

ARTICLE

The re-production of social relationships in the thought of Henri Lefebvre: a contribution to formation in social work¹ .

La re-producción de las relaciones sociales en el pensamiento de Henri Lefebvre: una contribución a la formación en trabajo social .

Daniele Batista Brandt²

Isabel Cristina da Costa Cardoso

Mónica Brun Beveder

129

Received: 08/08/2023

Accepted: 10/08/2023


How to cite

Brandt, D., da Costa Cardoso, I., & Beveder, D. (2023). The re-production of social relationships in the thought of Henri Lefebvre: a contribution to formation in social work. *Propuestas Críticas en Trabajo Social - Critical Proposals in Social Work* 3(6). 129 -148. DOI: 10.5354/2735-6620.2023.72330.

Introduction

This text emerges from the convergence of the authors' research processes, developed in two doctoral theses defended in the postgraduate program of the State University of Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), and a collective training and study initiative – UrbanoSS – Study Group on Urban Space, Everyday Life, and Social Work, from the School of Social Work (FSS) of UERJ, which is also dedicated to the study of Henri Lefebvre. The presentation of Lefebvre's work is an invitation not to fragment his thinking, which is indeed a unitary whole formed by different "moments" that intertwine and complement each other. Thus, the challenge of the text is to compartmentalize his vast work,

¹ The original article titled "The Re-Production of Social Relations in the Thought of Henri Lefebvre: Contribution to Social Work Education," published by Editorial Navegando in 2020. Available in: https://www.editorianavegando.com/_files/ugd/35e7c6_e201cab1476d402aad49c66777151dcd.pdf#page=117
We appreciate the authors and Editorial Navegando for granting permission to translate and republish this article.

² Corresponding author:  danielebrandt@yahoo.com.br

highlighting the strength of his Marxist tradition and dialectical reading of the reality in motion.

The chapter aims to analyze the conceptual formulation of the re-production of social relations of production as an interpretative key to Lefebvre's work and the Marxist tradition, especially through the centrality given to everyday life and the social production of space, from the development of capitalist society. It analyzes the reduction of the programmed everyday life of social space to abstract space, subsumed under the logic of the commodity. From Lefebvre's emphasis on the dialectics of contradictions and the non-closure of the real and its historical development into a closed systemic totality, we analyze the contradictions of human praxis to detect the processes of deconstruction of domination practices, contained in the dynamics of social re-production, at the level of everyday life and in the dynamics of space production. This process is analyzed from the idea of "residue," which expresses the irreducible nature of praxis until its closure in a closed systemic totality, closed to capitalism. In this sense, the concepts of the right to the city, appropriation-work, and the dialectical movement of the possible-impossible are also analyzed. Finally, the chapter aims to dialogue Social Work with some of the analytical syntheses of Lefebvrian thought. To do this, it chooses professional training and constructs three "fields of complexity" to reflect on the possibilities of this theoretical-methodological and political encounter. The text argues that this dialogue contributes to the realization of the principles of apprehending social totality and rigorous theoretical and methodological treatment of social reality and Social Work.



The Re-production of Social Relations in Lefebvre's Thought

Lefebvre was an unconventional intellectual, resistant to academic formalities (Beveder, 2019). Especially between the 1950s and 1970s, criticisms against him from the Marxist field became recurrent and harsher, primarily due to his fight against vulgarizations of Marxism by the so-called “official Marxism” and, later, the strong structuralist influence. In this “battle of ideas,” the notion of the reproduction of social relations proved to be an important weapon against attempts to construct and disseminate “true” and official Marxism. Against such dogmatism, Lefebvre’s ambition is to contribute to restoring the integrity and richness of Marx’s thought, mainly by reclaiming the writings of his youth, considered “unscientific” and pre-materialist, primarily through a return to dialectics.

For Lefebvre, the process of problematizing social reproduction suffered too many blows to become a valued and developed theme among Marxists. This field of praxis requires even deeper study due to the significant transformative changes during the tumultuous 20th century, when “the capitalist mode of production had to defend itself on a much broader, more diversified, and more complex front, namely: a reproduction of relations of production” (Lefebvre, 2008a, p. 47)³ .

The issue of the reproduction of social relations is a theoretical key to analyzing reality as a concrete and contradictory totality, which is not always in the process of totalization. In addition to helping think about the connection between dimensions of reality, the Lefebvrian notion of re-production of social relations of production has a global character, allowing the conjunction and simultaneity of different historical temporalities and enabling the articulation of analyses of everyday life and urban reality.

Understood as a “constellation of concepts” (Lefebvre, 1973, p. 6), including everyday life, the urban, space, and the production of space, the notion of the re-production of social relations was formulated to serve as a “guiding thread, an intellectual tool for describing and analyzing the ‘real’” (Lefebvre, 1973, p. 6) in the study of contemporary capitalist society. Its importance lies in its ability to encompass the totality of relations of production, not only biological reproduction but also the material or spiritual reproduction of society.

³ Specifically, the theme of the dynamic reproduction of production relations appears explicitly and directly in Lefebvre’s work in the book “La re-producción de las relaciones de producción” (1973). However, this theme is already present in the first volume of the trilogy “Critique of Everyday Life,” published in 1946, albeit indirectly, requiring further theoretical development.

In Lefebvre's words, "The question of relations of production and their reproduction does not coincide with Marx's reproduction of the means of production (labor force, machinery), nor with expanded reproduction (production growth). It is because, for Marx, the reproduction of the means of production and the continuity of material production go hand in hand with the reproduction of social relations. They are inseparable aspects of a process that involves simultaneously cyclical and linear movements, i.e., links between causes and effects (linearities), but also results that regenerate their conditions and reasons (cycles)" (Lefebvre, 1973, p. 8).

In a study on Lefebvre's thought and the centrality of everyday life, Beveder (2019) suggests thinking about Lefebvre's conception based on three axes already present in Marx's thought, which were taken up and developed to think about the reproduction of social relations.

The first axis refers to the criticism of the primacy of productive forces over relations of production, supported by the view of the mode of production as a closed and cohesive system, existing a priori and in itself, as a pre-existing and finished totality. It is a totalizing perspective of knowledge, reinforced by the erroneous analytical conception that capital is a thing and not a social relation that, to exist, requires the expropriation and subjugation of workers and the appropriation and domination of capitalists. Instead of the notion of the mode of production, which closes like a dogma, Lefebvre advocates the use of the notion of socio-economic formation.

The second highlighted axis concerns the need to apprehend and work with the concept of production in its broad sense, against the restricted sense, more common in vulgarizations of Marxism. The strict sense refers to the production of products, things, objects, while the broad sense corresponds to total social production, including the production of social relations and the production of works⁴. In Lefebvre's words, in one of his most famous publications, the human being, as a social being, produces "his life, his history, his consciousness, his world," and therefore produces "the political, legal, religious, artistic, philosophical, and ideological forms." Production in this sense encompasses a multiplicity of works and diverse forms" (Lefebvre, 2013, p. 125).

Thus, "this concept designates a complex process that involves contradictions and not only repeats them, reduplicates them, but also displaces them, modifies them, amplifies them" (Lefebvre, 1973, p. 6). In this way, the field of re-production of social relations is essentially contradictory, presupposing a clash between the repetitive and the residual, the differential, what does not allow itself to be incorporated into the order, and therefore

⁴ "[...] the work possesses something irreplaceable and unique, while the product can be repeated, and indeed, results from repetitive gestures and acts" (Lefebvre, 2013, p. 127, our translation).

re is an open field to becoming, a field of dispute that contains the possible, the virtual, as a constitutive part of the real. It is from this assumption that Lefebvre grounds the utopian dimension of praxis, for example, with the concept of the “right to the city,” which arises from the dialectical movement between the possible and the impossible.

For Lefebvre (1976), the process of reproducing social relations in neocapitalism takes place primarily in three dimensions: everyday life, the urban, and the production of space (the latter containing the first two). As such, the notion of the reproduction of social relations serves to mediate the relationship between these spheres and the totality of bourgeois society. Let's first delve into Lefebvre's critique of everyday life, and then move on to the formulation of the spatial problem and the concepts of the urban phenomenon and the right to the city.

The centrality of everyday life

One of Lefebvre's great contributions to the study of social reality and the reproduction of production relations is the critique of everyday life in Lefebvre's thought, progressively formulated throughout his intellectual career⁵. Everyday life should not be understood as a separate level; in fact, it only makes sense in the concrete totality in which it is inserted. At the same time, and for this reason, the critical analysis of everyday life has undeniable explanatory value, especially in the study of contemporary capitalism.

In a scenario characterized by profound upheavals and transformations, Lefebvre realizes the centrality that everyday life has come to assume within the set of social reproduction strategies, mainly through the establishment of mechanisms for programming and organizing consumption and leisure, the introduction of new technologies in family and domestic life, and what unites these elements: the rationalization of everyday life by the State. Everyday life, Lefebvre says, “[...] is the foundation on which neo-capitalism was established. It was established on everyday life as soil, that is, on firm ground, social substance preserved by political instances” (Lefebvre, 1973, p. 66).

Especially since the 1950s, everyday life has ceased to be a “common place of specialized activities, a neutral place” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 66) and has become a fundamental part of a new reproduction strategy, shaping what Lefebvre proposed to call a “bureaucratic society of directed consumption.”

⁵ Many of the elements later developed in publications do not refer to this theme—the three volumes of “Critique of Everyday Life” (1947, 1961, 1981) and the essential “Everyday Life in the Modern World” (published in 1974) appeared in 1936, in the first book that Lefebvre published, together with Norbert Guterman, titled “Mystified Consciousness”.

In this type of society, everyday life is structured by the State, configuring it to become a structuring element of capitalist social reproduction itself. Everyday life in modernity is brutally established, programming, controlling, configuring, and organizing everyday life, producing enormous discomfort that coexists in tension with generalized satisfaction through manipulated and directed consumption. From this tension arises the “misery of everyday life,” which, with the privileged help of advertising, operates by programming needs and desires, being repetitive and tedious, controlling and organizing time and space through the rationalities imposed by the State⁶.

In the society of directed consumption, everyday life intertwines with terrorism, forming an indispensable binomial for the study of contemporary capitalism and the forms of its social reproduction. The concept of everyday life allows us to observe the pressures and repressions that are exerted at all levels of everyday life.

In Lefebvre’s thought, the concept of terrorism has a meaning as common use and common sense. For Lefebvre, one of the elements that maintains the bureaucratic society of directed consumption is the progressive and diffuse penetration of terror into everyday life, that is, the pressures and repressions in everyday life. Lefebvre’s notion of terrorism, in this sense, goes beyond state institutions or those linked to the State and beyond ideology to unveil the power and action of repression in the everyday lives of people. What is important to emphasize, to avoid misinterpretation, is that Lefebvre does not refer to violence, fear, terror, as inherent control mechanisms in contemporary society.

However, in the “modern world,” repression penetrates and extends into everyday life in such a way that it is difficult to understand where it comes from and how it becomes internalized, justified, and even naturalized by individuals. The highest point of internalization and naturalization of terrorism is manifested in “terrorist societies” (Lefebvre, 1991), where diffuse terror is maximized, as repression comes from all sides, and each subject becomes not only a terrorist of others but also of oneself. Consequently, oppressions are not perceived or recognized but play a fundamental role in controlling and programming everyday life. However, terrorism in everyday life is only subject in appearance, dominating and controlling society entirely. There, the development of contradictions also produces other syntheses where desire pulsates, and, potentially, the residue.

⁶ The “misery of everyday life,” one of the terms in the dialectics of everyday life, refers to “tedious work, humiliation, the life of the working class, the life of women burdened by everyday life. The child and childhood always starting over: Elementary relationships with things, with needs and money, as well as with merchants and commodities. The realm of numbers. The immediate relationship with the sector of reality (health, desire, spontaneity, vitality). The repetitive. The survival of hardship and the prolongation of scarcity: the dominance of the economy, abstinence, deprivation, repression of desires, stingy greed” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 42).

Lefebvre's critique of everyday life is a radical critique of social totality, and its foundations are dialectical: it coexists with its misery, its greatness, its richness, its potential. Everyday life, brutally established, entails its negation. It expresses itself in the field of possibilities, in the creative practices of the new, in a terrain that seems to be only that of repetition in social relations and practices. These escape the reducing and homogenizing power that wants to dominate everything. The richness of the everyday is, therefore, irreducible, ineliminable, albeit residual. It corresponds to thought, a commitment to the movement of reality, to identify, appropriate, potentiate, and guide the residues of a utopian project based on revolutionary praxis. This is the richness and fertility of Lefebvre's critique of everyday life: its main objective is to lift everyday life out of its misery and decadence, rescuing its meaning and power, to break with dominant tendencies and thus subvert the order.

The theory of space production and the development of the right to the city

Parallel to his efforts to systematize a critique of everyday life, Lefebvre emphasizes, in all his works published since the late sixties⁷, the transformations of industrial society resulting from the implosion-explosion of the city and, consequently, the emergence of urban problems, highlighting its entry into the "urban society." Recognizing the historical and temporal limits of Marx's thought, for whom industrialization had its purpose in itself and whose works questioned the urban, Lefebvre argues that industrialization, by producing the urbanization of society, materializes a dual process called urban society.

However, it is important to note that this dual process of industrialization and urbanization lost its meaning when urban life was subordinated to economic growth without proper social development. Thus, observing in late capitalism the tendency for the decline of phenomena linked to industrialization, giving way to urban phenomena, Lefebvre identifies the inversion of this perspective, where industrialization becomes a stage of urbanization.

The issue of space, involving both the urban question (the city and its extension) and the everyday (programmed consumption), displaces the problem of industrialization. However, this does not mean eliminating it, as pre-existing social relations still exist, and the new problem lies precisely in their reproduction (Lefebvre, 2006, p. 67).

⁷ "The Right to the City" in 1968, "From the Rural to the Urban" in 1970, "The Urban Revolution" in 1970, "Marxist Thought and the City" in 1972, "Space and Politics" in 1973, and "The Production of Space" in 1974.



Neocapitalism, by subdividing everyday life into work, private life, and leisure, begins to organize the production of obsolescence for consumption to accelerate capital turnover. It also programs the use of time in a space adapted for this purpose, giving rise to the bureaucratic society of directed consumption in a new city whose inhabitants acquire the generalized status of proletarians.

Within the debate on everyday life and modernity, the concept of “re-production” of social relations of production gains strength in his work, serving as a key to understanding the process of producing social relations (which produce and are producers of everyday life and space) that ensure the reproduction of certain relations (capitalist). In this way, the author contributes to overcoming the traditional (structuralist) interpretation of Marxism regarding urban phenomena, which were considered part of the mode of production (capitalist), whose structure is defined as a relationship between two groups: units of production (companies) and units of consumption (cities) where “the necessary labor force is reproduced,” and where “consumption has no other meaning or scope: to reproduce the labor force” (Lefebvre, 1973, p. 74).

For Lefebvre, traditional Marxism oversimplified urban phenomena by reducing them to a poor scheme where the problem of the “re-production” of relations of production became a mere component of the reproduction of the means of production (labor force)⁸. In contrast, he understands that the place of the “re-production” of relations of production is not limited to the company, the workplace, or labor relations. This is because capitalism has generated new sectors, transforming elements of the pre-existing society, such as art, knowledge, leisure, urban and everyday reality, appropriating them for use mediated by exchange.

It is a production in the broadest sense, encompassing the production of social relations and the “re-production” of specific relations. From this perspective, the entire space becomes the place of this reproduction, including urban space, leisure spaces, educational spaces, everyday spaces, and more (Lefebvre, 2008a, p. 48–49).

In this sense, Lefebvre’s theory of social space contemplates the critique of urban reality and everyday life, as all human activities unfold in a complex space that is both urban and everyday, seeking to guarantee the reproduction of social relations of production. For the author, the urban and the everyday are both product and production, even of the residues that arise from contradictions. These elements occupy a social space that is generated through them and vice versa. With this premise, the author takes up the dialectic

⁸ “The Urban Question,” by Manuel Castells, published in 1972, is the main work of that period presenting structuralist thought on the urban phenomenon and space. Castells is a widely recognized sociologist for his work on society and urban changes, and his work has had a significant influence on the study of urban issues.

tical critique of political economy, emphasizing the contradictions of space production and its central importance in the reproduction of the capitalist system.

Capitalism found in space a way to “overcome” its crises, explaining the transition from industrialization (production) to urbanization (reproduction). In this way, it managed to mitigate the effects of its crises by driving growth not only through the production of traditional commodities but also by occupying and producing a space and an everyday life as part of its predominant strategy for the “re-production” of social relations of production. However, by not resolving its internal conditions, it allows the opposition between dominated spaces and appropriated residues and the formation of residues with the potential for building a counter-hegemonic strategy.

Social space contains, by assigning them appropriate places (more or less), the social relations of reproduction, i.e., the biophysical relations between genders and ages, along with the specific organization of the family. These two intertwining, production and reproduction, cannot be separated: the division of labor influences the family and is supported by it; conversely, family organization intervenes in the division of labor. However, social space distinguishes these activities to ‘locate’ them. Not without difficulties! (Lefebvre, 2006, p. 30, author’s emphasis).

137

For the author, urbanization has “autonomized” from industrialization, and consequently, the crises of capital manifest in the production of space. Therefore, the contemporary urban issue presents itself as a spatial problem. Lefebvre shifts the debate from the classical contradiction between capital and labor to the new contradictions present in the everyday life of neocapitalist urban society, without denying this fundamental contradiction:

“It is not the whole society that becomes the place of reproduction (of relations of production and not just of means of production: it is all space. Occupied by neocapitalism, sectorized, reduced to a homogeneous yet fragmented medium, reduced to fragments [...], space becomes the hallways of power. Productive forces allow those who control them to dispose of space and come to produce it. Productive capacity extends to terrestrial space and surpasses it; natural social space is destroyed and transformed into a social product by the set of techniques [...]. But this growth of productive forces does not stop generating specific contradictions that reproduce and aggravate” (Lefebvre, 1973, p. 95–96, author’s emphasis).



On the one hand, space is the place of the reproduction of capitalist relations of production, where the forces of capital produce a homogeneous space, replacing the desire to live with the simplifying imperative of “surviving first and surviving only” (Lefebvre, 1973, p. 25). On the other hand, dialectically, it allows the formation of differential space as a negation of capitalism, containing a virtuality that points to the horizon of the right to the city. Therefore, class struggle intervenes in space production, with the ability to produce differences that are not internal to economic growth, preventing abstract space from spreading across the planet and erasing such differences.

If space becomes the place of the “re-production” of relations of production, it also becomes the place of extensive opposition that cannot be easily localized, it is diffuse and establishes its center sometimes in one place and then another. This opposition cannot disappear, as it is the murmur and the shadow filled with desire and expectation that accompany the occupation of the world by economic growth, the market, and the (capitalist or socialist) State (Lefebvre, 1973, p. 97–98).

From the perspective of overcoming space only as a product (a commodity), Lefebvre points out the dialectic between the triplicity “perceived – conceived – lived” (which corresponds spatially to the triplicity “practice of space – representations of space – spaces of representation”). Far from being an abstract model, this triplicity aims to highlight the interference of social relations (of production and reproduction) in space and the contradictions they generate. According to the author, spatial practice unites and separates everyday reality (the use of time) and urban reality (the routes and networks that connect places of work, private life, and leisure) in perceived space.

Representations of space form a system of meanings produced by knowledge and ideology, serving as tools for urban planning and technocracy to identify lived and perceived space with conceived space. Spaces of representation materialize the space of domination, which is influenced by the appropriation in the lived space of inhabitants and users.

Therefore, his critique seeks to overcome the “blind spot” and allows understanding urban planning as an ideology that replaces the concept of “inhabiting,” which implies participating in a social life, in a community, a people, or a city, where urban life had, among other qualities, this attribute. Instead, it replaces it with the concept of “habitat,” which, by functionalizing the city, causes the loss of the centrality of the sense of the work and social awareness of production, which is replaced by the everydayness of



consumption and, consequently, urban consciousness. It also recognizes segregation and integration in the society managed by the bourgeoisie (and the State at its service) as a class strategy, through systems and subsystems that favor a particular element of social space, attracting an activity and “diverting it from appropriation to formalize it and transform acts and works into signs and meanings” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 110).

Lefebvre emphasizes that, without idealizing the past, for the city to recover what it once was, as an act and a complete thought work, an urban strategy is required. This strategy must be implemented by groups, classes, or fractions of social classes capable of undertaking revolutionary initiatives. This strategy has the task of formulating and carrying out solutions to urban problems based on the creation of a political program of urban reform and urban projects in the short, medium, and long term:

“Only a global project can define and proclaim all rights, the rights of individuals and groups, determining the conditions of their participation in practice. Among these rights, let us remember: the right to the city (the right not to be excluded from society and civilization in a space produced with the intention of discriminating) and the right to difference (the right not to be forcibly classified into categories imposed by homogenizing powers)” (Lefebvre, 1973, p. 38, author’s emphasis).

139

The pressure exerted by the masses results in the emergence and recognition of some rights that define civilization and are gradually incorporated into everyday life, inscribed in codes regulating social relations. Among these rights, the demand for the right to the city arises, “not for an archaic city, but for urban lifestyle, renewed centrality, places of encounter and exchange, rhythms of life and time management that allow the full use of these moments and places, etc.” (Lefebvre, 2008b, p. 139, author’s emphasis), which manifests as a higher form of rights: the right to freedom, to individualization in socialization, to habitat and to inhabit. The right to work (active participation) and the right to appropriation (different from property rights) are implied in the right to the city (Lefebvre, 2008b, p. 134, author’s emphasis).

In this direction, the right to the city seeks the realization of urban life as a realm of use, which requires overcoming the economic (exchange value, market, and commodity) and presupposes a comprehensive theory of the city and urban society that uses the resources of science, philosophy, and art. This theory must be guided by the working class as the agent, bearer, or social support of this realization, inscribed in the perspective of a revolution under the hegemony of that class.



To achieve this, along with economic revolution (planning for social needs) and political revolution (democratic control of the state apparatus and widespread self-management), a permanent cultural revolution is necessary. In this context, the author's reflection presents a counterposed strategy, a utopia projecting on the horizon a "possible-impossible," a project proposing new urban practices in a new urban society.

It is noteworthy that the concept of the right to the city, although formulated by Lefebvre in 1968, has gained new interpretations since the World Charter for the Right to the City of 2004⁹ and the book "Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to Urban Revolution" of 2012 (Harvey, 2014). It has become a rallying cry in demonstrations in Brazil and other parts of the world. Therefore, it has become a polysemic concept, with a variety of approaches, including the right to move freely in the city, the right to exercise power over the urbanization process, and even the right to create and appropriate the city.

It is noteworthy that the concept of the right to the city, although formulated by Lefebvre in 1968, has gained new interpretations since the World Charter for the Right to the City of 2004⁹ and the book "Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to Urban Revolution" of 2012 (Harvey, 2014). It has become a rallying cry in demonstrations in Brazil and other parts of the world¹⁰. Therefore, it has become a polysemic concept, with a variety of approaches, including the right to move freely in the city, the right to exercise power over the urbanization process, and even the right to create and appropriate the city.

In this context, Brandt (2018) points out that interpretations of the right to the city, even those inspired by Harvey (2014), have taken on a more reformist than revolutionary character, focusing on democratic management of the city through public policies led by the State. This approach, by hiding segregation through integration into a bureaucratic society of directed consumption, suggests the loss of its status as an experimental urban utopia, an approach so important in Lefebvre's thought.

⁹ "The letter resulting from the Social Forum of the Americas in Quito in 2004, the World Urban Forum in Barcelona in 2004 and the V World Social Forum in Porto Alegre in 2005.

¹⁰ Since the economic crisis of 2008, various protests have spread worldwide, including the June Days in Brazil, Occupy in the United States, the Indignados in Spain, the Arab Spring in the Middle East, among others. These events have been driven by a variety of reasons, such as economic inequality, lack of political representation, corruption, and the pursuit

Contributions of Lefebvre's thought to education in Social Work

The limits of a synthetic text on the study of Lefebvre's thought require a capacity for synthesis to address the relationships between this theoretical and political legacy and Social Work. Therefore, we start from the elements of Henri Lefebvre's thought, already analyzed, and emphasize the interaction between these elements and professional education in Social Work.

The structuring logic of current curricular guidelines for Social Work education highlights the existence of three cores of foundation and the necessary transversal articulation between them:

1) core of theoretical-methodological foundations¹¹ of social life; 2) core of foundations of the socio-historical formation of Brazilian society; and 3) core of foundations of professional work.

These cores relate to principles of professional training, among which two stand out:

A rigorous theoretical, historical, and methodological treatment of social reality and Social Work, allowing for understanding of the problems and challenges faced by the professional in the field of the production and reproduction of social life.

of fundamental rights. These mobilizations have shown the ability of civil society to organize and voice their concerns, generating a significant impact on the global political and social agenda.

¹¹ The approval of the curriculum guidelines for Social Work courses through Resolution No. 15, on March 13, 2002, modified both the document presented by ABEPSS in 1996, based on the "National Proposal for Minimum Curriculum for Social Work Courses," approved at a National Assembly of the entity, and the document of the Commission of Experts in Social Work Education, established within the scope of the Higher Education Secretariat of the Ministry of Education and Sports. This process was marked by the approval of the new Guidelines and Bases Law in 1996, one month after the approval of the minimum curriculum, as well as the strengthening of the neoliberal agenda in the field of higher education policy. Therefore, the final text of the three core foundations experienced a reduction in the scope of its wording. However, in this case, the formulation of the document from the Commission of Experts in Social Work Education of 1999 is used, which ratifies the original formulation of 1996.



The adoption of a critical social theory that allows an understanding of social totality in its dimensions of universality, particularity, and singularity (MEC-SESU, 1999, p. 3).

By analyzing each of the cores and the necessary articulation between them, we start from the understanding that Henri Lefebvre's Marxist theoretical and political heritage fits into strengthening the adoption of a critical social theory based on the methodological perspective of totality, to understand both social life in the historical and spatial particularity of Brazilian social formation and Social Work and its critical requirements for training and intervention in social relations. Therefore, three themes expressing "fields of complexity" are presented below, from which the contribution of Lefebvre in the field of education in Social Work can be considered. The intention is to contribute to an agenda of debates and studies on Henri Lefebvre's contribution to professional training in Social Work.

1) Space is socially produced, and the spatial practice of a society reacts to social relations, thus reproducing society.

The theory of the production of space implies recognizing that space is not reduced to the dimension of the location of objects in space, although this practice is also contained and subsumed in the production/reproduction of space. As Lefebvre says, "Let's be clear: production of space and not of this or that object, of this or that thing in space" (Lefebvre, 2008a, p. 138).

Therefore, as previously analyzed, there is no theory of the production of space in Lefebvre that stands without understanding the centrality of the reproduction of social relations of production, mediated by the level of everyday life. Among the important implications of this theoretical-methodological and political assumption for the training of social workers, two stand out.

The first is the critique of reducing the spatial dimension of social policies to the location of their teams in urban and rural spaces, reinforcing the also residual and objectified understanding of the materiality of social policies as "products" (teams), emptying the procedural dimension of the social relations that produce them. Similarly, this view reiterates space as something inert, a mere "background" and a "physical portion" of the territory where social policy teams are implemented. In other words, everything happens as if the production of space and the socio-spatial configurations of its practices, structures, and urban morphologies, such as segregation, social representations of

The second important implication, related to the first, is expressed in the relational and critical conception of territory, which is not reduced to the normative or administrative dimension of the forms of fragmentation and classification of reality and social life by the State¹². This practice also produces space but in the sense of its fragmentation, normalization, and disciplining, and the control of social relations that provide it with material and symbolic support for everyday life. The legal and administrative regulation of urban and rural territories by the State corresponds to what Lefebvre (2006) calls “representation of space.” These practices represent a domain of various areas of scientific knowledge, including Social Work, and contribute to the creation of a “conceived space” (Lefebvre, 2006). This “techno-bureaucracy” is responsible for delineating and controlling space, turning everyday life into an institution (Lefebvre, 2006) and disciplining what Lefebvre calls “spaces of representation,” that is, the space lived by people (Lefebvre, 2006, p. 40).

Given these two implications, it is important to reflect on educational contents and pedagogical and curricular practices that reinforce the orientation proposed by Farage, Helfreich, and Cardoso (2019) in the field of Social Work.

Social workers must question from which conception of territory they are working, both theoretically and practically. Is the starting point the idea of territories of life or territories used, as taught by Santos and Silveira (2001), full of contradictions and, therefore, also generating “residues” in space, in the sense of Lefebvre (1991), that resist, escape, and are irreducible to the discipline of bodies and practices, to forms of thought and desire in everyday life and in the exercise of their overcoming? Or does it start from the notion of an abstract conceived territory, represented, fragmented, and designed from government offices, from top to bottom, without the participation of the population and, in many cases, without the participation of the professionals who will carry out the actions, whether from the public sector or subcontracted social work teams? To answer this question, it is necessary to delve into research processes on the long history of Social Work in popular housing territories and in urban policies aimed at these territories. This will allow understanding and, subsequently, teaching and disseminating in the professional field the theoretical-methodological and ethical-political foundations of these experiences. It will also allow understanding how much creative capacity Social Work has, remembering that this capacity is built collectively and interdisciplinarily in the direction of the struggle for the right to the city (Lefebvre, 2001). All of this starts from the concept of “used territory” (Santos; Silveira, 2001) and its subjects (Farage; Helfreich; Cardoso, 2019).

¹² It is important to note that the actions of the State generate socio-spatial practices that blur the always porous boundaries between the legal and illegal, the formal and informal, as those exercised in racist and violent ways in popular territories.

2) *The historical becoming as an openness to the irreducible nature of human praxis.*

The transformation of reality is one of the existing possibilities among the syntheses produced by the movement of contradictions in the real world. This presupposes a non-reducible understanding of the category of praxis to the mimetic and repetitive moments of capitalist social relations, which contain the potential for utopia and the deconstruction/reconstruction of social relations, thus transforming the conditions that make historical becoming possible through the action of subjects. Here, the centrality of the category of praxis in Marxist dialectics is one of the fundamental legacies of Lefebvre's thought, which can operate as an important mediator between the core foundations of professional work and the other cores, even regarding the dialectic of the "possible-impossible" in relation to human praxis within the movement of historical becoming.

This consideration allows, for example, contributing to a deeper understanding of the professional praxis of Social Work concerning the relationship between the professional project and the social project; analyzing the intersectional dimension of class, gender, and race in this project, its historical and spatial conditions of concrete correlation of forces, as well as its utopian components, articulated to the different temporalities of the daily struggles of Social Work as a profession and part of the working class. Similarly, it allows raising questions about professional training regarding its real and constant permeability to the movement of contradictions in the real world and its conflicts led by different social and class struggles and their subjects and collectives. In other words, under the interpretative key of praxis, questions are raised in the professional training of Social Work about whether and how its knowledge and pedagogical and curricular practices are oriented towards civil society, the collective action of the working class, social movements, and new forms of social activism that are not limited to the institutional field of State politics or the narrower form of social policies.

3) *Dialectical articulation between the agrarian, urban, and environmental dimensions of space and their expressions in the social issue.*

The dialectical understanding between the agrarian, urban, and environmental dimensions of space production and their expressions in the formation and development of the social issue in Brazil presupposes the articulation between the three core foundations of the Social Work curriculum guidelines, as a movement of reconstruction of multiple

determinations of real life. In this sense, they express contradictory forms of social being and social relations in capitalist society, in its universality, which articulate with particularities and singularities, including the different, unequal, and combined temporalities of the development of Brazilian social formation and the re-production of its social relations of production. It is argued here that a fundamental “interpretative key” for the re-production of social relations in Brazil and the expressions of the social issue, to articulate the three core foundations of professional training, is the social history of land and property, and its contradictions, subjects, and conflicts. This praxis is not only historical but also socio-spatial and is inserted in the long history of social space production in Brazil.

In relation to this theme, the text supports Cardoso’s (2018) reflections on the matter:

“By analyzing the relationship between the more universal movement of capital as a social relation and the history of Brazilian social formation, which includes its transition and development process towards capitalism, the issue of land and property is a structural determination of this process, which is singularized and particularized in different forms and social relations, such as agrarian, urban, and environmental issues, which come into conflict because they are based on the contradictions of this ‘long history.’ This structural determination manifests itself, in the present time and in different historical conjunctures, through different practices embodied in class subjects that, as they transform historically, also change the forms and contents of conflicts and their struggles, thus influencing the structures and historical conjunctures and shaping the present and future conditions of land and property in the organization of social life (Cardoso, 2018, p. 48).”

Lefebvre’s analysis of the trinitarian unity between labor, land, and capital, by retaking the centrality of that relationship in Marx’s thought and exposing the transformation of land use and occupation practices and their subordination to private property and the logic of the commodity, overcomes the ideological “disjointedness of space” and offers an important contribution to the realization of principles for understanding social totality and rigorous theoretical and methodological treatment of social reality and Social Work. Thus, it is understood that the raw material for the training of social workers is the teaching and study of the social history of land and property, based on different forms of appropriation, domination, use, and occupation of land, their traditions and histories of conflict, oppression, and resistance, at different scales of the territory of the daily life of the working class, including the bodies of these subjects and their gendered and racialized existences, as an immediate and mediated dimension of these historical processes of class oppression and inequality for the understanding of the social issue.

Final considerations:

The text sought not to compartmentalize Lefebvre's vast work, highlighting the power of his thought for the Marxist tradition and the dialectical reading of reality in motion. The analysis of the re-production of social relations of production, from the centrality given to everyday life and the production of space, aimed to present and analyze the contradictions of these two levels in the dynamics of the re-production of social relations in capitalist society. Through the problematization of these contradictions, the chapter highlighted the necessary understanding of the irredeemable nature of praxis in the face of its closure in a systemic totality, closed to the capitalist order. In this sense, the text also analyzed the driving idea of the wealth and misery of the everyday, as well as the concepts of the right to the city, appropriation-work, and the dialectical movement of the possible-impossible. Finally, the text advanced in the interlocution between Lefebvre's thought and Social Work education, advocating the contribution of this interlocution to the realization of principles for understanding social totality and the rigorous theoretical and methodological treatment of social reality and Social Work contained in the curriculum guidelines for professional training.

References

- Beveder, M. B. El retorno a Lefebvre: la noción de re-producción de las relaciones sociales de producción y la crítica de la vida cotidiana como contribuciones a la tradición marxista. 2019. Tesis (Doctorado en Trabajo Social) - Facultad de Trabajo Social, Universidad de Río de Janeiro, Río de Janeiro, 2019.
- Brandt, D. B. Produção social do espaço e mobilidade das pessoas com deficiência e doença crônica na Cidade do Rio de Janeiro. 2018. Tese (Doctorado em Serviço Social) - Faculdade de Serviço Social, Universidade do Rio de Janeiro, Río de Janeiro, 2018.
- Cardoso, I. C. C. Terra e propriedade como fundamentos da análise das questões agrária, urbana e ambiental. In: SANTANA, J.V. (Org.). Habitação e Serviço Social. Campinas, 2018.
- Farage, E.; Helfreich, F.; Cardoso, I. C. C. Questão urbana, direito à cidade e o serviço social. In: RAMOS, A. et al. (Org.). Desenvolvimento, formação social brasileira e políticas públicas: subsídios analíticos para o serviço social. Uberlândia/MG, 2019.



Harvey, D. Cidades rebeldes: do direito à cidade à revolução urbana. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2014.

Lefebvre, H. Contra os tecnocratas. Lisboa: Moraes Editores, Coleção Temas e Problemas, 1968.

Lefebvre, H. A re-produção das relações de produção. Porto: Publicações Escorpião, 1973.

Lefebvre, H. Tiempos equívocos. Testimonio autobiográfico. Barcelona: Kairós, 1976.

Lefebvre, H. A vida cotidiana no mundo moderno. São Paulo: Ática, 1991.

Lefebvre, H. A revolução urbana. Belo Horizonte: Ed. UFMG, 1999.

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: 2006.

Lefebvre, H. Espaço e política. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2008a.

Lefebvre, H. O direito à cidade. São Paulo: Ed. Centauro, 2008b.

Lefebvre, H. La producción del espacio. Madrid: Capitán Swing: 2013.

MEC-SESU. Coordenação da Comissão de Especialistas de Ensino. Comissão de Especialistas de Ensino (CCEE). Comissão de Especialistas de Ensino em Serviço Social (Coness). Diretrizes Curriculares. Curso Serviço Social. Brasília, fev. de 1999. Disponível em: http://www.abepss.org.br/arquivos/textos/documento_201603311140412406970.pdf. Acesso em: 12 fev. 2020.



Authors' Biographies:

Daniele Batista Brandt is a social worker with a Ph.D. in the Graduate Program in Social Work at the State University of Rio de Janeiro (PPGSS/UERJ). She is a professor in undergraduate and specialization programs in Social Work and Health at the School of Social Work (FSS/UERJ/UERJ). Additionally, she works as a social worker at the National Cancer Institute José Alencar Gomes da Silva (INCA) and is a researcher at “UrbanoSS - Grupo de estudos sobre espaço urbano, vida cotidiana e Serviço Social” at FSS/UERJ. Her work focuses on the intersection between urban space, everyday life, and Social Work.

E-mail: danielebrandt@yahoo.com.br

Isabel Cristina da Costa Cardoso is a social worker with a Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of São Paulo (USP) with a postdoctoral degree in Social Work from the Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP). She serves as a professor in undergraduate and graduate programs in Social Work at the School of Social Work at the State University of Rio de Janeiro (PPGSS/FSS/UERJ). Additionally, she is the coordinator of “UrbanoSS - Grupo de estudos sobre espaço urbano, vida cotidiana e Serviço Social” at FSS/UERJ, where she conducts research and studies on urban space, everyday life, and Social Work.

Email: icostac@superig.com.br

Mónica Brun Beveder is a social worker with a Ph.D. in Social Work from the Graduate Program in Social Work at the State University of Rio de Janeiro (PPGSS/UERJ). She is also a professor at the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of the Republic (UdelaR) in Uruguay and is part of “UrbanoSS - Grupo de estudos sobre espaço urbano, vida cotidiana e Serviço Social” at the School of Social Work at the State University of Rio de Janeiro (FSS/UERJ).

Email: mbrunb@hotmail.com

