. 80).

Unproductive but socially necessary labor, in turn, increases relative surplus value by optimizing the circulation time of capital. Although it does not create value (Marx, 2013 [1867]), unproductive labor does not deny it either, except when the cost of excess unproductive workers hinders the circulation of value (Harvey, 2018). This was the case of recent mass layoffs in big techs, which, after record hiring and earning during the global health crisis, laid off 264 thousand professionals in 2023.³

Regarding the last announced form, Harvey (2018, p. 78) is more emphatic, as he treats the "role of debt as a crucial form of anti-value." It is not necessarily a force contrary to the formation of value, even though it may violently deny it. What is new is "The massive deployment of anti-value within the financial system to ensure future value production" (Harvey, 2018, p. 81).

Because capital is value in motion, any deceleration or interruption becomes a devaluation.⁴ These adversities do not reveal "nothing mystical or obscure about the negation of value" (Harvey, 2018, p. 73), as they are inherent in any capitalist production process. However, failure to overcome these barriers implies, on an expanded scale, the eventual general devaluation of capital (Harvey, 2018). Thus, the value in motion *must* be maintained (or accelerated).

This dynamic illuminates the contradictory role of debt in conserving and expanding the value cycle. If, at first, indebtedness made it possible to reconcile different times of capital circulation, as well as to admit the circulation of hoarded capital (Harvey, 2018), the current challenge is to understand "how

³ See layoffs.fyi.

⁴ "If capital comes to a stand-still in the first phase, $M - C$, money capital forms into a hoard; if this happens in the production phase, the means of production cease to function, and labour-power remains unoccupied; if in the last phase, $C' - M'$, unsaleable stocks of commodities obstruct the flow of circulation" (Marx, 1978 [1885], p. 133).

the debt-credit relation is perpetuated and transformed into a fundamental driving force of value” (Harvey, 2018, p. 82).

The lending of a certain amount of capital by the owner of the money to the capitalist producer enables the former to claim a share of the production. To the extent that the borrowed capital bears interest, a fraction of the surplus value that *will still be produced* is relegated to be shared with the owner of the money (banker, financier, etc.).

The growing issuance of debt securities (public and private), originating in the credit system, and their circulation in the financial market shift future value to the center of current social relations and production. At a higher level, the overaccumulation of anti-value by the entire debt of the nation states, small (and large) capitalists, and the population in general occurs in two specific forms: in the inevitable crises and in debt bondage. On the latter, a situation on the horizon in which debt, a claim to the value of future production, is coercively established as a predominant social relationship.

Workers shackled by debt, motivated by different needs, by the offer of empty promises (gambling) and predatory loans, compromise the construction of alternative futures by pre-emptively curtailing any form of anti-capitalist insurgency. That is, “Piling up debt on vulnerable and marginalised populations is, in short, a way to discipline the borrowers into being productive labourers” (Harvey, 2018, p. 82).

Descriptions of anti-values, far from being accidental or novel, are subject to “rescue” or capture, as the negation of value can be carried out consciously or strategically by the ruling classes (Harvey, 2018). However, in moments of capital inflection, such as generalized crises, the “realization” of anti-value implies the massive destruction of values that do not indicate the collapse of the capitalist system but its renewal.

Rediscovering anti-value readings

So far, the explanation of anti-value concepts has described processes distinct from capitalist dynamics. At certain times, however, the anti-value identified by one author can resonate in the analysis of the other. After all, each one perceives the world in their own way, in their own time and place, projecting their critical views on certain features that make up the totality of capitalist social reproduction.

First, Oliveira’s proposition was constructed to denote the public fund as a non-capitalistic resource, employed not in the sense of its reproduction or

valorization, similar as Marx's (2011 [1858]) mentions of non-capital in the *Grundrisse*. These resources become presumptions of accumulation, in a contradictory construction, but functional to capital to boost the circulation of value. Such resources "appear not as deviations from the capitalist system, but to necessitate its internal logic of expansion" (Oliveira, 1998, p. 35).

Different forms of indirect compensation promote, according to this author, a partial decommodification by the public fund – and, in this sense, reconnect with the direct policy of anti-value in Harvey's terms. On the other hand, when Harvey discusses the centrality of credit in the general scheme of accumulation, its anti-value expressed in the form of debt rises to a privileged position. Circulating financial capital in the international market appears as a support in the reproduction of capital. However, this same support emerges in the Brazilian socio-spatial formation through the object privileged by Oliveira – the public fund – and the State-Finance nexus of Harvey (2011):

To the extent that the pattern of public funding constituted a true public sphere, the rules of reproduction became more stable because segmented competition arose from predictable and anarchic competition. Certainly, competition still occurs in capitalism but within pre-established and consensual rules. This universalization has paradoxical effects, segmenting competition into at least two levels, the first the oligopoly circuit and the second the competitive capital circuit. *Strictly speaking, the public fund is an Ersatz [substitute] of financial capital*, going beyond the theorization proposed by Hilferding. (Oliveira, 1998, p. 27-28, our italics).

This substitution of functions essential to capital is not new. Based on Wakefield's work, Marx (2013 [1867]) discusses the strategies adopted by capital to overcome the obstacles to its expansion in colonies that did not have the necessary preconditions for capitalist accumulation. The exploitation of the enslaved worker and the political establishment of land prices were palliatives that promoted alienation to the conditions of their own subsistence, subjugating the reproduction of individuals to the determinations of wage labor. In Brazil, for a different set of reasons, a capital market (and a financial sphere) was not formed as quickly as in core countries; therefore, it is the State that promotes circulation and accumulation.

Currently, one could disagree with the decommodification via the public fund that Oliveira suggested. By assuming that this amount of resources, monetary or not, comes from taxes, its origin linked to the distribution of the produced surplus value (together with capitalist profit, interest, and other sources of revenue such as rent). Therefore, its mobilization would be framed, first of all, in a dispute between classes for the reappropriation of

this bulk of social surplus value. That is, there is an unequal redistribution of the bulk of surpluses converted into taxes.

It is worth considering that Oliveira's date and place of vision were *different*. In *The emergence of anti-value*, in 1988, the public fund was foreseen as an alternative, an *anti-capital* provider of *anti-commodities*. The capture of the State, as can be seen today, was a distant threat on the horizon of a country that transitioning back to democratic rule and trying to establish the theoretical bases of its political and economic restructuring.

Oliveira's ideas followed the reality he investigated. His *optimism* when discussing the *rights of anti-value* becomes the pessimism of *The Platypus* (2013) as the State reconverts according to neoliberal caprice. This moment further degrades general living conditions, especially peripheral ones. The dispute over Oliveira's *rights* confronts the *dangerous limits and contradictions* that Harvey (2013 [1982]; 2016) discusses from his place of perception of core capitalism. The temporal and geographical differences between Harvey and Oliveira evidence the transition from welfare capitalism to neoliberalism as well as an underlying process. Harvey describes a scenario subsequent (of capital advancement) to Oliveira's, where privatization and commodification intensify. The practices of decommodification *recommodify*. The public becomes private, and social rights are transformed into commodities.

However, this approach does not reveal any equivalence between these *anti-values*. The meaning that Oliveira attributes is far from what Harvey proposed. They are essentially different. Although they may, in certain situations, emerge from the same object, they do so in directions that do not converge.

This also does not mean that such disputes cannot be read as the result of the anti-value of one or the other. In Harvey's sense, anti-value as a public fund can be understood as creating a dangerous dependence on accumulation or the excessive drainage of resources. This can occur in the form of unproductive labor or in the exhaustion of these resources when absorbed by the private sector in production or consumption, which could be directed to raising the living conditions of the working class. Oliveira's anti-value, converted to the terms of the proposed triad, would approach a non-value (non-capital) replenished as value (in motion) when reappropriated in circuits of valorization benefited by the public fund. Furthermore, as already discussed regarding *decommodification* through the public fund, this scheme would work only when considering the capture of this fraction of the bulk of surpluses (by taxes) as a brief withdrawal from the social circulation of

capital. Such withdrawal would justify a rupture with the social mediation of value. However, this premise can be contradicted, considering broader dimensions of analysis that do not exclude the State itself from the scheme of total circulation of capital. In the case where the public fund never gets rid of its links with value, it can have no other determination than that of value.

While Oliveira's optimism did not materialize, Harvey seems to have given no importance to distinguishing the processes of *opposition* and *negation* of value from his notion of anti-value. Therefore, he makes the mistake of equating two categories that require, from the point of view of production, a theoretical and methodological distinction: anti-value and non-value.⁵ This difference is clear to Oliveira, after all, he proposed this notion of anti-value as distinct from non-value when dealing with goods not produced for exchange (such as self-constructed housing). On the other hand, Harvey often equates these two terms. Non-value is a blind spot in this author's work despite being essential for the theoretical extension of value. As the limit and frontier of a universe not incorporated into capital, non-value illuminates precisely what is beyond the abstractions imposed by the market, revealing essential aspects for the reproduction of the labor force, at least in the periphery of capitalism.

Let non-value be an unexplored frontier for the renewal of accumulation, through its expansion to new social spheres; let it be a way to overcome a mode of social reproduction that conditions life to the expropriation of social work time for the benefit of the ruling classes. This is the direction that the thought integral to this work is oriented. This is accomplished through the contradictions of anti-value, which operate *at* and *through* value.

WHERE WE ARE NOW AND HOW TO MOVE FORWARD

This final section has two objectives: first, to reaffirm the contributions of Oliveira and Harvey to the simultaneous, albeit distinct, dimensions of the economic and political character of anti-value; second, to propose an exploratory synthesis that goes beyond the initial contributions of these authors. To understand the potential of anti-value as an analytical category in the production of space and its struggles, a theoretical reflection is proposed that contributes to the multidimensional investigation of its concrete manifestations and the abstract determinations in the near and far orders.

5 Here, the discussion does not yet address the *non-produced*, the "free gift" that, without representing labor, enters the circulation of value; Harvey (2018) discusses such form in the chapter "Prices without values".

The *near order* and *far order* (Lefebvre, 1991 [1974]) is an open category encompassing both methodological determinations, which allow successive and varied approximations, as well as a perspective on constructing totality. Its mobilization contributes to the thinking of the proposed triad, allowing us to qualify the forms that capital acquires in different dimensions (local and global/ particular and general) and to understand how its determinations persist (transformed) today (Lefebvre, 1991[1974]).

The theoretical framework outlined based on the analyzed works illuminates how, in different orders, the terminology for negation of value terms is recognized.

Table 2 – Manifestations of negation of value

Idea	Expression
Anti-value	The negation of capital in its different forms (commodity, labor, money).
Non-value	Concrete forms of production that do not fit into the capitalist mode of production, as they do not participate in the production or immediate negation of value.
Without value	Gifts of a physical, human, or social nature that, although not the product of labor, can be incorporated into the valorization process used for the rentier to capture social value.

Source: created by the authors.

In addition, the production of space gains centrality in this approach since the “mediator or intermediary” level is “the level of the ‘city,’ as the term is currently used.” (Lefebvre, 2003 [1970], p. 80). On the one hand, it mediates the private level, the built domain, living, and daily life as a sphere for the reproduction of human life (Lefebvre, 2003 [1970]). On the other, the global level, “accommodates the most general, and therefore the most abstract, although essential, relations, such as capital markets and the politics of space.” (Lefebvre, 2003 [1970], p. 79). It is the “institutional space” of capital and its ideologies (Lefebvre, 2003 [1970], p. 79). The urban manifests the elements and forms that do “not exist solely in spatial reality, but also at the representational level.” (Lefebvre, 1991 [1974], p. 230).

RAMIFICATIONS OF ANTI-VALUE

This subsection formulates an *exploratory synthesis* from such approaches and distances, seeking to understand the (dis)continuities between the two conceptions of anti-value, in addition to drawing parallel advances between the authors. For this, this exploratory block is organized as a recapitulation

represented by the economy and politics in the time-space relationship, inferred from the readings and discussions of the authors.

Economy and politics are not separate dimensions, they are integrated spheres that are articulated in time and space. All economic relationships are social relationships, constituted with their own spatio-temporalities. Put in these terms, neither time is reduced to chronology nor space to a stage for the economic and social relations that move value in production, distribution, and consumption. Considering these moments and dimensions, closer observation of the interactions of value and anti-value, sometimes as emulation of the value in motion, sometimes as negation of its movement, is required. The economic, political, and spatio-temporal dimensions can be used to inventory possible developments of the anti-value concepts of both authors.

Economic dimension

Both Harvey and Oliveira highlight the intersection between economics and politics as a theme not fully developed by Marx, in which the State gains prominence. Not by chance, Harvey (2011) emphasizes the explanatory power of the notion “State-Finance nexus”, whose institutional role is to strategically manage interest-bearing capital to circumvent barriers to the circulation of capital, making it the driving force of the accumulation process. Oliveira (1998 [1988]) describes a “*pattern of public financing*” whose function should be to expand the possible production and circulation of goods. In this description, the State becomes a mediator of class relations, being overdetermined by financial capital, which guides it to promote dispossession and ensure the continuity of accumulation.

The notion of dispossession emerges in Harvey’s *The New Imperialism* (2003) and Oliveira’s *The Critique of Dualist Reason* (2013 [1972]). Each in his own way, they return to the concept of *primitive accumulation*. Harvey suggests a change in terminology to emphasize the critique of contemporary capitalism, globalization, and its new forms of dispossession. Oliveira brings to the debate his perspective from the periphery of capitalism, in which he understands that primitive accumulation is not a mere historical phenomenon but a structural characteristic of the Brazilian urban-industrial process. These are different mobilizations of the concept, close to Marx, whose differences must be investigated.

Both authors attribute a central role to distributional conflicts in capitalism, moving away from a view in which distribution is a passive result of the production of surplus value. For Harvey, the current need to pay off debts

has become a key stimulus for the production of value, positioning the distributive conflict as a regulator of the accumulation process. Oliveira, in turn, examines how the public fund works similarly to financial capital, streamlining the circulation of capital and serving as a bridge between savings and investment. He argues that the public fund assumes a preliminary and structural role, essential for the reproduction of capital and life, transforming distribution into a prerequisite of production. Therefore, both emphasize distributional conflicts and their impact on capitalist dynamics, highlighting the interconnection between the State, the financial system, and the circulation of capital as fundamental elements in regulating the production of value.

Oliveira (2013) also stresses the importance of the processes outside the sphere of value and how they integrate with capitalist accumulation in the periphery. An example is the self-construction of housing by workers, a rudimentary practice that, by reducing housing costs, benefits entrepreneurs by enabling lower wages. His criticism argues against the promotion of the collective effort as a public policy, as this housing solution would extend capitalist exploitation instead of promoting the “rights of anti-value.” He views the self-construction of housing as a form of extra work that, by not challenging capitalist logic, is a non-value. Thus, he does not recognize this “solution” and indicates the complexity of “outside of value” practices in housing policies, highlighting the role of non-value in the reproduction of capital in peripheral capitalism.

The notion of non-value represents a blind field in Harvey’s work, which, in turn, highlights the “free gifts” when it comes to valueless prices. He mentions the ability of capital to expand its borders and integrate various forms of work and elements whose potentialities and limitations can be exploited. These products refer to that which is not, in its origin, the result of alienated labor but which, once appropriated, becomes essential for the reproduction of capital. The capitalist appropriation that leads to criticism about the use of science, free gifts, and unpaid work points to:

the danger that such non-value producing activities will either be appropriated by capital as a basis for value production (e.g. appropriated or taken as a free gift of human nature) or function as some kind of reserve for the reproduction of the industrial reserve army (Harvey, 2018, p. 89).

The political dimension

The “direct policy of anti-value” (Harvey, 2018) refers to anti-capitalist practices and policies that seek unalienated existences, located outside the conventional spheres of production and exchange of commodities. It en-

compasses the decommodification of basic goods and services, including the notion of anti-value proposed by Oliveira (1998 [1988]). However, Harvey's (2018) view contemplates a broader range of resistances occurring at various stages of capital circulation, including strikes, boycotts, and movements against privatization.

The two offer different perspectives on the class struggle. Even so, in his analysis, the recognition of the capitalist interconnection between production, reproduction, realization, and distribution remains, indicating the importance of understanding the totality of the circulation of capital. Both expand the concept of class struggle beyond the traditional sphere of production, exploring how conflicts manifest in other areas of everyday life and interaction with the State.

The struggles that occur in the sphere of social reproduction and realization of value are observed by Harvey (2018). He warns that well-intentioned resistance strategies may inadvertently benefit the valorization movement, arguing that social and political struggles should consider the totality of circulation and the need for different strategic alliances to avoid traps that compromise the effectiveness of resistance. This is the case, for example, of the proposal of implementing a basic income in the US or demanded wage increases, which could meet the interests of Silicon Valley entrepreneurs by creating demand for their goods or be appropriated through price increases.⁶

For Oliveira (1998), the social state is both the result of class struggle and a space of struggle. Disputes over the public fund and the budget emerge as a mediator in the new configuration of class struggle and relations in social democracy. There is a "publicization" of social classes, which become collective subjects, but without abandoning the direct confrontation between employees and employers in the private sphere of production, which does not cease to exist. For him, there is no self-regulated market. Capital is dependent on the public fund for its reproduction and has, in the neoliberal retaliation, tried to destroy the "rights of anti-value" without eliminating the dependence of private capital on state resources.

Harvey is an anti-capitalist that observes practices outside the logic of value and identifies not only the manifestation of surplus labor but also the seed of post-capitalist practices. He criticizes the tendency to incorporate these activ-

⁶ Critical analyzes indicate that the free passes in Brazil can favor employers by eliminating payroll expenses.

ities into the capitalist theory of value, providing the issue of domestic work as an example. He also questions why progressives would choose to defend the submission of all forms of work to an alienated regime. For him, the resistance must articulate these practices as elements of a broader anti-capitalist strategy, avoiding the traps that reinforce capitalist accumulation. Note that nothing is said about the practice of self-construction of a house.

In another context, Oliveira adopts a distinct position and transcends the discussion of non-value by setting his hopes on social democracy and possible redistribution from the public fund. He understands that “It is necessary to address the construction of housing decisively for its character as a commodity” (Oliveira, 2006, p. 73). Thus, his gamble consists of incorporating non-value into the logic of value and anti-value rights. Something different from the path taken by Harvey, who, although he does not distinguish the notions of non-value and anti-value, relies on the negative potential of these categories to actively counter the logic of value and challenge it as a “direct action” of anti-value – even though they can promote accumulation or solve problems of irrationality overaccumulation.

Spatial-temporal dimension

The temporal and geographical differences between Harvey and Oliveira entail not only the transformation of capitalism from the Welfare State to neoliberalism but also the transition from decommodification practices to an era of recommodification. In other words, their analyses suffer both from the influence of the context they conducted the interpretations and from the rate of transformations in the different contexts. In addition, the scenario that Harvey describes is later than Oliveira’s, in which privatization and commodification intensify, integrating into the analysis what he called “free gifts from nature,” such as the natural elements of the subsoil and surface, and “free gifts from human nature”, such as knowledge and creativity, which could previously be protected by the Social Welfare State.

From the temporal difference, analogous functions between public fund and financial capital are identified. The way in which both combine and interact presents substantial differences according to geographical contexts (Harvey, 2018). In this sense, the differences between these authors derive not only from a temporal difference but also from a geographical one. Oliveira’s perspective, located on the periphery of capitalism, provides him with insights related to non-value, differentiating them from the manifestations of a more developed capitalist economy, which leads to insights related to

anti-value. After all, the experience and analysis of a more homogeneous capitalist context differ from those where life and research occur in a more fragmented and unequal context.

At this point, we find ourselves again with the very method of criticism aimed at overcoming *insights*: dialectics, which still keeps Marx's work central to understanding and criticizing capital. This justifies exploring the notions of anti-value to present developments that extend the theory of value and, perhaps, update it to elucidate the current crises and the challenges necessary to overcome them. The opposition and interposition of each author's objects, arguments, and starting perspectives allow us to explore their propositions beyond an immediate and direct reading. Dialectical thinking illuminates the criticism of mediations and articulations between the different orders, levels, and dimensions of analysis. It approximates and extends criticism to the totality – of social reproduction and the reproduction of capital itself in all its complexity – allowing the identification of cracks, continuities, discontinuities, and other ways that admit emancipatory practices.

Between the near order and far order

The critical reflection on the proposed triad, articulating these notions in the near order and far order, aims to qualify the different dimensions from the movement of capital itself. As a method, the successive approximations and distances on the categories provide a renewed (and expanded) perspective on their current (re)production. Orders allow us to rethink value in motion and its negative forms as an open and moving totality.

Between the near order and far order, *property* becomes a central element of reflection, as it develops according to the dominant relations of each period and can "give an exposition of all the social relations of bourgeois production" (Marx, 1963 [1847], p. 154). Thus, as a theoretical-conceptual exercise, the proposed triad on the ownership of money, capital, merchandise, and perhaps nature (such as land) applies.

Capital, in its valorization, expresses an immaterial (but objective) relation (abstract labor), whose determination has a social nature (Marx, 2013 [1867]). In the absence of a concrete expression, for example, of gold, money is the form that represents value (Marx, 2013 [1867]). In the cycle of reproduction⁷

⁷ "The conditions of production are at the same time the conditions of reproduction" (Marx, 1976 [1867], p. 711).

of capital, the ownership of money is fundamental for its mobilization as capital, “money [M] which has been changed into commodities [C] and, reconverted into more money [M'] by the sale of these commodities” (Marx, 1976 [1867], p. 256).

The mere ownership of money implies to the *entrepreneur* his commitment as an investment, aiming to expand his wealth as capital (value that is valued). The opposite motion – hoarding money – would be a refusal to invest and a form of anti-value. Since money invested is “the starting point and the conclusion of every valorization process” (Marx, 1976 [1867], p. 255), in the rigid form of the treasury, it renounces its determination of self-valorization by not being placed in mediation or in circulation (commodity money or capital). In the next order, it is a denied value that has not even been circumscribed to the movements of capital, since it has not been transformed into capital.⁸

On the other hand, when money is invested, it becomes a commodity, the elementary form of capitalist wealth. The possession of a “immense collection of commodities” (Marx, 1976 [1867], p. 125) represents a mass of *potential* wealth, because it needs to be collected for the value returns to its monetary form in a greater magnitude than the initial one and, thus, be reinvested according to the cycle of capital.

The realization of the bulk of commodities is only possible if, when traded, it has a use value to others, since, for the producer, it has no use value at all (Marx, 2013 [1867]). In the event that the product is not an object of use for another, it cannot be transacted and, therefore, has no value. If the good “is useless, so is the labour contained in it; the labour does not count as labour, and therefore creates no value.” (Marx, 1976 [1867], p. 131). Under these conditions, the absence of utility negates the return of invested capital; therefore, a bulk of *anti-value* is formed. In the material form of what should be a commodity, it cannot even be considered devalued capital, since value was never, in fact, created.

Ownership of capital, in turn, refers to a broader set of relations of production, which does not exclude the commodity form itself. As a value in motion and in constant search for valorization, any mishap in its cycle implies potential devaluation. That is, one can negate both value and surplus value. How-

8 “A thing can be a use-value without being a value. This is the case whenever its utility to man is not mediated through labour. Air, virgin soil, natural meadows, unplanted forests, etc. fall into this category.” (Marx, 1976 [1867], p. 131).

ever, as previously explained, such a movement is not necessarily contrary to the formation of value and may well increase it. Sometimes, "Anti-value had to be created to force the production of value." (Harvey, 2018, p. 186).

An important emphasis that is becoming much more prominent today is the contradiction that falls on the production of value from financial domination. That is, in the generalization of the expectation of capture in the form of interest and/or income from part of all surplus value to be produced by society. As Harvey (2018, p. 150) stated, "The future is mortgaged to the past." Whether as interest-bearing capital or fictitious capital, the progressive shift from future value to the present places it at the center of current relations of domination.

Under financial preponderance, any projection of future earnings can secure different forms of fictitious capital. In the spatio-temporal dimension, unsurprisingly, important fractions of capital have turned, in recent decades, to the built environment. After all, there is a huge mass of capital immobilized in space whose circulation becomes imaginable under the guise of fictitious capital. Thus, orders near and far are concatenated, and the simple expectation of future revenues, arising from the construction or operation of a building (or infrastructure), allows its owner to capitalize this amount at its present value.⁹ This process consists of the issuance of securities depending on the business to be carried out, which are held by investors and may circulate and possibly return in the form of income to the owners of the securities.

In the development of the proposed terms, the mobilization of anti-value is dynamic¹⁰ and can both promote the reproduction of capital and impair it, either by the expanding debt (public or private) or by the unbridled exploitation of natural resources (which in recent times encourage the accumulation of fictitious capital). However, this methodological issue of dynamizing the notion of anti-value is not only projected on it but also extends to the other categories addressed.

In this sense, the driving force of some production is not value (the valorization of capital) but the need for survival and the possibility of producing the common. If anti-value is the negation of capital, it is circumscribed to the movements of capital. Thus, non-value is that which is not directly inserted in the capital valorization process, i.e., it does not participate in the produc-

⁹ Capitalization refers to the formation of fictitious capital (Marx, 2016 [1984], p. 672).

¹⁰ Through the form of the Public Fund, Oliveira's source of anti-value (1998 [1988]) or through the various forms discussed by Harvey (2018).

tion or *immediate* denial of value. It is not subordinated, in the near order, to the relations of direct exploitation, nor is it aimed at the production of surplus value or the reproduction of capital. The appropriation of the product of self-construction or subsistence production, depending on the triad, allows the development of this notion of non-value.

In the self-construction of the house, similar to subsistence production, the beneficiary is the producer of the good itself. That is, the production of non-values mobilizes only the unproductive labor of the useful thing and does not imply abstract labor or valorization of value. Nevertheless, the use of the good is the material support of value and, in some situations, the utility of the self-constructed house, such as that of the surplus subsistence produce, can end up taking part in the mass of commodities produced for exchange, become a use value, receive a price and, as *if it were value*, be realized. However, since it is not, in fact, value, could another *becoming* beyond the endless accumulation of capital be possible? Perhaps – if, in times of crisis, there is a radical rejection of the society of surplus value.

The production of non-values reveals an emancipatory potential. Although incipient, this proposal suggests reflection on the negative forms of value as a way of thinking about the social production of the common (Harvey, 2016) as opposed to the production of value in the “commodity world” (Lefebvre, 1991 [1974]). At this moment, which in the face of imminent social crises and overlapping events is characterized as Anthropocene, the value, anti-value, and non-value (and without value) triad is reinforced to rethink and practice an alternative path. In it, negation gains prominence by bringing, as a new *becoming*, the transformation and resignification of nature and value to overcome the Capitalocene. This is configured as an object of dispute and class objective that, by denying the valorization of capital, seeks to privilege, contradictorily, in the theory of value, that which is devoid of value.

In the Marxist perspective, the production of non-values would constitute a theoretical and practical social force for the *negation of negation of value*, in which the negative surplus value is transformative of social reality. An absolute negation that, in view of the totality, contains positivity in the *insurgency of use*, in confrontation and overcoming the mercantile vision. Finally, use (not the value) will emerge as collective wealth, and life will be emancipated from the domain imposed by surplus value. ●

AGRADECIMENTOS

We would like to thank the Editor of the Geografares journal and the anonymous reviewer for their valuable and constructive comments, which helped to improve this research. We would also like to thank Dr. Beatriz Rufino (USP) and Dr. Guilherme Petrella (Unifesp) for their careful reading and suggestions. This work was carried out with the support of the Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP), Brazil, Process nº 2022/15763-9 and Process nº 2023/08544-1.

REFERÊNCIAS BIBLIOGRÁFICAS

- HARVEY, D. **O Enigma do Capital: e as crises do capitalismo**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011.
- HARVEY, D. **O novo imperialismo**. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 2005.
- HARVEY, D. **Os limites do capital**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013 [1982].
- HARVEY, D. **17 contradições e o fim do capitalismo**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2016.
- HARVEY, D. **A loucura da razão econômica: Marx e o capital no século XXI**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2018.
- LEFEBVRE, H. **A revolução urbana**. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2002 [1970].
- LEFEBVRE, H. **The production of space**. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell, 1991 [1974].
- MARX, K. **A miséria da filosofia**. São Paulo: Global, 1985 [1847].
- MARX, K. **Grundrisse**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011 [1858].
- MARX, K. **O Capital: crítica da economia política. Livro 1**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013 [1867].
- MARX, K. **O Capital: o processo global da produção capitalista. Livro 3**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2016 [1894].
- OLIVEIRA, F. **Os direitos do antivalor: a economia política da hegemonia imperfeita**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1998.
- OLIVEIRA, F. **O vício da virtude: autoconstrução e acumulação capitalista no Brasil**. Novos Estudos - Cebrap, 2006, p. 67-85.
- OLIVEIRA, F. **Crítica à razão dualista/Ornitorrinco**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Paulo Cesar Xavier Pereira: CConceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Validation, Writing - review & editing.

Vinicius Kuboyama Nakama: Conceptualization, Investigation, Formal Analysis, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing.

Kamir Freire Gemal: Conceptualization, Investigation, Formal Analysis, Writing - original draft.

Tales Fontana Siqueira Cunha: Conceptualization, Investigation, Formal Analysis, Writing - original draft.

Luis Andrés Cevallos Serrano: Conceptualization, Investigation, Formal Analysis, Writing - original draft.

ARTICLE EDITOR

Cláudio Luiz Zanotelli

Federal University of Espírito Santo

Vitória, Espírito Santo, Brazil

claudio.zanotelli@ufes.br

Received: 11/19/2024

Accepted: 03/17/2025

Available online: 03/21/2025