

SÃO PAULO

Flávio Villaça
Dec. 26th, 2002 version

Introduction

Social inequality has been Brazil's and São Paulo's most fundamental problem for the past forty years. There are at least two main reasons why social inequality is emphasized in this paper. Firstly because it is especially serious in large cities such as São Paulo. Secondly because it has been increasing all over the world in the past few decades. Not only inequality within cities but also within and between countries.

This paper begins with a few chapters dedicated to a description of São Paulo metropolitan area and its main problems. Though descriptive, these chapters pave the way to subsequent ones, dedicated to an analysis of the relationship between inequality, urban space and urban segregation.

1. São Paulo Metropolitan Area

Municipalities – *municípios*, from now on - are the smallest political unit in Brazil. They have a reasonable degree of autonomy given by the National Constitution. *Municípios* elect a mayor and a city council, (with a number of councilmen proportional to the population), both at the same time and for a four year term. According the Constitution, they are autonomous in all aspects which concern their *local* or *peculiar* matters. Among these are urban real estate property tax , local planning and land use control. *Municípios* can create Districts, which are simply administrative units. However, a district can become a *município*, according to rules defined by National and State Constitutions. The most important of these rules is the requirement that, if a district wants to become a *município*, it's independence must be approved in a plebiscite, which takes place every four years, and must be held in the whole territory of the *município*. Most *municípios* have both, rural and urban areas. They can have more than one urban area, but seldom do, since as its villages grow, they request a plebiscite and may become the seat of a new *município*. In metropolitan areas there are several *municípios* which are 100% urban.

São Paulo is the name of a state, a metropolitan area and a *município*. The city of São Paulo is the capital of São Paulo state. According to 2000 census,(IBGE is the source of all census figures)) population figures were:

São Paulo State	37.032.403
Município of São Paulo	10.434.252
São Paulo Metropolitan Area	17.343.252

São Paulo Metropolitan Area comprises 39 *municípios*. Several of them have significant rural areas but only a few have significant rural production. The metropolitan area has roughly the shape of a trapeze, about 75km wide and with an average length of 110km (fig.2) São Paulo is only 50km from the sea, in a straight line, but 800m above sea level(fig..5). Within a 90km radius from the city center there are two other rather large metropolitan areas; Campinas (pop. 2.338.000 in 2.000; fig.3) and Santos, São Paulo's port (pop. 1.477.000 in 2.000; figs., 4 and 5). Within this radius there are also other cities and towns with populations ranging from 50.000 to 600.000. This megalopolis has a present population of some 23 million.

Economy

São Paulo State is Brazil's richest, more developed and more populous state. It is responsible for 1/3 of Brazil's GNP (*) although representing 22% of the country's population. In 1996 the megalopolis mentioned above (90km radius from downtown São Paulo) was responsible for 90,3% of São Paulo State industrial added value. (SEADE, quoted, in *Plano Diretor Estratégico do Município de São Paulo*, 2002, p. III.). In 2000, the same area was responsible 12.8% of Brazil's population and for 27.7% of Brazil's GNP. (EMPLASA's site, oct. 10th, 2002).

São Paulo, once a large industrial city, is today a metropolis of business and services. In the past 20 years there has been a considerable increase of industrial development in other metropolitan areas of the county. The reasons for this, however, are not related – as some contend - with internal disadvantages of São Paulo Metropolitan Area, be it congestion, pollution, violence, labour salaries or living conditions. These disadvantages are important factors influencing the declining rate of industrial growth in the Metropolitan Area, but there are other more important causes for this process. The first one is that Brazil's space is today far more homogeneous in terms of transportation routes and availability of energy and even qualified labour power, than it was 20 or 30 years ago; today, other cities in the country offer locational advantages that , in the past, only São Paulo offered. The second important cause for the so called *industrial decentralization* or *demetropolization* of São Paulo has been the industrial growth which has been taking place around São Paulo – just like in the past – but within a much bigger radius of some 100 or 200km. Industrial development which today takes place within that radius is equivalent to the same development which took place within a 50km radius in the 60's. The difference is that technological development in transportation and communication allows industries to locate at greater distances. Besides, São Paulo today is 6 times bigger than it was in the 60's (fig. 2). All this means that industries which today locate further away are not industries which are leaving São Paulo. Finally the exceptional growth of employment in business and services is a trend which is taking place in the economy of the whole county, (if not in the whole world) not only in São Paulo. Figures below show employment breakdown by economic sector.

(*)Brazil's GNP - Gross National Product, was US\$ 705,32 billion in 1995, but dropped to 595,9 billion in 2000, due to changes in the dollar rate of exchange. *Per capita* GNP dropped from US\$4.542,00 to US\$ 3.490,00 in the same period.(DIEESE's site)

Unemployment has increased considerably in the past few years, jumping from 10% in 1990 to 18.2% in 1998 (SEADE's site, oct. 8th 2002))

Employment 1998

Primary sector.....	0,1%
Industry.....	28,3%
Commerce.....	15,4%
Services.....	40,7%
Public administration.....	15,3%
Other.....	-

Source. EMPLASA's site, oct. 10th 2002

Inequality

The knowledge of the enormous inequalities which prevail in Brazil, is of vital importance, in the understanding not only of the country and its society but also of the urban space of its cities as well. The understanding of geographical structure of São Paulo metropolitan area requires the understanding of social inequalities in Brazil.

Bellow is the distribution of households in São Paulo Metropolitan Area according to monthly earnings of household heads, according to 2000 census (IBGE).

3 minimum salaries or less(*).....	32,2%.
From 3 to 30 minimum salaries.....	52,4%
More than 30 minimum salaries.....	4,2%
No earnings.....	11,2%

Brazil has already been first in the world concerning unequal income distribution, but according to the UN 2001 Report it had the 4th worst wealth distribution in the world and the 2nd worst in Latin America behind Honduras, Bolivia, Paraguay, Chile and Colombia (FSP July 11th, 2002, pag. A-7)). In Brazil, the wealthiest 20% have an income 33 times bigger than the poorest 20%. In Mexico it is 13 times bigger (*Veja Magazine*, march 27, 2002) According to officials of the Brazilian Government Statistics Bureau (IBGE) income distribution has not improved in the 90's since "... in 1999, as in 1992, ... the earnings of the wealthiest 10% and those of the poorest 40% have had the same rate of growth which means that the gap hasn't changed. (FSP April 5, 2001, pg. C-1). According to the 2001 UN Report on Human Development, income inequality in Brazil is still very high since "... the wealthiest 10% capture 46,7% of total income whereas the poorest 10% capture only 1% (FSP July 10th, 2001, pg. A-9).

(*) Minimum salary in the past few years has varied between US\$ 70,00 to US\$ 100,00 a month, according to the dollar rate of exchange.

Considering now the UN Human Development Index Report released in 2000, Brazil's position concerning the HDI was 79th in the world, behind Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Costa Rica, Cuba, Mexico, Venezuela, and Colombia, (FSP june 29th, 2000, pg. 2). Later on we will see the consequences of this picture not only in São Paulo's population but specifically on its urban space

Figures below were selected to show the gap in living conditions between different neighbourhoods in São Paulo. The indicator selected is infant mortality rate. To the left are shown the names of four neighbourhoods and to the right the distance between them in a straight line. The first and the third ones are upper class neighbourhoods located within the *Area of High Concentration of Upper Income Classes* (see below, **Urban Space**). The second and the fourth concentrate mostly poor population. Last column shows the distance between the two neighbourhoods. Both, in 1995 and 1999, rates in poor neighbourhoods were almost three times bigger.

Neighbourhoods	Infant mortality rate (*)		Distance
	1995	1999	
Lageado	37.6	18.4	28 km
Jardim Paulista	13,8	5,3	
Anhanguera	38.3	11,0	22 km
Moema	13,1	5,6	

(*) Deaths below 1 year/ 1000 born alive
 Source: EMPLASA's site oct. 10th 2002

Transportation

São Paulo's subway is quite new. It opened in September 1974 and the present total length of its three lines is only 49,2km. This means that in the past 30 years the average rate of subway construction has been only 1,64 km/year. If this rate is kept in the next decades, it will take from 200 to 270 years for São Paulo to have a subway network close to those of New York, Paris or London (from 350 to 450 km). São Paulo's subway carries today 715 million passengers a year. Suburban passenger train lines are 275,9km long and carry only 895.000 passengers a year.(CPTM stie, october 12th, 2002)

Is this poor urban transportation system the result of the lack of financial resources of Brazil and São Paulo? Partly yes, but it is also the result of the enormous income and political power gap between social classes in the country? Let's see the other side of the coin of the urban transportation picture in São Paulo. According to *Veja Magazine* (march 13, 2002, pg. 70) São Paulo Metropolitan Area has the largest helicopter fleet in the world outside the

US; 550 vehicles in a total of 950 aircrafts outside the US.. This fleet, associated with a total lack of air traffic planning and discipline, is responsible for the fact (according to

the Magazine) that São Paulo has 70 (seventy) times more helipoints than New York and seven times the added number of helipoints of Tokio, Los Angeles, New York, Frankfurt, London, Rome, Chicago and Paris.

Housing

Statistics on shanty towns (from now on, *favelas*) are a delicate and complex matter (by no means an excuse for not having them) mainly due to different criteria in defining *favela*. Historical statistics series are limited. The basic characteristic of a *favela* is the absence of a precise lot and of land ownership title, not so much physical quality of houses and absence of infrastructure.. There are two types of poor neighbourhoods in Brazilian cities. *Favela* and illegal subdivisions. Since the former occupies invaded land (hillsides in Rio or public land set aside for recreation facilities in land subdivision developments) there are neither defined lots nor defined streets (fig. 7) The other type is the *periferia* which has its origins in illegal land subdivision developments (fig. 6). The illegality consists mainly in the lack of approval of the subdivision plan by municipal authorities, according to federal and municipal codes. However, contrary to the *favela*, there are defined lots, defined streets and legal land ownership titles. All house construction is self help and, with time, *periferia* can reach a reasonable urban standard. Sooner or latter streets will be paved and infrastructure will come (see fig....) *Favelas* have been consistently growing in Brazilian large and middle size cities in the past 40 years. Only very recently authorities throughout the country gave up considering *favelas* a temporary phenomenon . As a result experiences in improving their urban standards and giving occupants land ownership titles are still very limited.

Figures bellow show the proportion of total population living in *favelas* in *Município* of São Paulo and metropolitan area.

São Paulo Município

1973	1,09%
1974	1,60%
1978	4,01%
1979	3,20%
1980	From 3,94% to 5,18%
1985	6,27%
1987	7,70%

Source; TACHNER and VERAS, 1990

São Paulo Metropolitan Area

1994	6.20%
1995	9.10%

Source; SEADE.'s site oct. 8th 2002

Although there is some discrepancy between figures above, according to different sources, a conservative estimate would indicate that by 2000, at least 10% of the Metropolitan Area population would live in *favelas*. According to SEADE, in 1998, 5% of São Paulo's population lived in slums. That would mean a total housing *deficit of* at least 750.000 dwelling units (2.7 million people) in 2.000.

In the past 10 years low cost public housing production in the metropolitan area (by both, state and municipal government) has never exceeded 12.000 dwelling units / year. Adopting this optimistic rate of low cost public house production, it would take some 63 years to meet present *deficit* only, assuming no *deficit* growth at all in the future.

Violence

There is a considerable resistance from part of the Brazilian elite (a part of the press included) in accepting any association between poverty and violence. A TV newsmen once said: “If poverty were the cause of violence, India would be the most violent country on earth”. We believe that is not the proper way of looking at the problem. What has to be analysed is social injustice, relative poverty. What has to be explored is the *gap* in income, living conditions and opportunities between rich and poor. Is the *consciousness of poverty* not absolute poverty .

Although not shown in statistics, it is not unreal to associate income gap with gap in political power, housing conditions and education opportunities. The poor minority doesn't see this connection (may be even many rich people don't) but they *feel* it. They feel the injustice of exclusion, of unequal distribution of opportunities, difference in health care, education and housing conditions. Here we arrive at the question of *political power gap*. Together with the income gap, this is the most fundamental, complex and important of all inequalities in Brazilian society today.

One expression of such inequality is the explosion of violence in the past few decades, which today is widespread in Brazil, reaching even middle size towns. Violence then, would be the expression of social revolt which has its roots in the injustice which comes with unequal distribution of income, political power and opportunities.

Bellow are some figures concerning violence in São Paulo Metropolitan Area: (*)

	1990	1999
Homicides and homicide attempts	8.287	14.132
Deaths in traffic accidents	1.520	1.695
Cases of body injuries in traffic accidents	45.394	38.597

Source: Secretaria de Segurança Publica and SEADE, shown in EEMPLASA.'s site in oct.10th 2002.

(*) Population in 1991 census was 16.567.317 (IBGE, 1991 census).

Two types of violence were deliberately chosen to be shown above. One which would be, and another, which would not be, related with a revolt against exclusion and injustice. One is increasing and the other is stable or dropping.

Inequality, urban segregation and urban space

Urban space clearly reflects income and political power gap between the poor majority and the rich minority. In fact, the analysis of urban space in Brazil, through the study of urban socio-spatial segregation, throws new light and opens new and interesting paths in the understanding of violence. That is why we will deal with it rather extensively in this paper.

Urban spatial segregation was widely studied in the 50's and 60's especially by American sociology. Studies however have failed in going beyond description and became outmoded. One of the most outstanding features of urban space in Brazilian large and middle size cities is that all of them exhibit, to considerable degree, a significant pattern of socio-spatial segregation. It is a subtle type of segregation, different from traditional patterns. Despite its enormous importance it has gone unnoticed by most experts. This pattern has to be understood if one wants to understand the structure of metropolitan space in Brazil. Understanding urban space helps understanding of violence, and vice versa, understanding violence helps understanding urban space.

Ethnic segregation is probably the most widely known kind of urban segregation. Up to the 60's in many cities or states in the United States, for instance, there were ordinances defining separate *spaces* for whites and African Americans such as bus seats, bathrooms, schools etc. Jewish *ghettos* are another example.

What we want to stress here is the difference between minority groups segregation (be it an ethnical group or not – such as gays for instance) and social class segregation. In almost every large city in the world today there is some segregation of some social minority, not necessarily ethnical; Negroes, Jews, Latins, gays. There are Japanese neighbourhoods in São Paulo, Afro American ones in New York, Turkish ones in Berlin, Arabians in Paris, Caribbeans in London and gays in San Francisco.

Recent advances in segregation studies have been limited and keep describing and/or measuring it, not *explaining* it. At best, some investigations correlate urban segregation and social classes or government action, but do not advance beyond correlations. There is very little – if any – attempt to *explain* segregation, to reach a common ground explaining different types of urban segregation, not to say integrating explanations into social totality and its movements (*).

(*) This was quite clear, for example, in a seminar called *Segregation and the City* held in Cambridge, Mass. USA in July 2001, sponsored by the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy gathering about 30 scholars from different parts of the world.

This topic will briefly present the difference between social class segregation and other types of segregation – mainly ethnical segregation - and stress the fundamental character of the former. Rich Jews and poor Jews live in different neighbourhoods. In São Paulo rich gays and poor gays meet in different sectors of the city. The main difference between these neighbourhoods or sectors is *location*. In São Paulo, for instance, the area where upper class gays meet is close to upper class neighbourhoods where most of them live. Poor gays meet downtown, a violent and “deteriorated” area, but offering optimum accessibility to most parts of the city. In America, a society dominated by automobile transportation, the worst locations are the central ones, where people depend upon public transport. In central areas live a significant proportion of the poor - Afro Americans, Latins or Chinese (although the reverse is not necessarily true) – *regardless of ethnicity*.

Social class segregation is a process which would occur in all class societies. The class segregation process which takes place in Brazil is not very different in nature (although very different in degree) from the ones which have produced East Side and West Side in New York, East End and West End, in London or Rive Droite and Rive Gauche in Paris.

Another aspect which makes class segregation fundamental is that it would be inherent to class societies whereas ethnic segregation, for instance, is not necessarily inherent to multi racial societies. In the past few decades segregation of negroes has been considerably reduced (if not eliminated) in America and South Africa. Class segregation however, would be inherent to class societies and the stronger the gap between classes the stronger segregation would be. Last but not least, class segregation is the main force determining urban spatial structure and differences in urban space, in societies with deep gap between social classes. Group segregation does not exhibit a similar power. Since we believe class segregation dominates other kinds of segregation, we consider it the most fundamental kind of segregation. This is the aspect which brings São Paulo into the picture.

Most urban segregation studies concentrate in neighbourhood segregation, i.e. areas with a *high degree of internal homogeneity*., Our focus however, is in larger areas which include several neighbourhoods of different social classes and do not exhibit a “high” degree of internal homogeneity. Nevertheless they are segregated areas.

Our studies (VILLAÇA, 1998) have shown that Brazilian metropolises have developed for over a century, a clear segregation process of upper income classes. Such process has exhibited a remarkable similarity with the one described by Homer Hoyt (HOYT, 1959) for American metropolitan areas about 60 years ago. Hoyt however, described but did not explain the patterns he discovered. In Brazil, upper class neighbourhoods have shown a *pattern of movement*, always in the same direction, and today are highly concentrated in one single general area or region of the metropolis. We believe that the wider the gap between social classes’ economic and political power (like in Latin America) the stronger will be upper class segregation and the stronger the role their segregated area will play in shaping the whole of urban spatial structure. We shall see how and why this happens.

The “*Area of High Concentration of Upper Income Classes*” (fig.8) has the following important characteristics:

It includes several neighbourhoods of different social classes. In Brazil, several of them have even *favelas* .

The majority of families in such areas **are not** upper class – or income - families.

The majority of upper class families live in such areas, **but the reverse is not true**.

In most Brazilian metropolitan areas – São Paulo included - such areas concentrate about 10% of total population but more than 50% of upper class families. The remaining 50% are spread out all over $\frac{3}{4}$ of the urban area. However, in all metropolitan areas in the country, the **trend** toward concentration in one single large area or direction is clear .

Since the beginning of the 20th century upper income classes in Brazilian large cities, started a spatial movement and segregation process toward areas (or in areas) which met the two following requirements, both involving the development of the city's transportation system: a) good accessibility to the city center. b) natural beauty. As the city grew and consolidated its spatial structure, the second requirement became less important. This became quite clear in cities with no exceptionally beautiful natural site (like São Paulo, and unlike Rio). The spatial growth in one single direction is necessary for meeting the first requirement. It shows the dominance of the spatial structure (accessibility) over natural beauty.(*). The result of this movement has been the formation of an area of high concentration of upper income classes. To show such area in São Paulo, several census tracks were grouped and an area was defined which in 1991 comprised 13,7% of total population and 9,7% of the metropolitan built up area, but 54% of family heads earning more than 20 minimum salaries a month. (fig.8). In 2000 the same area had 9,97% of total population but 41,18% of family heads earning more than 20 minimum salaries a month. This does not mean, necessarily that segregation has decreased. What probably happened is that the *Area of High Concentration* has moved a little bit (as it always has) and needs to be reshaped.

Social class segregation is a necessary process for controlling urban space production process by upper classes. Without segregation in a single **urban region** or **large area** such a control would be impossible or extremely difficult. According to CASTELLS (1978, 141) "... the whole social problematic has its origin in these two terms (nature and culture) in a dialectical process through which a particular biological species (particular, for it is divided into classes) "*man*" transforms itself and the environment in its struggle for life and for *the unequal appropriation of the product of its labour* (emphasis added) . Urban space is a set of resources produced by human labour and social classes struggle for its unequal appropriation. These resources are of two kinds: a) Those which are produced by human labour and can be reproduced by it; apartment buildings, shopping

(*) Accessibility to the city center (CBD) has traditionally been an important location requirement for upper class neighbourhoods in Brazilian cities. In the past three decades however, there has been a strong trend toward upper class suburban growth. Nevertheless, the majority of that class still lives in the central city and even reasonably close to the center.(fig.8).

centers, office buildings, super markets, industrial plants etc.

b) Those which are produced by human labour but **cannot** be reproduced by human labour. These are the **locations** of schools, parks, hospitals, shopping centers and office buildings. It is impossible to reproduce the corner between Broadway X 42nd Street. Urban space's fundamental characteristic is that it is (contrary to buildings) made up of a set of resources (locations) which are produced by human labour, but cannot be reproduced by human labour.

Segregation is a necessary process for the unequal appropriation of space as a set of resources, location being the main one. Through segregation, the production (and consumption) process of locations (and their counterpart which is transportation), is controlled. The control we are talking about is exercised through the control of space production process itself. Through the control of a specific spatiality. It takes place in all three spheres of social totality: the economic, the political and the ideological spheres. Let's see how this happens.

-Segregation and the economic control of real estate market

The economic spheres works on segregation mainly through the real estate market. We will show how does this happens, analysing the the biggest concentration of business and services in São Paulo: its CBD. Along the 20th century CBDs of Brazilian metropolitan areas (and São Paulo's) have consistently grown in the same growth direction of upper income residential areas. In a first stage (first half of 20th century) , the CBD has split into two **contiguous** parts. One, facing upper classes growth direction, gathering shops and services oriented toward upper class clientele. The other part, facing the opposite direction and oriented to lower class customers. In the 60s and 70s the CBD split into two **completely separated** and distant parts. As a result another CBD (a so called *new* CBD) was developed separately from the first (*old*) one.. The new one has grown oriented toward upper class customers and the old one, abandoned by these customers, was taken up by lower class customers. Its shops, offices, cinemas, restaurants etc. once patronised by upper classes were abandoned by such classes and their buildings lost their real estate value. This process became known as *blight* or *deterioration* of the CBD. An ideology was developed according to which the city had a *new* center. Precisely at the moment, when the *old* CBD becomes really the center of the city - since it is used by the majority of the population - the dominant ideology says it is no longer the center of the city, since the city has a new center We will return to this point further on . .

-Segregation and the control of the State

The analysis of the role of the State (at national, state and local levels) shows how political power operates in shaping a segregated urban space. This control also takes place in three spheres: the spatial distribution of infrastructure, specially the transportation system; the location of government offices and finally land use and environment control legislation.

Historically the State in Brazil has always privileged infrastructure investments in the *Area of High Concentration of Upper Income Classes*. Rio is a good example. The difference

between the major street and transportation systems between the North (poor) and of the South (wealthy) “Zones” in Rio is remarkable. Since the beginning of XX century freeways, tunnels, elevated freeways and boulevards have been built (including dumping the sea) to improve access to the so called South Zone in Rio. The North Zone has traditionally been served by a much poorer major street system and by a poor, obsolete, unsafe and terribly overcrowded suburban train service. On the other hand, the South Zone is served by a much better major street system, with beautifully landscaped parkways and freeways and by a modern air conditioned subway..

In almost all metropolitan areas in Brazil, government offices are moving out of the *old* CBD and locating in the *Area of High Concentration of Upper Income Class* in the so called *New CBD*. In São Paulo, more and more, government offices – federal, state or municipal – move to that area.

Finally the analysis of changes in land use and environment control ordinances along the 20th century - especially zoning and subdivision regulations – show they have been designed to meet upper income standards of lot sizes, set backs, heights and uses. According to the City of São Paulo Government (ROLNIK et alii, no date, 90) 60% to 70% of São Paulos buildings have not followed either zoning, or building and land subdivision codes. Following them would cost money; more than the poor majority can afford.

- Segregation and the control of ideological production

The traditional Marxist concept of ideology will be followed here. It says the real world is not immediately obvious to our senses and to our knowledge. That is the reason why science is necessary. The reality we observe is then subject to versions or to interpretations. Ideology (Chauí, 1981, 21) is the version developed by the ruling class in order to make its domination easier and acceptable by dominated classes. Such a version tends to hide from society the true process of social relations of production (urban space production, in our case). In the case of São Paulo, the purpose of ideology is to hide the real social process which produces two different cities within the same city.

There are several ideological versions concerning urban space and its social production. We will group them into two categories:

The first one can be called *naturalization of social processes*. The idea here is to make society believe that social processes are caused by nature, not by men. For instance: poverty in Northeastern Brazil is caused by persistent draughts. The version of CBD *deterioration* belongs to this category. It tries to convey the idea that urban decay is a natural process. The idea of deterioration refers to the rotting of living bodies – fruits, vegetables, animals, human body - caused by old age or death. It is a natural inevitable process. Ideology tries to convey the idea that the so called *urban decay* of the CBD is a natural process caused by the old age and obsolescence of many CBD buildings. The words themselves – blight and deterioration – were taken up from the natural world.

The second category is the *universalization of the particular*, which tries to take the whole by one of its parts. Ideology tries to convey the idea that a specific *part* of the city is *the*

city. Which part? The *area with high concentration of upper income classes*, and the **new** CBD, or (a few decades ago) that part of the CBD patronised by upper income classes. Another good and internationally known: example *Rio de Janeiro is a beautiful city*. Actually only a small part of the city is beautiful: its center and the *Area of High Concentration of Upper Income Classes*, (which houses a small minority of the metropolitan area population) . Most of the metropolis is as ugly, poor, dirty and with poor sanitation as any other metropolitan area in Brazil. Other examples: *The city center is moving*. *The city* has a *new* center which is no longer the old one. Actually the center that is moving is that *part* of the CBD oriented towards upper income clientele. The traditional CBD, now taken up by lower income classes, is not moving and is now, more than ever, *the* center of the city since it is *the* center of the majority of the population. Ideology tries to convey the idea that the center of upper classes is *the* center of the city.

In order to check the image of the city the press conveys to its readers, a survey was made in outstanding daily newspapers, both, in Rio (*Jornal do Brasil*) and São Paulo, (*Folha de São Paulo*). The survey counted all mentions to any urban spot (streets, plazas, beaches, parks, neighbourhoods, outstanding public and private buildings etc.) in days chosen at random during 1993 and 1994, amounting to a total 1.789 mentions in Rio and 2060 in São Paulo. Mentions in paid matter were not counted. In Rio, mentions to places located in the *Area of High Concentration of Upper Income Classes*, which houses 9.4% of total metropolitan area population, amounted to 47,29% of total and mentions to CBD, to 13,36%. In São Paulo, mentions to the first area, which houses 13.7% of metropolitan area population, amounted to 74,66% of total and to the CBD to 5,87% (VILLAÇA, 1998, 234) .This survey shows the kind and part of the city that the press shows to its readers. It helps to convey the idea that the *Area of high concentration* is “the city” and not a part of it.

There are strong reasons to believe that the deeper the gap between social classes and the smaller the proportion of upper income classes, the stronger segregation will be and the stronger its effect upon urban spatial structure..

Final Remarks and the Future

In societies with a wide gap between rich and poor the control of urban space production process would be impossible without segregation in one single general region of the metropolitan area. Only with that kind of segregation it is possible for the State to build a transportation system favouring mostly a small part of urban space and of total population. Only with that kind of segregation, upper classes oriented commerce (luxury boutiques or restaurants, for instance) can more economically serve its clientele. Only that kind of segregation makes possible the unequal distribution of space as a product of human labour. All this would be impossible – or economically unfeasible - if upper classes were segregated in neighbourhoods spread out all over urban space; southward, eastward, northward and westward. In this case, downtown decay would be much less significant than it is in Brazil. The power of shopping centers, for example, in their struggle with CBD business, would be much smaller. Only segregation in one single broad urban region – the one we are calling here *Area of High Concentration of Upper Income Classes* – makes possible for upper classes the control of urban economy, ideology and the State, and

through these, the control of urban space, transportation system and real estate market, in the production of an urban space tailored to meet the needs of those classes. .

That is why segregation is a necessary process for the unequal appropriation of urban space as a product of human labour.

It is good to look back into the past when speculating about the future. In the 50's São Paulo had no shanty towns (*favelas*). Today, more than 10% (at least) of the metropolitan area population live in *favelas*. Violence rates, in the 50's were not much different from those of the first world. Organised crime and street crime did not exist. Today, the difference is enormous. No one, in the 50's would possibly foresee that the *future* of São Paulo would be the way it is today.

The future then, seem not to have the sweet aura of hope, happiness and optimism it usually is associated with. To be realistic, contemporary speculations about the future must shift to the political arena. Does capitalism work only in the first world? Does it bring wealth only where there is already wealth? Is it necessarily associated with inequality? Has Brazil's (and Latin America's) development in the past 50 years been the work of Brazilians only? If there may be doubts in the answer to these questions for the past, there would be little doubt for the present. After all what global economy, culture and politics mean? In global capitalism causes of social problems have necessarily to have – if it is to be global - two sets of causes. Local causes and global causes. The future of São Paulo and the Third World will depend on the reduction of the wealth gap, both, internally and externally. The gap between rich and poor is not increasing in Brazil only. It is increasing between rich countries and poor countries and even inside some rich countries. The US GNP in 1960 was 6.7 times bigger than Brazil's. In 1995 it was 16.6 times bigger (Veja Magazine dec. 11th, 2002, pg. 44/48). The reduction of these gaps will require a political struggle which must take place – and it is beginning to take place - in the national and international spheres. In the past decade Brazil has advanced considerably in these two spheres. Internationally, with its strong support to the World Social Forum (to mention only one significant example) and internally with considerable political advance of progressive forces as last national elections have shown

REFERENCES

- CASTELLS, Manuel, **La cuestión urbana**, Mexico, Siglo Veintiuno, 1976, 2nd ed.
- CHAUI, Marilena, **O que é ideologia**, São Paulo, Brasiliense, 1981, 2nd ed.
- DIEESE – Departamento Intersindical de Estatística e Estudos Sócio-Econômicos. www.dieese.org.br
- EMPLASA , Empresa metropolitana de planejamento da Grande São Paulo S.^a São Paulo’s metropolitan agency. www.emplasp.gov.br.
- FSP – *Folha de São Paulo*, one of São Paulo’s leading newspapers.
- HOYT, Homer, *The pattern of movement of residential rental neighborhoods*, in
- IBGE – Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística, National statistics office. www.ibge.gov.br or www.ibge.net.
- MAYER, Harold M, and KOHN, Clyde E. eds. **Readings in urban geography**, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1959, p. 499/510.
- IPEA – Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada, Ministério do Planejamento, Orçamento e Gestão. Federal government research institution in applied economics. www.ipea.gov.br or www.ipeadata.org.br.
- PMSP – Prefeitura Municipal de São Paulo. São Paulo City Government.
- ROLNIK, R. et alii, orgs. **São Paulo, crise e mudança**, São Paulo, Prefeitura Municipal de São Paulo, no date.
- SEADE – Fundação Sistema Estadual de Análise de Dados; São Paulo State statistics office .www.seade.gov.br/ivj/principal/html
- TACHNER,S. and VERAS, M. *Evolução e mudança nas favelas paulistanas*, in **Espaço e Debates** no. 31, ano X, 1990, pg.52.
- VILLAÇA, F. **Espaço intra urbano no Brasil**, São Paulo, Studio Nobel, Fapesp, Lincoln Institute, 1998.

ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Satellite image of São Paulo Metropolitan Area
2. São Paulo Official Metropolitan Area and Build Up Area in 1962 and 1990.
3. View of Campinas
4. View of Santos
- 5 Highway to Santos
- 6 São Paulo’s *periferia*
- 7 A *favela*
- 8 Area of High Concentration of Upper Income Classes

