



Mercator - Revista de Geografia da UFC
ISSN: 1984-2201
mercator@ufc.br
Universidade Federal do Ceará
Brasil

BEHIND THE ORIGINS OF SOCIO-SPATIAL FRAGMENTATION

Morcuende, Alejandro

BEHIND THE ORIGINS OF SOCIO-SPATIAL FRAGMENTATION

Mercator - Revista de Geografia da UFC, vol. 20, núm. 2, 2021

Universidade Federal do Ceará, Brasil

Disponível em: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=273667617014>

BEHIND THE ORIGINS OF SOCIO-SPATIAL FRAGMENTATION

Alejandro Morcuende
University of Barcelona, España
morcuende.gonzalez@unesp.br

Redalyc: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=273667617014>

Recepción: 18 Abril 2021
Aprobación: 01 Julio 2021
Publicación: 15 Julio 2021

ABSTRACT:**Abstract**

The concept of socio-spatial fragmentation has been debated for several decades, especially in Latin America. Like other concepts, it has been approached from a variety of perspectives and themes, making it appear polysemic and, at the same time, confusing. In order to continue its demarcation and make it explanatory of the present, we analyzed the times, spaces, and geographies that gave rise to socio-spatial fragmentation. This analysis is based on three trends: the fall of the modern project, the chronic nature of the capitalist crisis, and the processes of differential urbanization. Each of these provides an attribute to explain the origins of socio-spatial fragmentation. Separation, contradiction, and homogenization offer an expanded view of the concept, establishing a network of processes that clarify how and why a transition has been consolidated in the relationship between space and society, which can be called a differential moment.

KEYWORDS: Socio-Spatial Fragmentation, Differential Urbanization, Everyday Life, Modernity, Capitalism.

RESUMO:**Resumo****POR TRÁS DAS ORIGENS DA FRAGMENTAÇÃO SOCIOESPACIAL**

O conceito de fragmentação socioespacial vem sendo debatido há várias décadas, especialmente na América Latina. Como outros conceitos, ele foi abordado a partir de perspectivas e temas muito diferentes. Isso fez com que a fragmentação socioespacial aparecesse como um conceito polissêmico e ao mesmo tempo confuso. Com o objetivo de continuar a delimitá-la, de torná-la explicativa do presente, são analisados os tempos, os espaços e as geografias que deram origem à fragmentação socioespacial. Esta análise é baseada em três tendências: a queda do projeto moderno, a cronificação da crise capitalista e os processos de urbanização diferencial. De cada um deles emerge um atributo para explicar as origens da fragmentação socioespacial. A separação, a contradição e a homogeneização oferecem uma visão ampliada do conceito, permitindo o estabelecimento de uma rede de processos que esclarecem como e por que uma transição se consolidou nas relações entre o espaço e a sociedade, que pode ser denominada de momento diferencial.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Fragmentação Socioespacial, Urbanização Diferencial, Cotidiano, Modernidade, Capitalismo.

RESUMEN:**Resumen****TRAS LOS ORÍGENES DE LA FRAGMENTACIÓN SOCIOESPACIAL**

El concepto fragmentación socioespacial viene siendo debatido a lo largo de varias décadas, especialmente en el ámbito latinoamericano. Como otros conceptos, ha sido abordado desde muy diversos enfoques y temáticas. Esto ha llevado a la fragmentación socioespacial a presentarse como un concepto a su vez polisémico y confuso. Con el objetivo de seguir delimitándolo, para hacerlo explicativo del presente, se analizan los tiempos, los espacios y las geografías que han ido dando origen a la fragmentación socioespacial. Ese análisis se apoya en tres tendencias: la quiebra del proyecto moderno, la cronificación de la crisis capitalista, y los procesos de urbanización diferencial. De cada uno de ellos se desprende un atributo con el que explicar los orígenes de la fragmentación socioespacial. La separación, la contradicción y la homogeneización, ofrecen una visión ampliada del concepto, permitiendo establecer una red de procesos que aclaran cómo y por qué se ha consolidado una transición en las relaciones entre el espacio y la sociedad, que puede denominarse momento diferencial.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Fragmentación Socioespacial, Urbanización Diferencial, Vida Cotidiana, Modernidad, Capitalismo.

INTRODUCTION

Socio-spatial fragmentation has been frequently debated by academics in Latin America since, at least, the 1980s. From various gateways, such as socio-spatial segregation, mobility, security, and core-periphery logic, socio-spatial fragmentation points to the decline of social and spatial unity in the city over time. Although it has never been absent from the discussion, a few years ago, it reappeared in the leading Social Sciences journals (BORSODORF, HIDALGO, 2010; KLINK, DENALDI, 2011; JIRÓN, MANSILLA, 2014), and even more recently in the work of Delmelle (2019), Sposito (2020), Morcuende (2020) and Legroux (2021). Given the confusion caused by the polysemic use of socio-spatial fragmentation, this article presents its origins to continue delimiting the concept. Uncertainty is avoided by an empirical identification that differentiates its origins, determines its nature and how it develops, and examines its consequences.

Most of the contributions to the fragmentation debate concur in pointing out the emergence of new dynamics and processes from 1970 onwards, which changed the spatial production and social configuration of cities. The object of analysis of this text is, therefore, three corresponding historical trends that have profoundly changed the relationship between space and society: a) the fall of the modern project and the advent of a new economic, political, and social order, resulting from cultural changes (JAMESON, 1984; HARVEY, 1989b); b) an economic, political and social order, defined by the definitive crisis of capitalism, referred to here as capitalism in crisis (WALLERSTEIN, et al., 2013; MORCUENDE, 2018; FRASER, 2020); and c) the processes of differential urbanization, analyzed under the hypothesis of planetary urbanization (LEFEBVRE, 1970a; BRENNER, 2014). These historical trends are conceived here as the social, economic, political, and cultural processes that bring about socio-spatial fragmentation.

Each of these trends is responsible for changes in the space-society relationship and signals the need to review how these relationships have been studied, understood, and explained. Our contribution addresses the comprehension of these coincident trends as a differential moment in which profound present-day transformations took place and continue to occur. This moment's main characteristic is that processes are occurring at the global level, when in the past these same processes were produced and expressed, with different rhythms and forms, according to social and territorial contexts. This work is not intended as a universal explanation; instead, it offers a theoretical-interpretative framework of when one can speak of fragmentation and through which concrete processes. Therefore, the argument is global in scale, deciphering dynamics and relationships, which are presented with specificities on a larger scale, according to spatial and temporal contexts.

How do these trends contribute to the understanding of socio-spatial fragmentation? First, the background to the fall of the modern project is what Guy Debord called separation: a sharp fractioning of the compartments of everyday life -dwelling, work, and leisure through the inflexible time imposed by the consumer-directed society (DEBORD, 1967). A physical, social and individual separation. For its part, capitalism in crisis is nothing more than a short period (1970-2020) of accumulation of contradictions, resulting in the maximum tension between value and social life, between the reproduction of capital in the face of the reproduction of life (JAPPE, 2016; FRASER, 2020). Finally, differential urbanization processes bring the possibility of urbanization of space as a whole and its specialization through different land uses, consequently homogenizing and differentiating it in equal measures (LEFEBVRE, 1968; BRENNER, SCHMID, 2015).

Thus, this text understands fragmentation as a triple movement of separation, contradiction, and homogenization, resulting from an extensive differential moment, a transition in the relationship between space and society, when various patterns of segregation, differentiation, wealth distribution, and inequality overlap. The affirmation that socio-spatial fragmentation mediates these relationships contends that it takes shape at this point, producing processes that destroy and create ways of life. Thus, a passage exists between

a concrete organization of the world and a different one, between explaining the state of things and an alternative (LEFEBVRE, 1970b). Hence our use of the adjective differential.

These three historical trends and the concepts linked to them are not intended to be exhaustive nor explain the present in its entirety; this is not the aim of our text. However, they allow us to consider an explanation of fragmentation by exploring the processes that give rise to it. In this manner, socio-spatial fragmentation is considered from a broader panorama and conceptually delimited, an approach that is only possible through all the social sciences. Therefore, attention is focused on searching for moments and trends that changed the relationships between space and society, under the hypothesis that socio-spatial fragmentation can contribute conceptually to their understanding in the present.

FRAGMENTATION AS SEPARATION

Our analysis begins with the first trend that has led to socio-spatial fragmentation: the fall of the modern project, perceived in this analysis as the present historical time. Postmodernity is considered not as a style or a set of attitudes but as the periodization hypothesis formulated by cultural critic Frederic Jameson in 1984. Since the 1950s, cultural changes correspond with the advent of a new economic, political and social order (JAMESON, 1984).

Although the fall of the modern project consists of three movements, the focus is on creating present cultural characteristics and their spatial relationships. These movements have three points. First is a policy where illustration and rationality were confusedly linked to capitalism (DOMENECH, 2007). The second is epistemological, based on the denial of verifiable facts and objective truths that guide the scientific debate, and finally, the cultural movement. The latter allows us to identify the cultural characteristics of the present, based on the submission of culture to post-war capitalism, a differential fact regarding modern culture that has always been in opposition despite being elitist and antisocial.

Three characteristics stand out in this general dynamic for their explanatory power in the debate on socio-spatial fragmentation, although they are not a complete picture of current cultural attributes. The first is the emergence of a perpetual present, indicating oblivion of time in philosophy, literature, art, and the Social Sciences. For example, suppose postmodernity brings with it the perpetual present. In that case, there is a problem of historicity because the imposition of the idea of the end of reports and the incursion of merchandise time means the past and the future are far away, leading to future alternatives and emancipatory projects that can no longer be thought of socially, based on historical experience (JAMESON, 1998).

The second is the death of the subject. With the end of universal stories, the creation of individual identity in a unique world by Baudelaire, Joyce, and others, so characteristic of modern aesthetics, has given way to postmodernist aesthetics centered on neutral imitation, a pastiche of modern styles. It contrasts the active creation of private worlds and the contemplative alienation of the subject, who can only imitate other people's worlds. The spectacle is the receptacle containing all these imitations (DEBORD, 1967). It concentrates and recreates all dimensions of life, emptied by the separation of the individual and society, leading to fragmentation from the impoverishment of the lived space, compartmentalizing these dimensions and the fall of the unit of social life (JAPPE, 2016).

Thirdly, the result is a metamorphosis of the present space and social and individual relationships with it, all mediated by rupture, which creates a new space characterized by the proliferation of total spaces, aiming to become autonomous and self-sufficient. These attributes present themselves as totally alien to the city. This first feature is expressed in varying degrees, as there are residential spaces with all services included providing full autonomy, and others that only manage to offer some services, most leisure-related (JAMESON, 1998).

The second characteristic that attributes "totality" to these spaces is the rejection of the exterior. If modern architecture and urbanism impose themselves on the existing city while carrying out utopian amendments to the degraded urban fabric, proposing a transformation, postmodern architecture does not intend any

relationship with the city, thus legitimizing the existing order (JAMESON, 1998). The Bonaventure Hotel in Los Angeles was the example analyzed by Jameson as an initial approximation of this new total space. It expresses its apartness from its surroundings by using glass that repels the city. Likewise, the walls, the controls, and the security reject rather than repel the city, as these are not exterior elements; they do not form part of the street or public space.

There is, therefore, a new relationship between internal space and city space like public spaces, mobility, the appearance of the streets carried out from the planning crisis. Unrelated to the exterior, total spaces do not contribute to a city project, imposing themselves into a space in which "everything fits." Total spaces proliferate in all latitudes of the planet, with different forms and styles. Residential areas include gated communities and semi-open condominiums of second homes; while increasingly affected by new standards of online consumption, commercial and consumer establishments offer shopping malls. The leisure industry provides tourist complexes like resorts that guests do not need to leave until the whole of life is affected.

Cultural changes bring economic, political, and social changes, resulting in new ways of life. This raises the question of whether, overall, we are transitioning between the destruction and creation of different ways of life, which can be understood as a fragmentary process. How does this transition take place in this first point of the argument?

As seen above, the fall of the modern project, like the cultural logic of capitalism from 1970 onwards, has had consequences for society and space. The concept of separation, presented by Debord in 1967, explains this expanded view of socio-spatial fragmentation in the physical, social, and individual dimensions.

Separation points to a fetishism, an inversion of life, which has become a way of life founded on the diffusion of consumption, including the current comprehensive digital transformation, creating what some authors call the consumer society (BAUDRILLARD, 1970), or bureaucratic society of controlled consumption (LEFEBVRE, 1968). For Debord, the spectacle, which is not just the society's image but the use of time in that society, results in an inverted society.

A separation that is concretized in a rigid use of time and space, which leads to a life of sealed compartments, is anti-daily life (DEBORD, 1967). Thus, there is a first physical dimension of separation related to the total spaces mentioned above. In their residential, commercial, or symbolic functions, the spaces turned inwards are forms of segregation that use new instruments and persist and separate different social groups.

It is not only the high-end closed residential spaces that add new content to a much more heterogeneous periphery. Together with large housing complexes, which are very hard to escape, they form total spaces. Therefore, it is noteworthy that according to an early statement about socio-spatial fragmentation, due to the isolation and lack of mobility of the poorest, the reason for the cost of mobility is the cause of the genuinely fragmented metropolis (SANTOS, 1990).

Separation also has a social dimension, as the distance between groups is not just physical. In parallel with the weakening of the class itself, the fall of traditional solidarities created a subsistence community, Milton Santos' banal space of scarcity. On the other hand, a community of equals following the logic of social homogeneity emerged. A social distance was established through the recreation of the images of other people's ways of life.

The advertisements for gated communities are a clear example of the above. They portray a way of life in a condominium, with spaces for collective use. However, the residents no longer follow this lifestyle. Therefore, these closed residential spaces are an image of a status that includes the best facilities and security.

Likewise, a double image is imposed on the periphery, associating it with crime and trafficking while also romanticizing it, often linked to tourist exploitation. This double movement simultaneously homogenizes and heterogenizes the space, always classifying it (D'ANDREA, 2020). Representations of lifestyles and spaces are constructed for different ways of life, which simplify them and lead to "a social relationship between people, mediated by images" (DEBORD, 1999 [1967], P. 38)

Lastly, there is an individual dimension of separation. Here the inversion of life, the recreation of all that life lacks, becomes sophisticated. Given the increasing compartmentalization of everyday life, the spectacle is the facilitating element that unites one's representations and those of the other. In this way, the spectacle brings contemporary alienation, full of these imitations, produced in the perpetual present and the death of the subject, as discussed above. If modernity can create subjects through activity, postmodernity alienates them through contemplation; this is the center of the society of the spectacle. This is where separation opens up: the impoverishment of the lived space, the compartmentalized areas of life, and the consequent loss of the unitary aspect of society.

Fragmentation can be understood, in the first place, as a separation between a total space and social and individual subjects who have contradictory lives with this new space and whose relationship is also contradictory. It is not just that total spaces reject what is different; they also do not fit perfectly into the lives of those who live in them, whether they are gated communities, heterogeneous peripheries, or spaces of directed consumption, as the ways of life being created are just imitations. A new space, which has been developed to meet the needs of rentier capitalism, is an authentic contradiction that required and requires the sale of supposedly innovative real estate products (HARVEY, 1989b; JAMESON, 1998).

FRAGMENTATION AS A CONTRADICTION

Despite capitalist realism, which makes it easier to think of the end of the world than the end of capitalism, the current system is defined by crisis. That is, crisis is a chronic element of the political economy of the contemporary world. For this reason, the second trend of the differential moment is the current phase of capitalism, named capitalism in crisis, which began with the counter-reform of capitalism in the 1970s and the fall of the post-war social pacts (DOMENECH, 2004).

It appears counterintuitive to bring the capitalist crisis to the fore because although the COVID-19 sanitary crisis has caused historical falls in most states' GDP, capitalism does not seem to be suffering any crisis, and recovery is only a matter of time.

This consideration starts from a conception of capitalism as merely an economic system. Thus understood, capitalism goes through alternating periods of crisis and recovery. However, capitalism is not just an economic system but an institutionalized social order (FRASER, 2020).

If there is a permanent capitalist crisis, it is not just because the capitalist economic system shows signs of weakening but because of the exhaustion of capitalist society itself. The contradictions inherent in the capitalist means of production, widely treated in different ways throughout its trajectory, have led to greater tension in the functioning of current post-war capitalism. As a result, we are witnessing a second major transformation, which compromises the conditions that make capitalist society possible; life is eroded, leading to a new content of inequality (POLANYI, 1944; FRASER, 2020).

Capitalism in crisis is a concept that allows crisis to unfold simultaneously as a period, a trend, and a method; elements that lead to fragmentation as a contradiction.

The crisis that is certainly triggering the 2020-21 health emergency reinforces the proclivity towards the capitalist crisis that began in 1970. At that time, the capitalist counter-reform resulting from the anti-fascist victory of the Second World War began. Through globalization, this counter-reform restored many of the characteristics of Belle Époque capitalism (1871-1914), including the globalization of the economy, through the freedom of capital movements, an uncontrolled financial system, and the weakening of labor regulations (DOMENECH, 2004).

Since that restoration, more crises have occurred in different parts of the world than during post-war reformed capitalism (1945-1970). These include the 1973 oil crisis, the 1997 Asian crisis, the 2007-2008 Great Recession, the 2010 European debt crisis, and the 2020 crisis (TOOZE, 2018). The latter has consequences that will surely exceed any previously recorded situation. Therefore, crisis has been a chronic

element in the world's political economy from 1970 to the present, although it may manifest itself differently and be explained according to regional and urban contexts.

Santos divides the history of capitalism into periods in which the coherence between the period's variables remains stable, and the crises that precede and follow these periods compromise their coherence. It is clear that after more than 50 years, after the advent of neoliberalism, the period and the crisis overlap, so that we are facing a period that is a crisis (SANTOS, 2000).

If crisis as a period is limited to the strictly capitalist economic sphere, crisis as a trend is centered on capitalism as a society and now points to an expanded vision of capitalism and crisis. According to Fraser, this is a second major transformation, like the one detailed by Polanyi in 1944 (FRASER, 2020). As in the eighteenth and nineteenth century, today, the crisis emerges in three markets whose exchange objects are not commodities, as they were not created to be sold in a specialized market: land, labor, and money (POLANYI, 1944). This is where we understand why the trend is the contradiction, because "to postulate that labor, land, and money can be exchanged as ordinary commodities is tantamount to supposing that society as a whole can become a pure set of commodities" (FRASER, 2020, p. 37).

The capitalist system relies on these three elements for its survival. However, the inevitable trend towards capital's self-expansion leads to the erosion of these three elements, which become points of contradiction and crisis. Thus, the crisis is reflected in a speculative and financialized economy, which increasingly exploits the population's resources in the form of income. It also has an ecological dimension, which has emerged in its most violent form with the Covid-19 pandemic, adding to most people in the world the difficulty of accessing basic resources and the contamination and destruction of the planet. Finally, the current crisis also has a dimension of social reproduction in the work that sustains people's livelihoods and existence (BHATTACHARYA, 2017; FRASER, 2020). Thus, they make "the crisis we face today a crisis of life as we know it" (ARRUZZA, FRASER, BHATTACHARYA, 2019, p. 131).

Therefore, the fundamental contradiction is between the tendency towards capital's self-expansion and social life, as the former erodes capital's conditions of possibility, which are land, labor, and money, opening up more and more areas of life to the market. The current debate between economy and life, whether to restrict the population's activities and movements to control the spread of the virus, is an excellent example of this contradiction.

In this second point of the argument, understanding socio-spatial fragmentation as a contradiction allows us to establish how the reproduction of life is placed in this phase of capitalism in crisis (FERGUSON, 2020). Social reproduction is the set of paid or unpaid activities that create material, social and cultural conditions for people, both essential and subordinate to the production process (FRASER, 2020). This is the contradiction highlighted here because "by launching a major attack on social reproduction, it makes this primordial condition for capital accumulation an important turning point in capitalist crises" (FRASER, 2020, p.22). Moreover, this attack gives inequality a new content, where fragmentation brings not as much quantity -more inequality- as quality. Fragmentation as a contradiction thus points to a tendency towards the erosion of social life.

Given the above, one last consideration is necessary: the crisis is, thirdly, an element of a method for the Social Sciences aiming to illuminate the social change of the present. It is only possible to build a Political Economy by establishing the crisis and the expanded vision of capitalism as its central element. Any project, work, or reflection on the current relations between space and society, mediated by fragmentation, needs a clear and accurate perspective on the current capitalist crisis.

FRAGMENTATION AS HOMOGENIZATION

The nature of transformations in spatial production and explanations of the most recent urbanization changes are discussed below. Brenner and Schmid (2015) propose that urbanization is considered from

its three constituent moments, which coexist and complement each other. The first is concentrated urbanization, characterized by the concentration of people, capital, knowledge, among others, in the agglomeration; it is therefore centered on cities and metropolises. The second is extended urbanization, which through new forms of urbanization operationalizes places and territories beyond the agglomeration, but in relation to it; for example, metropolitan areas of influence, medium-sized cities, and infrastructure networks. Differential urbanization is the last of these moments, where a logic of innovation and obsolescence of urban forms accelerates and depresses spaces, surpassing a conception of urbanization as only growth or the city's expansion (BRENNER, SCHMID, 2015).

To explain fragmentation as homogenization, we focus on this last differential moment. Suppose concentration and extension processes took place, and still occur, at different paces according to the location. In that case, differential urbanization harmonizes them on a planetary level, articulating the concentrated and extended forms of urbanization, highlighting the differential character due to the overlap of these forms while creatively destroying them. It is a harmonization resulting from the other two dynamics of the differential moment, where the fall of the modern project and capitalism in crisis converge.

Differential urbanization still lacks robust theorization and empiricization. What, then, are the attributes that grant the differential character? In order to advance these theoretical exercises, there are three dynamics observed at different scales and places, which can help in the realization and understanding of the differential urbanization processes:

a) Implosions-explosions: the urbanization of capitalism in crisis is characterized, firstly, by an impulse to constant restructuring under the logic of innovation and obsolescence. The realization of this impulse is the Lefebvrian metaphor of implosions-explosions, understood as the movements of concentration of population, objects, capital, and ideas in agglomeration. The latter as movements projecting fragments, whose objective is to operationalize territories beyond the agglomeration (LEFEBVRE, 1970a). Differential urbanization is defined, in the dimension of spatial practices, as "recurrent pressures to destroy geographies inherited from agglomeration and associated operational landscapes creatively" (BRENNER, SCHMID, 2015, p. 171), that is, the creative destruction of the concentrated and extended moment of urbanization. Today, implosion-explosion processes have been happening both in metropolises and their hinterlands. One thinks of the empty, or emptied, spaces occupied by different social groups in consolidated, usually central urban fabrics: implosion. Explosions include the spread of shopping malls, gated communities, housing complexes, and other infrastructures beyond fabrics and perimeters that are responsible for the restructuring and heterogenization of old and new peripheries in recent decades. More recently, the changes that the Covid-19 pandemic has caused in the commercial sphere and distribution chains have led to a change in the use of stores that now house warehouses instead of commercial activities: implosion, in parallel with the proliferation of platforms and logistics centers that have been restructuring beyond the commercial sector of the economy: explosion (ARBOLEDA, 2018).

b) Planning crisis and territorial regulations: often, current urban planning is analyzed from a shift in the view of planning as an exclusive competence of the public authorities to increasingly shared management of the urban issue, primarily through public-private collaborations. This move is guided by a new metropolitan current, whereby urban planning must be orientated towards urban renewal and large projects (HARVEY, 1989a; BRENNER, 2018). This orientation is carried out by networks of agents who intend to extract progressively more income from land and soil (WOOD, 2016 [1998]). Developers, real estate companies, builders, and different lobby groups are part of these networks, which the government often assists unable resist the promotion of management mechanisms for this creative destruction, which guides differential urbanization today (BRENNER, SCHMID, 2015). They are faced by social collectives and political movements increasingly focused on subsistence struggles, including housing, access to energy, and water, who are also active in the production of space.

This transition from comprehensive State urbanism to neoliberal urbanism leads to the total mastery of the logic of the "spatial arrangement," which, alongside timid alternatives such as tactical urbanism, makes any planning to solve the multiple and varied problems of the urban issue impossible. Therefore, the result is a crisis of urban planning, a strategic and propositional void into which "everything fits." There are many examples of recent urbanization processes in many suburbs. For example, the implementation of new real estate products, such as closed residential spaces, surrounded by a significant lack of basic urbanization, such as lighting, sidewalks, and wall-lined streets, recalling the idea mentioned above of the total space facing inwards.

c) Countryside-city conflict: finally, today, the differential character points to an intensification of the country-city contradiction and how to overcome it. The third characteristic of the urbanizing processes is typical of the differential moment. There is an evident deepening of the countryside's submission to the city that originates the capitalist mode of production, which today presents itself more as its assimilation. Behind this is an urban frontier driven by a social division of labor currently focused on agribusiness, the restructuring of mining and industries, and the development of infrastructure and logistical platforms (ARBOLEDA, 2018; ASTEGIANO, 2020). The mechanization of the countryside, the destruction of traditional agricultural work, the proliferation of infrastructure, and tourism in supposedly wild spaces are among the achievements of this assimilation.

Therefore, the countryside-city contradiction and the social division of labor are the innovative variables of spatial differentiation, as the entire territory has become susceptible to urbanization, becoming homogenized while increasing its differentiation and specialization. Thus, this overcoming is one of the most fundamental expressions of the present crisis in its ecological dimension and adds to the symptoms described above that point to a new phase of capitalist society (FRASER, 2020).

CONCLUSION

Following the explanation of the differential moment, the most relevant final consideration is the need to reflect on historical, social, and individual times and the spaces and geographies, which shape socio-spatial fragmentation. The differential moment is a transitional phase of profound transformations in which several paradigms regarding social organization and spatial production overlap. The element is differential because some paradigms seem to give way to others in a trajectory spanning more than five decades.

The shift from a pattern of center-periphery segregation, with the center for the rich and the periphery for the poor, to fragmented spatial-social relations, occurs through wide-ranging changes rather than a group of total ruptures. As the differential moment is a phase that gives rise to socio-spatial fragmentation, new elements are less relevant than trends that have collided with or reinforced each other over these fifty years. It is noteworthy, in this sense, that for at least five decades, the three trends analyzed, which are present in various parts of the world, are total spaces or the processes of the explosion of the peripheries.

The trends detailed in this work propose an analytical framework from which these wide-ranging changes can be understood. Therefore, the second consideration is that these three supporting points help design a web of social, economic, political, and cultural processes, which intersect at different scales, clarifying how and why there is a transition in the space-society relationship.

Today, these relationships can be called fragmentary, firstly, because of the imposition of a cultural logic and total spaces, generating physical, social, and individual distances, based on a contraction of public and private spaces, and the consequent reclusion from different areas of everyday life (JAMESON, 1998; CALDEIRA, 2000; SPOSITO, GOES, 2013). Fragmentation as separation thus underlines the process of destruction and creation of ways of life, fundamentally through consumption (CARRERAS, MARTINEZ-RIGOL, MORCUENDE, 2020). At this point, everyday life becomes the privileged object of analysis, as it expresses the different separations in each of the everyday spheres.

Second, because crisis is a chronic element of capitalist society, it leads to a contradiction between the reproduction of capital and the reproduction of life (PEREZ, 2014). Fragmentation as a contradiction points to the attack on social reproduction that capitalism in crisis brings, giving inequality new contents. Thus, social reproduction becomes the central element to analyze the changes in the forms and contents of inequality in recent decades.

Finally, the ongoing differential urbanization processes are characterized by the production of differentiation at different levels. Overcoming the countryside-city contradiction means simultaneously overcoming the traditional urban-suburban-rural differentiation at a global level. At the state level, differentiation occurs in land uses and functions that have been changing considerably in recent decades. Furthermore, social differentiation appears at the level of everyday life, manifest in the class structure, expressed beyond the wage earner, and necessarily linked to race and gender (WRITGH, 2015; BHATTACHARYA, 2017). Finally, fragmentation as homogenization points to urbanization processes that, homogenized, have overcome traditional differences and specialize the entire territory, without exception.

DIFFERENTIAL MOMENT TREND	DIMENSION OF SOCIO- SPATIAL FRAGMENTATION	TARGET OBJECT OF ANALYSIS
Fall of the modern project	Separation	Everyday Life
Capitalism in crisis	Contradiction	Social Reproduction
Differential urbanization	Homogenization	Socio-spatial differentiation

FIGURE 1
Analytical scheme
: by the author.

The historical correspondence, and the abundant intersections between separation, contradiction, and homogenization, allow us to propose the terms through which socio-spatial fragmentation can be conceived. The term presented here suggests an expanded view of socio-spatial fragmentation, understood as a product of interwoven historical trends, constituting this differential transition moment, expressed in everyday life, social reproduction, and the processes of differentiation at different scales.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was made possible with the support of the Foundation for Research Support of the State of São Paulo (FAPESP) (Case number: 2019/04385-0)

REFERENCES

- ARBOLEDA, M. Extracción en movimiento: circulación del capital, poder estatal y urbanización logística en el norte minero de Chile. *Investigaciones Geográficas*, 56, 3-26, 2018.
- ARRUZZA, C.; FRASER, N.; BHATTACHARYA, T. Notas para un manifiesto feminista. *New Left Review*, 114, 2019.
- ASTEGIANO, N. Objetos técnicos en la agricultura moderna: de la individuación al medio. *GEOUSP Espaço e Tempo* (Online), [S. l.], v. 24, n. 2, p. 181-202, 2020.
- BAUDRILLARD, J. *La société de consommation*. Paris, Éditions Idées/Gallimard, 1970.
- BHATTACHARYA, T. *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentring Oppression*.
- BORSODORF, Axel; HIDALGO, Rodrigo. From Polarization to Fragmentation. Recent Changes in Latin American Urbanization. In: VAN LINDERT, P; VERKOREN, O. (eds.) *Decentralized Development in Latin America: Experiences in Local Governance and Local Development*. GeoJournal Library 97, 2010.

- BRENNER, N. *Implosions-Explosions. Towards a study of planetary urbanization*. Berlin: Jovis, 2014
- BRENNER, N. *Espaços da urbanização: o urbano a partir da teoria crítica*. Rio de Janeiro: Letra Capital Editora LTDA, 2018, 356 p
- BRENNER, N.; SCHMID C. Towards a new epistemology of the urban? *City*, 19: 2-3, 151-182, 2015.
- CALDEIRA, T. *Cidade de muros: crimes, segregação e cidadania em São Paulo*. São Paulo: Edusp, 2000, 400 p
- CARRERAS, C.; MARTÍNEZ-RIGOL, S.; MORCUENDE, A. Afterword. The Consumer's Society in the Era of the Postglobalization. *Bollettino della Società Geografica Italiana. Serie 14*, 3 Special Issue: 183-194, 2020.
- D'ANDREA, P. 40 ideias de periferia. história, conjuntura e pós-pandemia. São Paulo: Editora Dandara, 2021.
- DEBORD, G. *La sociedad del espectáculo*. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1999 [1967].
- DELMELLE, E.C. The Increasing Sociospatial Fragmentation of Urban America. *Urban Sci.* 2019, 3, 9. <https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci3010009>
- DOMENECH, A. *República y socialismo también para el siglo XXI*. Sin Permiso N°1, 2004.
- DOMENECH, A. *Izquierda académica, democracia republicana e Ilustración. Diálogo con un estudiante mexicano de filosofía*. Sin Permiso, 2007.
- FERGUSON, S. *Women and Work. Feminism, Labour and Social Reproduction*. London: Pluto Press, 2020.
- FRASER, N. *Los talleres ocultos del capital. Un mapa para la izquierda*. Madrid: Traficantes de sueños, 2020.
- HARVEY, David. From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: the Transformation in Urban Governance. In: *Late Capitalism. Geografiska Annaler, series B, Human Geography*, 71(1), p.3-17, 1989a.
- HARVEY, D. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Inquiry Into the Origins of Cultural Change*. London: Basil Blackwell, 1989b.
- JAMESON, F. *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Oxford: New Left Review, 1984.
- JAMESON, F. *The cultural turn*. London: Verso, 1998.
- JAPPE, A. *Las aventuras de la mercancía*. Logroño: Pepitas de calabaza, 2016.
- JIRON, P.; MANSILLA, P. Las consecuencias del urbanismo fragmentador en la vida cotidiana de habitantes de la ciudad de Santiago de Chile. *Eure*, vol.40, n.121, p.5-28, 2014.
- LEFEBVRE, H. *Le droit à la ville*. Paris: Éditions Anthropos, 1968.
- LEFEBVRE, H. *La Révolution urbaine*. Paris: Anthopos, 1970a.
- LEFEBVRE, H. *Manifeste différentialiste*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard, 1970b
- LEGROUX, J. A lógica urbana fragmentária: delimitar o conceito de fragmentação socioespacial. *Caminhos de Geografia*, v. 22, n. 81, 2021.
- MORCUENDE, A. Interpreting sociospatial fragmentation, differential urbanization and everyday life: a critique for the latin american debate. *GEOgraphia*, vol: 22, n. 49, 2020.
- PEREZ, A. *Subversión feminista de la economía. Aportes para un debate sobre el conflicto capital-vida*. Madrid: Traficantes de sueños, 2014.
- POLANYI, K. *The Great Transformation*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1944.
- SANTOS, M. *Metrópole Corporativa Fragmentada: o caso de São Paulo*. São Paulo: Ed. Record, 1990.
- SANTOS, M. *Por uma outra globalização*. São Paulo: Ed. Record, 2000
- SPOSITO, M.E.B.; GOES, E. *Espaços fechados e cidades: insegurança urbana e fragmentação socioespacial*. São Paulo: Editora da Unesp, v.1., 2013, p.365.
- SPOSITO, E.; SPOSITO, M.E.B. Fragmentação socioespacial. *Mercator*, v. 19, e19015, 2020.
- TOOZE, A. *Crashed: How a Decade of Financial Crises Changed the World*. London: Allen Lane and New York: Viking. 2018.
- WOOD, E. M. Los orígenes agrarios del capitalismo. *Monthly Review. Selecciones en castellano*, 3ª época, nº2, 2016 [1998].
- WRIGHT, E. O. *Understanding Class*. London: Verso, 2015.

