

# Chapter 5

## Man is His Being in the World. Geography and Geographicity



Ruy Moreira

**Abstract** Man is an autopoietic being. A self-made being. However, he does not do it based on will, but because self-production is necessary. He does it himself, but within the possibilities of history. And this requires will, but also constant action and the capacity to materially organise his act of will. Here is where spatiotemporal conditionality comes in. Man does not construct himself without an act of will, but will is not sufficient if the objective reality does not allow for the possibility. This makes him the subject and the object of himself. To be this, you must construct yourself. And to construct, you need the means of construction. The supposition is the man-nature relationship. This is what location imposes. There, man makes space and space makes man. Self-construction is a geographical construction.

**Keywords** Geography · Geographicity · Socio-spatial relationship

### 5.1 Geographicity

Human construction is a combination of a spatially defined specific location on the earth's surface—every man is born in a place—and a universalist abstractivity—every man is born a human being—which leads the human species to historically transform into the human genus, the complete man, the integral man in the world, according to Lefebvre (1971, 1981). This means determining a form of man-nature relationship transformed into a defined form of socio-spatial relationship, strictly speaking man-spatial-nature, through the norms and rules of societal and sociability relationships that inform them and have in space their elevating link. The singularity of the man-nature relationship and the universality of the socio-spatial relationship materialised therein in the concrete particularity of the place. The human construction is this dialectic of the singularity and the universality realised in the particularity, in Lukács' (1970) thetic version, which Armando Correa da Silva refers to as geosociability (da Silva 1991), thus giving birth to man as the being, the real existence, which the

---

R. Moreira (✉)  
Universidade Federal Fluminense, Niterói, Brazil  
e-mail: [ruymoreira@uol.com.br](mailto:ruymoreira@uol.com.br)

geographical construction translates into being, the being of essence defined by its spatial mode of existence, according to Sartre (2002) and Lukács (2010, 2012), of each real concrete form of geographical construction. It is a topic that is so dear to geography today (Martins 2007; de Oliveira Biteti 2014; Lima 2019).

Geographicity is this structure of reciprocal transfiguration of the man-nature and socio-spatial relationships, organised by their sociability relationships and regulated by their societal relationships of control and reproduction. In other words, the totalised structure of the man-spatial-nature relationship oriented to the regulatory mediation of the societal relationship and structuring sociability relationship, as Jean Brunhes saw for the Mediterranean irrigation societies (Brunhes 1962) and Karl Wittfogel for the hydraulic societies of the Asian world (Wittfogel 1966).

A concrete form of society, therefore, not a mode of production, a social formation, a spatial formation or a way of life, a pure categorical link, but a concrete way of inhabiting and living. Geographicity is a spatial mode of being, the spatial mode of the historical-produced, located and locating, induced and inducing, regulated and regulating, produced and producing, determined and determining space, which Lefebvre's creative infinity also saw as the reproducibility condition of modern society (Lefebvre 1973, 2013) and Milton Santos brought to the theoretical particularity of geography (Santos 1978). Space is empirically local and universally global at the same time, which gives man the uniqueness of being born in a place and, however, humanity's act of doing.

This is what we learn from the classics, when Reclus describes geography as history seen in space and history as geography seen in time (Reclus, undated), Vidal de La Blache, space as the cohabitation that unites man and things as a totality (Vidal de La Blache 1954), Brunhes, the habitat as his mode of dwelling (Brunhes 1962), Sorre, society as the totality that becomes more socially complex in time as the spatial fabric becomes denser (Sorre 1967), George, history as temporality concretised in space as an existing reality (George 1968), and historicity and geographicity expressing the multifaceted plasticity of autopoiesis, even when they did not see it clearly as so (Moreira 2015, 2019).

## 5.2 The Forms of Geographicity

A concrete geographical form of the construction of man in each time and each corner, geographicity varies in space–time according to the way in which the societal and sociability relationships order the man-nature and socio-spatial interaction, with the whole combining to the command of its mode of production. Thus, a community geographicity, an ancient geographicity, a Germanic geographicity, a Slavic geographicity, an Asian geographicity, a slave-owning geographicity, a feudal geographicity, and a capitalist geographicity, all emerge with as many forms of geographicity as there are modes of production and life that each one in each corner and each period has at its centre. Hence, present and past geographicities are distinguished and contrasted, due to their interlinking mode of man-nature and

socio-spatial relationships, their fabrics of sociability and societal normativity, their forms of transition from one society in history to another, as in a relationship of communicating vessels (Hindess and Hirst 1976).

The geographicity of the present is the way of organising the reciprocal transposition of the man-nature and socio-spatial relationship regulated in the societal and sociability relationships of conflict. The way of being in expropriation (degrounding), expulsion (deterritorialisation), and purging (despatialisation), resulting from the separation between labour and the means of labour, on the one hand, and the concentration of money in increasingly fewer hands, on the other, that uproots and proletarianises the serf peasantry, its characteristic structural marks of configuration (Moreira 2007a, b). The unequal, stratified, and fragmentary way in which feudalism's sociability relationships give way to capitalist sociability relationships with their societal norms and rules of control, regulation, and reproduction in history (Moreira 2016).

Pre-capitalist geographicity is in all senses its opposite. In this geographicity, the man-nature relationship is a relationship of co-belonging, and involvement of identity that is consequently transported to the societal and sociability relationships, and this structure, in these terms, is the socio-spatial relationship. The relationship from which primitive accumulation will set man free, which is impracticable in the egalitarian structure of community society in the face of the absence of private property, enshrined in the mercantile privatism of the slave-owning society but hindered in the expansive stalemate of the productive forces, and lastly embryonic in the peculiarity of the classistlypersonalised land-territory relationship of feudal society, where, for this very reason, in the words of Massimo Quaini, capitalism, after all, is born (Quaini 1979).

Community geographicity, therefore, is the egalitarian mode of cohabitation that the societal and sociability relationships transport from the lower plane of the man-nature relationship to the upper plane of the socio-spatial relationship, regulating and organising the reciprocity of one relationship with the other, in order to maintain the whole of the man-nature relationship and the socio-spatial relationship in an all-encompassing solidary mode. The land and everything that men take from it is a common good. A general good that from the access to land to the distribution of means, the community relationship reaffirms itself as a way of life. It is a community of gentle conformation, where men and women are linked by consanguinity and kinship relations, differing in their interior by being grouped into nuclear families, in a great state of equilibrium. And it is these nuclear families that are responsible for the production, the community guiding the distribution and common use of land in a rotational occupation, the unequal productions of families being later brought together for collective distribution, according to the families' needs, a community relationship that is then maintained and reproduced by this unique societal mechanism of rotation. This consists of the annual exchange of use of parts of the territory, so that an equal distribution is agreed among the families, since, due to being distinct from each other in terms of their natural fertility conditions of the land, the parcels tend to lead the families to different results of production, some tending to produce more and others less, with the rotation of space fulfilling the role of remembering the temporary nature of the landscape and the perception of the benefit of keeping

the distribution even regardless of moments and circumstances. It is an ordering mechanism of the socio-spatial relationship over the man-nature relationship that is typified as the societal and sociability relationships, guaranteeing the permanent maintenance of its community tradition for the entire geographicity.

The development of the productive forces tends, however, to put this permanence at risk. And the opportunity comes when this happens to the point of causing a surplus to emerge, that is community surpluses on a constant basis, and with this surplus the threat of breaking the existing communitarianism. Until then, the productive forces are restricted to natural and demographical elements (natural resources and population size), forcing the entire population to have to participate in the productive task. However, the rise in the level of development of the productive forces will allow the community to free part of its members to carry out non-productive tasks, creating the administrative, priestly, and military functions as permanent functions, in a social division of labour beyond the then existing natural division by sex and working age, bringing with it the risk of a managerial stratification within the gentile order. Production remains a function of nuclear families, but part of the production must now be transferred to support the fraction of the population involved in the social function of labour, in a formal structural differentiation of management that can progress to a more profound form of social differentiation. The spatial rotation must now be reinforced, to now also prevent and force the managerial stratum to remain integrated in the community regulation of life. However, where this does not occur, community relationships begin their dismantling, subsequently transforming into the stratified relationships of the ancient, Germanic, Slavic, Asiatic, slave-owing, and, later, feudal, modes of production, with their respective unequal forms of man-nature, socio-spatial, societal, and sociability relationships, and generating the cartographic map of pre-capitalist geographicities that transcend the capitalist transition itself (Hobsbawm 1977; Moreira 2007b; Réclus, undated).

The geographicity of Asiaticism is an example of a hybrid case in this framework. Spatial regulation becomes dual. The social functions arising from the social division of labour assert their privileges, using them to define two distinct and combined ways of spatial ordering: on the one hand, the family rotation of the gentile community, maintained as a way to guarantee community production and transfer to it the surplus; on the other, the obligation of collective labour of the communities, then numerically multiplied, for carrying out the major works to regularise rivers and marginal lands subject to periodic flooding. A relationship of unequal combination of nuclear families that must continue to fulfil their obligation of surpluses and now also provide for those among their members who will regularly implement the works of rectification, canalisation, and preservation of rivers and areas subject to flooding that, in the end, enhance the obligatory task of surpluses. It is a relationship of extraction in which the managing layer, transformed into a superior community, enjoys the benefit, in a land (village communities) and territory (superior community) relationship of a multiplied list of communities now transformed into village communities, of increasing extraction, either in the form of taxes or in the form of goods, the community surplus. It is the geographicity of a societal relationship that regulates, within the organic whole

of the axial man-spatial-nature relationship, the ordering of the contradictory interaction of an egalitarian man-nature relationship and a non-egalitarian socio-spatial relationship, at the service of a sociability of domain of castes.

Germanic, Slavic, and ancient geographivities differ from it, as they are geographivities of a simpler man-spatial-nature configuration, with the managing layer standing out little in the face of a community dismantled into nuclear families interconnected by a spatial rotation made inconsistent and fragile. This is how it is with the Germanic and Slavic societal and sociability relationships, which are very close forms of geographicity, where a military caste, above all, controls and regulates their domain through a territorial-productive ordering of a socio-spatial relationship loyal to it. They are geographivities in which the hallmark of the co-belonging of the man-nature relationship, although stratified here and there, changes little or nothing. It is also the same with the geographicity of the old mode of production, a form of man-spatial-nature relationship that arises from the migration and establishment of nuclear families in areas far from their origin, with sociability establishing itself in a socially regulated man-nature and socio-spatial relationship of heavily blurred exchanges.

Slave-owning geographicity is the extreme form of these past modes of geographicity. It is the geographicity that comes from the direct subordination of certain nuclear families to others, either by dependence or by subjection, to which time adds the imprisonment and conversion of prisoners of war into slaves through purchase and sale, in a society turned mercantile that soon becomes militarist and imperialist, expanding its domains across a vastness of peoples and territories. The former community land becomes state property arising from the emergence of conflicts in the now stratified society, which cedes it for private use to the lordly class in large estates, cohabiting with a myriad of small pieces of family-use land scattered either throughout the territory of the former areas of rotation and or throughout the territory taken from the surrounding communities of the ancient, Germanic, and Slavic modes of production. Here, slave labour predominates, as it considered by the societal and lordly sociability relationships as a physical thing equal to other things in nature, but at the same time a subject legally responsible for its acts, with the slave-lord relationship determining the private form of reciprocal transfiguration of the man-nature relationship and the socio-spatial relationship in a territorial whole administratively managed by a central slave-owning military state from the big cities.

Lastly, feudal geographicity is the socio-spatial relationship in which land is a relationship of ownership of the serf and the fiefdom is a relationship of domain of the lord, in a combination of land and territory regulated by the relationship of obligation in which, according to Leo Huberman, the serf provides for himself and his lord, with the serf supporting the lord with surpluses and the lord giving him cover and protection from other lords in return (Huberman 1969). It is a kind of intertwining of different orders of geographicity, here in the slave-owning society, and there in the societies still with community components, all of them present in a form of spatial arrangement in rings arranged around the lord's castle fortress that represent each one of them (Weber 1968). The lord's fortress is the centre of the arrangement, in a kind of mediaeval town-countryside relationship. It is surrounded by the ring of lots of urban

inhabitants with their gardens and farms. Then, there is the ring of parcels owned by the serfs with their cultures associated with creation, with as many parcels as there are families. Followed by that is the ring of common use pastures, with the free raising of cattle. Lastly, closing the circle is the forest reserve ring, used for collecting firewood and feeding the community's pigs. Each ring expresses the form of man-nature relationship and regulation of socio-spatial relationship it expresses, with the fiefdom expressing the entirety of the slave-owning geographicity, in the guise of large estates, the plots of farmland for cattle the structure of nuclear families from the invading communities which, reacting to the former military-imperial domain, generate feudal order, the pasture and forest, the habit of common use by communities cohabiting with the slave-owing spatiality or communities of invading peoples, the castle fortress the form of defence against invasions with which feudalism is engendered. It is the historical origin that the lordship maintains through the constant wars waged among themselves, in the argument justifying the relationship of obligation and reciprocal servitude of the serfs. It is the mixed arrangement of community and private social relationships that explains for Quaini why capitalism came from the decomposition of feudalism, while it was hindered in the other geographicities of pre-capitalism.

### 5.3 Primitive Accumulation and the Framework of Modern Geographicity

Primitive accumulation is the way in which this transition takes place. The historical-structural form centred, on the one hand, on the separation between labour and the means of labour, and on the other, on the concentration of money in increasingly fewer hands. They are two processes that meet as two pillars in a single structure, pillars which have their master key in the expropriation, expulsion, and purging of the serf from the land. And their sewing stitch in the valorisation of money for the purchase and sale of labour.

The land is the centre of gravity of feudal geographicity. It is through the relationship with the land that the serf has his simultaneous relationship with nature, territory, and space. Land here means the contextual whole of nature in whose territorial spatial contour the serf sees agricultural soil, waters, rivers, forests, the diversity of the environment, and other men, as one and the same totality. The totality that Quaini calls the ecological-territorial structure (Quaini 1979). The rupture of the relationship with the land, thus, means the rupture and breaking of this totality. In a single act. An act that immediately expropriates man from nature and expropriates nature from man. Man and nature thus linking themselves in a relationship of radical externality. Breaking the link of co-belonging—the co-belonging that comes from community times—is still present in the rings, which primitive accumulation inherits and exorcises.

Community sociability is a man-nature relationship oriented in the space-time of the labour rites of the socio-spatial relationship. Each period and each area are the

mark of a calendar of festivities that periodise and categorise the communion of life codified in the set of symbols and signs whose sense of community traverses time and arrives at feudal sociability. The breakdown of the community relationship by the forms of geographicity that succeed it in time brings with it the need for new signs and symbols, whose mark of transition in the West is the birth of Christianity.

Christian symbology is the expression of the separation of body and spirit that announces the changes in the form of co-belonging between man and nature of the community relationship, body and spirit separated through the separation of music and dance, until then an organic unity in the ritualistic moments of the festivity of labour, where music and dance are guided by the rhythm of percussion as the corporeal rhythm of the labour's movement. This is the case of the trampling of grapes to make wine. Christianity undoes this relationship, separating music, henceforth an attribute of the spirit, and dance, henceforth an attribute of the body, separating music and dance, spirit and body, divinity and worldliness, nature and man, excluded from/subordinated to the rite of charisma, in a spatiality of religious subjection. The process is the breaking of the music in two, the percussion music and the wind music, the former a body music and the latter an enchanting music (Andrade 1977). It is the way of symbolising the breaking of the man-nature relationship that then occurs, man and nature separated on the subjective plane of the religious representation of the world, but kept unified on the plane of the daily objectivity of labour.

Primitive accumulation radicalises this separation, via the expropriation that degrounds, the expulsion that deterritorialises, and the purging that despatialises, denaturising man and dehumanising nature, breaking the man-territory-spatial bond both subjectively and objectively, creating a man with no land, no territory, no space, a man who no longer recognises himself, and is dissociated, abandoned, and uprooted from the estrangement from the world. The relationship between labour and money, labour purchased for the pure valorisation of money, is the aim and purpose of the relationship of estrangement. The degrounding, deterritorialisation, and despatialisation are the means. They are geographical strands through which primitive accumulation intervenes, producing capitalist geographicity via three corresponding processes of ordering: the emergence of the land market, the emergence of the labour market, and the emergence of the money market. Relationships through which primitive accumulation erects the labour-money-labour exchange relationship as the societal and sociability foundation of the socio-spatial relationship mode we know (Moreira 2016).

The starting point is the emergence of the land market, the legal and economic process that converts land from immovable property to movable property, and thus capital. The process that, at the same time, degrounds, deterritorialises, and despatialises man, and immediately breaks and transforms nature into a plethora of use values, thrown into the world as different modes of exchange value. A movement that is made in parts, from the rearrangement of the rings of sociability of the fiefdom, subjecting the reciprocal transfiguration of the man-nature and socio-spatial relationship of each ring to the same societal relationship of sociability of the market. First, it is the agricultural land (land in the sense that has since been current), dissolving and fragmenting the ring of crops and livestock arranged into multiple sections of

privately owned areas. This is followed by the ring of community pasture and then the outer ring of forest, divided and fenced equally in multiple parts. Then comes the centre of the fortress and lots of farms and gardens, consumed and reinscribed in the vortex of urbanisation that the market brings with it. A whole new ordering of space organisation and regulation is carried out in this way, with the market rule at the same time dividing and uniting everything at the ends of the exchange relationship.

The labour force market is the next step. Expropriated and expelled from the land, the serf proletarianises himself, migrates between places seeking to sell the only form of property he has left, the labour force, with the land market unfolding into the labour force market. That is, labour separated from the means of labour, thereby made free labour, wage labour, labour offered for sale at a value measured by a corresponding amount of money. Labour bought and sold, and, like land, converted into capital. Labour that from the outset crosses and moves in dual paths, facing the opposite path of money. There is the serf who becomes bourgeois. And there is the serf who proletarianises himself. Dual paths, but that here and there cross each other the more the money market prevails and the land market and the labour market merge with it, eliminating from the list of paths the motive and purpose of the transition from feudalism to capitalism.

Lastly, and along the paths, comes the money market. With the peculiarity of money being the great helmsman on the path of progression and fusion with itself of the land and labour market, benefitting from the common origin in the emergence of cash income. And being able, in this way, to give, in time, the stamp and content of the societal and sociability relationships that primitive accumulation raises as the substance and foundation of the new form of geographicity, since the roadmap of cash income is its roadmap. The flight and abandonment of the fiefdom by the serfs in light of the overexploitation of income from labour and income from production that occurred during the course of the tenth century is the source of origin of cash income, as the flight and abandonment forced the lordly class to change the obligation of free labour (income from labour, called *corvée*) and income from production (income paid with a second or third of the peasant's production) to payment in a corresponding amount of money. A change that means leading the serf to previously having to sell the products on the market, where he used to go, in a goods—money—goods (G-M-G) exchange circuit, to only exchange his consumption surpluses for the surpluses of other serfs, thus obtaining and paying the cash obligation. A change that will guide the trajectory of the serf himself, along two paths, depending on the place and the seasonality of the moment, in a way anticipating the relationship between labour and money that little by little the course of exchanges will determine: that of capitalisation of the countryside and bourgeoisification of one part of the serfs and the proletarianisation and impoverishment of another, in a vertical differentiation. Wherever the situation favours, the serf can, after having resolved the dispute over the obligation of servitude, manage to keep a sufficient accumulation of resources in cash, which he uses to buy and revert to property the portion that previously belonged to him as possession, becoming the owner of the land and becoming a modern peasant, with the possibility of, now acting as owner, and venturing on a new purchase or lease, returning his production to the market, to become bourgeois



and a member of the new class, the agrarian bourgeoisie, which thereby forms in the countryside. However, wherever the situation disfavours, the serf accumulates debt, is dispossessed of the land, and his cutback increases to the point that he will only be left with his labour to sell, an amount that grows the more the commodification of the land and agricultural production increases, often becoming expelled or employed as a wage earner by the former serf himself, now a rich peasant, from the fiefdom's coexistence, thus deepening and fuelling the creation of the growing labour force market. This movement of vertical differentiation fuels the joint expansion of the land market, the labour market, and the money market, and thus the monetisation that thrives on the side of change, putting money at the centre of everything (Dobb 1965).

However, the great transformation comes with the inversion of the order of money circulation, before a mere means of exchange in the G-M-G circuit, in which it is the goods that circulate, with money only mediating their movement, now becoming the centre itself with the transformation of the G-M-G circuit into the money—goods—more money (M-G-M') circuit, the circuit created in the influx of cash income and in the expansive impulse of monetisation, which comes from it, a circuit in which it is the money that now circulates, and the goods become its mere means of movement and expansion. The M-G-M' circuit in which the goods are no longer the surplus that is exchanged for other surpluses between the serfs, as before in the market, but the product that they now generate from the cradle as a product-for-sale, pushed by the demand for obtainment of cash income, and the capitalisation of land and agricultural production elevates as a project and presupposes the purchase and sale of labour force, the special goods created and expanded by this very capitalisation. Hence, the necessary prior commodification of land, without which there is no way to form a market for the labour force, the power of labour turned into a special form of goods, free labour, free for the wage-earning purchase and sale contract, and carry it over to the M-G-M' circuit to forge the labour-money exchange relationship that will continually valorise new money, the money valorised through labour, and make the proletarianised serf accept submission. It is impossible to imagine a sociability of serfs and peasants.

The inversion of the G-M-G circuit into the M-G-M' circuit, which comes from the emergence and development of mercantile intermediation, the result of the thought of a class then obscures in the dark theatre of feudal exploitation, which sees in the overlapping of the circulation of exchanges to the dispersiveness of peasant production, the opportunity to become enriched and emerge in the city as a new class alongside the agrarian bourgeoisie emerging in the countryside is the path of transformation. A lower class of inhabitants of the burghs, the bourgeoisie, the mercantile bourgeoisie sees in the growth of cash income, the driving force of this great leap from obscurity to the luminosity of dominance, through establishment of the overlapping of the sphere of circulation with respect to the deconcentrated sphere of peasant production, generating the embryo of sociability that will encase the reciprocal transfiguration of the man-nature relationship and the socio-spatial relationship in the societal rule of the market, the implicit rule, precisely, in the transformation of the land market, the labour market, and the money market, unfolded in the exchange of goods market.

A rule that leads to the growing expansion of precisely the centrality of the money circuit (Arrighi 1996; Hilferding 1985; Luxemburgo 1970).

And an inversion that puts serfs and market, income from production and cash income, lordship, and the consumer market beforehand, along with, on the one hand, the grounding, territorialisation, and spatialisation of the ascending money, and on the other, the degrounding, deterritorialisation, and despatialisation of the labour, destined to make money the key subject of primitive accumulation and labour the supporting subject that will amplify it as added value (the money  $M'$  of the relationship of the  $M-G-M'$  circuit that starts with money  $M$ ).

The birth of industry, however, the darling child of mercantile intermediation, is the actual moment of this leap. Intermediation is the act of the bourgeois merchant circulating between the areas of peasant production, an artisanal production, buying their products in a certain area for a low price and reselling them to peasant craftsmen from other areas for a higher price, profiting from the difference, thus substituting, with his intermediation, the act of the peasantry exchanging income from production for cash income, fulfilling the act of buying and selling in their place, profiting in the exchange mediation, and taking the profit back to the bourg. The result, on the one hand, is the peasant craftsmen coming to dedicate themselves to the exclusive task of production, and, on the other, the merchant intermediary organising the exchanges, and the mercantile bourgeoisie submitting the production to its domain, centralising the relationship of buying and selling on a scale of circulation that only it can do. Soon, however, the bourgeois merchant realises that he can take care of the production himself, renting and gathering in a large shed the necessary craftsmen-produced mass collected from handicraft locations, becoming a merchant and an industrialist, and over time taking the sphere of production and overlapping the sphere of trade. It is the stage that internalises the labour-money relationship in the sphere of its own domain, that of the industrial valorisation of money, shaping and starting the very phase of the sociability of money capital (Moreira 2012b, 2015c).

## 5.4 The Adventures of Autopoiesis

“One of the presuppositions of wage labour and one of the historical conditions of capital is free labour and the exchange of free labour for money, with the aim of reproducing money and valorising it; the labour is consumed by money not as a use value for enjoyment, but as a use value for money”, says Marx (1977), summarising the character and socio-geographical content of the sociability of money. Its presupposition, however, is the fragmentation of man. The fragmentation that begins with the intervention with which primitive accumulation dichotomises, fragments, and commodifies nature in the same act with which it reciprocally expropriates nature from man and expropriates man from nature, changing the man-nature relationship and the socio-spatial relationship, thus creating the basis for now fragmenting man’s relationship with himself. It is something that is only possible in the industrial stage

of the sociability of money capital. Indefinite in the dehumanisation that leaves dehumanised nature indefinite, the conceptual indefiniteness now completes itself in the dehumanisation of man himself.

Degrounded, deterritorialised, and despatialised in the relationship with nature, man now degrounds, deterritorialises, and despatialises himself in the relationship with himself, whereby the radicality of the symbolic objectivity-subjectivity of Christianity that had completely distanced him from nature, repeats itself in the radicality of the objectivity-subjectivity of the sociability of money that now distances him from himself. And in the same externalist perspective. The perspective of the sociability of the market that defines nature as the inorganic body of man, based on the conceptualisation that defines man as the inorganic body of other men themselves. Presuppositions of nature and man needed to define the reciprocity of the man-nature and socio-spatial transfiguration as a reciprocity of use values and exchange values that substantiate man and nature in the value concept of the labour-money relationship.

The universe of industry is the field for this disintegration. If for nature, the reference is the diversity of the natural landscape of the environment, and the reference for man would have to be the diversity of the landscape in the world of labour. Nature could of course be divided into as many use values and exchange values as there are visual bodies in the natural landscape. Man asked for a technical and cultural criterion of objectivity. The landscape for nature. The labour for man. And so it is the case. Hence, the gap of more than a century between one fragmentation and another, the immediacy of nature and the mediacy of man. The crumbling space comes as a result.

Thus, as with nature, labour is first separated into productive and unproductive labour. The production and realisation of value are the distinguishing reference. Productive labour is labour that produces added value, the raw material with which labour valorises money. Unproductive labour is labour that realises the valorisation. In the same way, men's labour and women's labour are separated, the former productive, destined to the functions of labour in the factory, and the latter, unproductive, destined to the domestic functions of reproduction of the productive labour of men, the man inserting himself in a market economy and the woman in a (natural) domestic economy, separating the work space and the dwelling space, both set up in the same capitalist society and sociability, but unequally and as hierarchical as the labour-money relationship that this productive-unproductive separation of labour embodies. Ultimately, it is a way, according to Silvia Federici, of concealing that it is the woman's domestic labour that, in the end, is responsible for the reproduction of the man's industrial-productive labour (Federici 2017) and that, according to Francisco de Oliveira, gives the parameter for the very reproduction and replacement of the entire population as a population available to capital, replacing and reproducing the system itself as a whole (Oliveira 1977). Then, intellectual labour and manual labour are separated on one plane, and on another, managerial labour and executive labour, in a fragmentation of space, now the factory, with managerial labour and intellectual labour forming the government and manual labour and executive labour forming the ground floor, in a labour-money hierarchy structuring the factory itself

(Weil 1979). Lastly, labour is pulverised in the diversity of categories of professions, the sectoralised fragment of specialisations that breaks up and dissolves labour in the presence of the state of awareness of the reciprocal transfiguration of the man-nature and socio-spatial relationship, the labour that places man at the very centre of the world as a world built by labour (Braverman 1977).

A form of sociability that reproduces itself simultaneously on a world scale. Primitive accumulation has from the outset been a historical process on a local and global scale, while at the same time organising, since then, but under different forms of geographicity, the planet under different modes of reciprocal transfiguration of the man-nature relationship and the socio-spatial relationship, allowing capitalist sociability, according to Rosa Luxemburgo, to lead its reproducibility to take place in a relationship connected to the reproduction of non-capitalist geographicities, in a reproductive integrality of money capital that from the outset has assembled the world map as a fragmentary cartography of metropolises and colonies (Luxemburgo 1970).

The basic way is to take the act of degrounding, deterritorialisation, and despatialisation of men and women of European extraction to reproduce itself in a repetition of degrounding, deterritorialisation, and despatialisation of men and women from other parts of the world, arranging planetary space in the same relationship of separation of labour and means of labour and the concentration in increasingly fewer hands of money from the original primitive accumulation, to, in this way, form a world of metropolises and colonies under the same general rules of sociability. Here, in the metropolitan context, in the relationship of expropriation, expulsion, and purging that transforms serfs into proletarians, and there, in the colonial context, in the relationship of expropriation, expulsion, and purging that transforms men and women from the communities into slaves. An act that is completed in the ideologisation of the imaginary that divides the world into countries of rationality and countries lacking rationality, the Hegelian vision of the territorial transit of reason around the world, taken as the substance of the distinction between the presence of sociability in the metropolis and the absence of sociability in the colony, the metropolitan world of reason and enlightenment and the colonial world of darkness and a lack of light distinguishing between themselves in a relationship of civilisation and barbarism (Schüler 1995). Civilisation and barbarism are in a kind of reproduction, on a planetary scale, of the spirit and body dichotomy, music and dance, wind instruments and percussion instruments, and the enchantment and worldliness of the birth of Christianity.

## 5.5 The Spatial Malaise of Modern Society

Contemporary geographicity is that of sociability of money mounted on the side of primitive accumulation, taken to the scale of its globalisation. The sociability of what David Harvey calls accumulation by dispossession (Harvey 2004), today taken to every corner of the globe. The sociability of money transformed into the single subject

(Simmel 2015; Santos 2002). Sociability of the degrounded, deterritorialised, and despatialised man on an international scale, against which he moves in a tenacious struggle for counterspace (Moreira 2012a, b). The counterspace of a geographicity of space lived in pieces, a crumbling space, in the words of Lacoste (1988). The malaise denounced by Freud (1997a, b, c). And the culmination of a dispossessed man that begins with the reciprocal expropriation of man and nature, the source of the lack of space that is at the heart of the problem. The problem of rooting that space, from the rotational system of community sociability, is the key category.

Man is, therefore, the product-producer of the spatial context in which he lives, man producing geographicity and geographicity producing man, until primitive accumulation came to change this rule, no longer putting the man-spatial-nature relationship, but the labour-money relationship at the centre of reference. Thus, modern geographicity emerges in which man produces money, but money does not produce man. But, its own reproduction expanded through man. And that has its key piece in the rule of reciprocal transfiguration of the man-nature and socio-spatial relationship carried out through the metabolic exchange of commodified labour. The relationship of transfiguration whose hominisation money capital inverts, to convert it into its monetisation.

Geographicity, however, was to be the whole of sociability that weaves the socio-spatial relationship from the societal rule of organisation of the man-nature relationship in the sense of man as his own subject and object (Moreira 2020). The man who creates himself and makes himself an autopoietic being through it. The man who sees and finds his own project in the societal relationship of self-production. And so to become the self-made being, not out of pure desire, but out of the need for self-production. And it has in the historicity of the man-spatial-nature relationship—a relationship in which space organises, orders, regulates, controls, reproduces, and transforms the man of natural history into the man of social history—the axis that makes from the human species (the man of natural nature, the first nature) and the human genus (the man of the second nature, the socialised nature) the total man. The man at the same time the presence and the being that is the substance—the being-there (the presence) and the being-in-the-world (the being), by Heidegger; the social place (the presence) and the geosociability (the being), by Silva; the being-in-itself and the being-for-itself (the presence) and the being-for-the-other (the being), by Sartre; the telluric man, from the geography of plants, by Humboldt; the territorial social justice, by Harvey—of every form of geographicity. And there is in space—the worldhood of the world (the world-around-us), by Heidegger (1978), the practico-inert, the existence that becomes essence, by Sartre (2002), the presence of the man who makes himself be social, by Lukács (2010, 2012), the topos, by Lefebvre (1976), the territorialisation-deterritorialisation-territorialisation (TDR), by Raffestin (1993), the relational praxis, by George (1973), and the territorial machine, by Deleuze and Guattari (1976)—self's way of being. The real place and condition of existence.

It is through space, and as space, therefore, that primitive accumulation became a labour-money relationship. Man must be uprooted, denaturising, degrounding, deterritorialising, and thus despatialising him, forcing him to submit to the dictates of the sociability of money capital. And in this submission, leading him to hand over his

potentiality as the potentiality of money, giving money the status of autopoiesis that is an attribute of man. Breaking the ecological and territorial aspect that integrates him in the world as a world-in-man (Quaini 1979). Subjecting him to the crumbling space (Lacoste 1974, 1977). Reducing him to corporeality and accusing him of madness (Foucault 1979, 1977). And, thus, leading him to schizophrenia (Deleuze and Guattari 1976). Making him a replicant, a Blade Runner lost in his own here-now.

## References

- Andrade M (1977) Pequena história da música. Martins Fontes, São Paulo
- Arrighi G (1996) O longo século XX. Contraponto/Editora da UNESP, São Paulo
- Braverman H (1977) Trabalho e capital monopolista: a degradação do trabalho no século XX. Jorge Zahar Editora, Rio de Janeiro
- Brunhes J (1962) Geografia humana. Fundo de Cultura, Rio de Janeiro
- Deleuze J, Guattari F (1976) O anti-édipo. Capitalismo e esquizofrenia. Imago, Rio de Janeiro
- Dobb M (1965) A evolução do capitalismo. Editora Zahar, Rio de Janeiro
- De Oliveira F (1977) A produção dos homens: notas sobre a reprodução da população sob o capital. In: de Oliveira F (ed) A economia da dependência imperfeita. Edições Graal, Rio de Janeiro
- De Oliveira Biteti M (2014) O em-si-para-o-outro-para-si: o ôntico e o ontológico como dimensões do ser geográfico. Postgraduate Programme in Geography, Niterói
- Da Silva AC (1991) Geografia e lugar geossocial. Editora Contexto, São Paulo
- Federici S (2017) Calibã e a bruxa. Mulheres, corpo e acumulação primitiva. Elefante, São Paulo
- Foucault M (1977) Vigiar e punir. História da violência nas prisões. Editora Vozes, Rio de Janeiro
- Foucault M (1979) Microfísica do poder. Edições Graal, Rio de Janeiro
- Freud S (1997a) O mal-estar da civilização. Imago Editora, Rio de Janeiro
- Freud S (1997b) O futuro de uma ilusão. Imago Editora, Rio de Janeiro
- Freud S (1997c) Moisés e o monoteísmo. Imago Editora, Rio de Janeiro
- George P (1968) A ação do homem. Difel, São Paulo
- George P (1973) Problemas, doutrina e método. In: George P (ed) Geografia ativa. Difel, São Paulo
- Harvey D (2004) O novo imperialismo. Edições Loyola, São Paulo
- Hilferding R (1985) O capital financeiro. Nova Cultural, São Paulo
- Heidegger M (1978) Ser e tempo, vols I & II. Editora Vozes, Rio de Janeiro
- Hindess BH, Paul Q (1976) Modos de produção pré-capitalistas. J. Zahar Editor, Rio de Janeiro
- Hobsbawm E (1977) Introdução a formações econômicas pré-capitalistas de Marx. In: Marx K (ed) Formações econômicas pré-capitalistas, 2nd edn. Editora Paz e Terra, Rio de Janeiro
- Huberman L (1969) A história da riqueza do homem, 4th edn. Editora Zahar, Rio de Janeiro
- Lacoste Y (1974) A geografia. In: Chatelet F (org.) História da filosofia: ideias, doutrinas. A filosofia das ciências sociais – de 1860 aos nossos dias, vol 7. Editora Zahar, Rio de Janeiro
- Lacoste Y (1988) A geografia – isso serve, em primeiro lugar, para fazer a guerra. Papirus Editora, São Paulo
- Lefebvre H (1971) O fim da história. Publicações Dom Quixote, Porto
- Lefebvre H (1973) A re-produção das relações de produção. Publicações Escorpião, Lisboa
- Lefebvre H (1976) Conversaciones con los radicales. Actuel, Madrid
- Lefebvre H (1981) Para compreender o pensamento de Marx. Edições 70, Lisboa
- Lefebvre H (2013) La producción del espacio. Capitán Swing Libros, Madrid
- Lima EL (2019) Encruzilhadas geográficas. Notas sobre a compreensão do sujeito na teoria social crítica. Editora Consequência, Rio de Janeiro
- Lukács G (1970) Introdução a uma estética marxista. Sobre a categoria da particularidade. Editora Civilização Brasileira, Rio de Janeiro

- Lukács G (2010) *Prolegômenos para uma ontologia do ser social*. Boitempo, São Paulo
- Lukács G (2012) *Para uma ontologia do ser social*, vols. I & II. Boitempo Editorial, São Paulo
- Luxemburgo R (1970) *A acumulação do capital (estudo sobre a interpretação imperialista do capitalismo)*. Editora Zahar, Rio de Janeiro
- Martins ER (2007) *Geografia e ontologia: o fundamento geográfico do ser*. Revista Geosp, espaço e tempo, n. 21. Department of Geography, São Paulo
- Marx K (1977) *Formações econômicas pré-capitalistas*. Editora Paz e Terra, Rio de Janeiro
- Moreira R (2015) *O pensamento geográfico brasileiro. As matrizes clássicas originárias*, vol 1. Editora Contexto, São Paulo
- Moreira R (2016) *O capítulo 24 e o segredo da atualidade de O Capital de Marx*. In: Moreira R (ed) *A geografia do espaço-mundo. Conflitos e superações no espaço do capital*. Editora Consequência, Rio de Janeiro
- Moreira R (2007a) *O mal-estar espacial no fim do século XX*. In: Moreira R (ed) *Pensar e ser em geografia. Ensaios de história, epistemologia e ontologia*. Editora Contexto, São Paulo
- Moreira R (2007b) *Sociabilidade e espaço: as sociedades na era da terceira revolução industrial*. In: Moreira R (ed) *Pensar e ser em geografia. Ensaios de história, epistemologia e ontologia*. Editora Contexto, São Paulo
- Moreira R (2007c) *A sociedade e suas formas de espaço no tempo*. In: Moreira R (ed) *Pensar e ser em geografia. Ensaios de história, epistemologia e ontologia*. Editora Contexto, São Paulo
- Moreira R (2012a) *O espaço e o contraespaço: tensões e conflitos na ordem espacial burguesa*. In: Moreira R (ed) *Geografia e práxis. A presença do espaço na teoria e na prática geográficas*. Editora Contexto, São Paulo
- Moreira R (2012b) *O paradigma e a norma: a sociedade capitalista e o seu espaço*. In: Moreira R (ed) *Geografia e práxis. A presença do espaço na teoria e na prática geográficas*. Editora Contexto, São Paulo
- Moreira R (2019) *Espaço, corpo do tempo. A construção geográfica da sociedade*. Editora Consequência, Rio de Janeiro
- Moreira R (2020) *A torre, o palimpsesto e a expropriação. Olhando Tricart, Aziz Ab' Sáber e Quaini pelos olhos da totalidade homem-meio*. In: Limonad E, Barbosa JL (eds) *Editora Max Limonad*, São Paulo
- Quaini M (1979) *Marxismo e geografia*. Editora Paz e Terra, São Paulo
- Raffestin C (1993) *Por uma geografia do poder*. Editora Ática, São Paulo
- Réclus E, *El hombre y la tierra*, 6 vol. Maucci, Barcelona (undated)
- Santos M (1978) *Por uma geografia nova. Da crítica da geografia a uma geografia crítica*. Editora Hucitec, São Paulo
- Santos M (2002) *O dinheiro e o território*. In: Posgeouff: *Território, territórios. Ensaios sobre o ordenamento territorial*. DP&A, Niterói
- Sartre J-P (2002) *Crítica da razão dialética. Teoria dos conjuntos práticos*, vol I. DP&A Editora, Rio de Janeiro
- Schüler D (1995) *Do homem dicotômico ao homem híbrido*. In: Bernd Z, De Grandis R (orgs) *Imprevisíveis Américas: questões de hibridação cultural nas Américas*. Porto Alegre, Sagra/Abecan
- Simmel G (2015) *Psicologia do dinheiro e outros estudos*. Edições Texto & Traços, Lisboa
- Sorre M (1967) *El hombre en la tierra*. Labor S/A, Barcelona
- Vidal de La Blache P (1954) *Princípios de geografia humana*. Cosmos, Lisboa
- Weber M (1968) *História geral da economia*. Editora Mestre Jou, Rio de Janeiro
- Weil S (1979) *A condição operária e outros estudos sobre a opressão*. Editora Paz e Terra, Rio de Janeiro
- Wittfogel KA (1966) *Despotismo oriental: estudio comparativo del poder totalitario*. Ediciones Guadarrama, Madrid