

editorial
editorial
entrevista
interview
ágora
agora
tapete
carpet
projeto
project
expediente
credits
próxima v!rus
next v!rus

ÁGORÀ
AGORA

V!23

REVISTA V!RUS
V!RUS JOURNAL

issn 2175-974x
dezembro . december 2021



PT | EN

TECENDO MEMÓRIAS NO FIO DA LUTA: DECOLONIALIDADE NA HISTÓRIA DA CIDADE WEAVING MEMORIES ALONG THE THREAD OF THE STRUGGLE: DECOLONIALITY IN THE HISTORY OF THE CITY

GIOVANA CRUZ, POLIANA MONTEIRO, FERNANDA OLIVEIRA

Giovana Cruz Alves is an Architect and Urbanist with a Master's degree in Architecture and Urbanism, researcher in the group Large Urban Development Projects (GPDU) of the Graduate Program in Architecture and Urbanism, of the Fluminense Federal University (UFF) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. She studies the history of architecture and the city, culture, memory and subjectivity in architecture and the city, and decoloniality. giovanacruzalves@gmail.com
<http://lattes.cnpq.br/4138061671074882>

Poliana Gonçalves Monteiro is an Architect and Urbanist with a Master's degree in Urban and Regional Planning. She is a researcher in the Laboratory of State, Labour, Territory, and Nature (ETTERN) of the Research and Planning Institute of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and the research group Large Urban Development Projects (GPDU) of the Graduate Program in Architecture and Urbanism, of the Fluminense Federal University. She studies social housing, social movements, precarious settlements, housing policy, space production and human rights, from a feminist perspective focusing on the struggles carried out by women. poli.dmambembe@gmail.com
<http://lattes.cnpq.br/0480556387169790>

Fernanda Gomes de Oliveira holds a Bachelor's degree in Tourism and a Master's degree in Architecture and Urbanism. She is a researcher in the group Large Urban Development Projects (GPDU) of the Graduate Program in Architecture and Urbanism, at the Fluminense Federal University, Brazil. Her research focuses on the relationship between tourism and the city, urban conflicts and tourism, and public policies and tourism. oliveiragfernanda@gmail.com
<http://lattes.cnpq.br/2815217161191494>

How to quote this text: Cruz, G.; Monteiro, P. G.; Oliveira, F. G. de., 2021. Weaving memories along the thread of the struggle: decoloniality in the history of the city. Translated from Portuguese by Brian Honeyball. *V!RUS*, 23, December. [online] Available at: <<http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/virus23/?sec=4&item=10&lang=en>>. [Accessed: dd Month yyyy].

ARTICLE SUBMITTED ON AUGUST, 15, 2021

Abstract

The coloniality of urban knowledge intersects the field of historical studies on architecture and the city in the Global South, and contributes to the invisibilization of the history and memory of subalternized groups. Based on this premise, this article brings a decolonial perspective circumscribed in theoretical debates regarding the Global South, which seeks to question hegemonic theories and methodologies, linking critique to the concrete experience of societies marked by colonialism. Our objective is to help construct a historiography of architecture and the city, which contemplates the memories of social groups in subordinate situations. We suggest that observing everyday life and urban struggles contributes to the democratization of history and collective memory. Thus, we address popular housing occupations in the port region of Rio de Janeiro and urban struggles for the right to housing and work, highlighting the women and men who live in the city and construct it. Using oral reporting, we bring the narrative and everyday life of peripheral working women to the center of the story. As the main results, we have reflected on the colonial and decolonial, Eurocentric and subaltern categories of theoretical debates located in the Global South, essentially demonstrating the speech of the working woman in the dispute of the narratives.

Keywords: The history of architecture and the city, Decoloniality, Memory, Everyday life, Urban struggles

1 Introduction: the history and memory of architecture and the city¹

Until the last quarter of the twentieth century, when the Western model of rationality began to be questioned in the field of social sciences, the idea prevailed in the modern world that history had a unique meaning and direction. Associated with this idea was an understanding that the countries at the core of the world system were somehow at the head of this unidirectional timeline, moving towards progress and development (Santos, 2002). This logic has influenced historical studies on a global level, including those related to the history of architecture and the city. In the case of colonized countries, such as Brazil, it may be stated that this influence was corroborated by the colonizing perspective. This was responsible for creating the image of the other as an inferior, primitive being, and for constituting the coloniality of power, knowledge, being and nature (Cruz, 2017), which intersects the most diverse fields of knowledge, including architecture and urbanism.

Recent decades, however, have been marked, in the field of social sciences in the countries of the Global South, by a deepening critique in the presence of hegemonic theories and by a growing effort of epistemological revision from which it is possible to observe a major tendency for these perspectives to become displaced. In this article, we understand the Global South as a relational concept under dispute. Forged within the context of postcolonial and transnational studies, it may refer to both the third world and to the group of developing countries, demonstrating the territorial positionality of ideas and theories from the South in contrast to those of the dominant Global North. We are in agreement with Vainer (2019) in that we are not just dealing with a geographic delimitation, but, first and foremost, with a dominance-subordination relationship in economic, political, social, cultural and epistemic terms. Although he does not exactly use the term Global South, Quijano (2000) has helped us to understand this debate. When addressing and characterizing these power relations, he stated that Latin America — as opposed to Eurocentrism and the colonial character — is constituted through two fundamental axes: the idea of race and the situation of inferiority; and the control of work, its resources and products surrounding capital and the world market.

Critical theory developed in the Global South has thus sought to link critique to the concrete experience of regions, where societies have been formed bearing the marks of the colonial experience and of the peripheral situation in global capitalism. Therefore, it has addressed coloniality as a characteristic that is still present in the mechanisms of exploitation and domination, thus developing and deepening a decolonial perspective (Lao-Montes and Vásquez, 2018). Simultaneously, in Brazil, the field of historical studies on architecture and the city has grown significantly, since they have become widely understood as an important contribution to the propositional practices inherent in the craft of architects and urban planners.

On the threshold of both processes, it seems pertinent, therefore, to consider a decolonial epistemology for historical studies on architecture and the city. In view of this, we have mobilized a reflection on the theories and methodologies that have thus far guided our historical investigations, as well as our narrative constructions and, consequently, our practices. We also aim to stimulate new interpretations of the material and symbolic production processes of architecture and the city that remove from the shadow zones, the female and male subjects, who, despite being placed in a subordinate situation, play a role within these

processes. Through their everyday dynamics, these subjects thus bring to light new aspects of the historical and social process and, therefore, favor the dispute for the collective memory² of urban society.

The dynamics of territorial fragmentation, of restricted access and of the expansion of settlements — which Mbembe (2018) calls “colonial occupation” — encounters echoes in the production of contemporary urban space. The disregard and interdiction of collective memory are a tool for territorial control and have been historically used as a way of enshrining dispossession processes. The “colonial occupation” itself was always a matter of apprehension, demarcation and affirmation of the physical and geographic control that formed a material basis for a set of specific social and spatial relations. The production of space, in this sense, is “[...] the raw material of sovereignty and the violence it carried with it. Sovereignty meant occupation, and occupation meant relegating the colonized into a third zone between subjecthood and objecthood.” (Mbembe, 2003, p. 26).

Hence, the aim of this article is to challenge dominant theories and practices, since, due to their colonial perspective, they continue to produce narratives that invisibilize those who have historically been fighting for their living and working spaces and playing an effective role, therefore, in the construction of the city. Herein, we seek to reflect on avenues of investigation that may contribute to a historiography of architecture and the city that surpasses the epistemic violence (Spivak, 2010) inherent in the production of Eurocentric and model-based knowledge. The urgency of this reflection, which involves questions of method, converges with the critique of the construction of the other and the oversimplification of identities (Sánchez, 2001) and the need to contemplate, in historical studies, the knowledge, traditions and memories of subalternized subjects and social groups. Thus, we also seek to identify yet another ethic in everyday practices that, moved by the care and sharing of life, continuously build and rebuild the city. These are practices that reveal a strong female protagonist role and that, removing the narrative of precariousness, seek the decolonial epistemic construction of re-existence (Lopes and Silva, 2018).

Thus, the article is divided into two sections, in addition to this brief introduction. Based on reflections that consider the coloniality of urban knowledge (Vainer, 2019) as a central element in addressing cities in the Global South, we present, in the first section, a reflection on the possibilities of breaking away from the systems of ideas that associate the production of space to power projects. Hence, we seek to feel our way through a decolonial approach to historical investigations that brings to the surface the hidden memories³ of everyday practices and urban struggles. We understand that, based on these, it is possible to consider the construction of a history of architecture and the city that is both the product and producer of a more plural, democratic collective memory.

In the second section, we then approach the everyday urban struggles that have materialized in housing occupations in the port region of Rio de Janeiro, in southeastern Brazil. We seek to highlight the relationship between housing and work, suggesting that such experiences point towards a possible pathway for the process of building a collective, popular memory with regards to the city. In this section, we present the reflections of Maria dos Camelôs, leader of the Movimento Unido dos Camelôs [the United Movement of Street Venders] in Rio de Janeiro, who sets off the thread of memory of urban struggles. Maria's reflections were collected through an oral report during the II Roda de Conversa com Mulheres Atingidas pelas Remoções — Mulheres em Luta pelo Direito à Moradia! [the II Conversation Circle with Women Affected by the Removals — Women Fighting for the Right to Housing!] The activity was organized within the scope of research conducted by the State, Labor, Territory of Nature Laboratory (known as ETTERN) from the Urban and Regional Research and Planning Institute (IPPUR) by the researchers Poliana Monteiro and Mariana Medeiros⁴. It took place in November 2017 during the Mariana Crioula Occupation, in the port area of the city, with the participation of around 40 women from different communities and regions of the city and social movements fighting for housing. Lastly, in the final considerations, we seek to unveil the nexus between theory and practice in the field of historical studies and the professional practice of architecture and urbanism, considering that “[...] the practice of criticism can't replace the criticism of practices.” (Vainer, 2019, p. 4)⁵.

2 Everyday life, urban struggles, and the dispute for the collective memory

Coloniality, according to Vainer (2019), is a hierarchical relationship of domination that was born with colonization at the dawn of modernity, and was maintained, produced and reproduced even after the end of the colonization process. Coloniality is a fundamental element of modernity and the capitalist system. In this sense, capitalism, racism and patriarchy are inseparable structures of colonial relations, which can only be historically overcome in a joint, integrated manner. Coloniality, materially imposed with the conquest and colonization of territories — in the Americas and, later, in Asia and Africa — is also the conquest and colonization of the imagination and, consequently, of history and the collective memory. Thus, the colonization process of knowledge operates through a dual movement: on the one hand, with the destruction of

knowledge, concepts, values and worldviews of colonized female and male subjects, and, on the other hand, with the systematic, violent construction of history and memory from the perspective of the colonizing agent (Vainer, 2019).

With this in mind, we understand that critical urban theories produced in the Global North do not problematize the colonial dimension in their interpretations, approaches and methods, thereby echoing normative city models imbued with hygienist, Eurocentric values and generally insensitive to issues of race and sex (Cassian-Yde, 2019). Thus, it is important to consider the limitations of urban theories built in light of the city experiences located in the United States and Europe (Roy apud Cassian-Yde, 2019), which place urban planning experiences, such as the case of Barcelona or London, as paradigmatic models that should be adopted.

Despite the dominant planning trends and the actions of commodification and homogenization undertaken across the territories, we understand that it is possible to consider the production of space from a decolonial perspective. In other words, we believe it is possible to read the city and architecture as heterogeneous spaces, lived and collectively produced by a plural set of social actors and from a complex network of knowledge that reflects different epistemes. From this angle, such a reading implies an understanding that urban spaces, once planned by global processes, acknowledge the introduction of different individuals and groups, which establish their own ways of living through their dynamics of use and modification of territories, buildings and landscapes. Thus, they manifest multiplicities, tensions and conflicts inherent in the practice that Lefebvre (2011) defines as appropriation. According to Lefebvre, the city is not limited to its morphology, which is a support for the ways of living that characterize the multiplicity of the social dimensions of urban dynamics. This approach contributes to our understanding of the city and architecture as being spaces that are continually produced, not only by dominant agents, but by the entire social body. It is this social collective that, inhabiting the spaces, not only manifests the diversity of the ways of life but also the disputes for the spaces of the city.

In this regard, in order to deconstruct the hegemonic narratives and norms and, thus, exercise a decolonial reading of the historical transformation processes of cities, it is incumbent upon us to review and tension the concepts and practices commonly used in the historical studies of architecture and of the city. Often, an investigation that may envisage the construction of more democratic and plural historical discourses necessarily involves the problematization and deviation of theories and methodologies that tend to generate representations of the city and architecture as products of exclusive actions of hegemonic agents. Lastly, it involves surpassing the processes that contribute to the construction of a selective, unilateral collective memory.

We understand that the coloniality of urban knowledge operates significantly in erasures, silencing, omissions and in the production of this selectivity and unilaterality. Within this context, the production, management and preservation of the so-called formal city and architecture mostly serve the ruling classes in order to perpetuate their memories. Mazivieiro (2018) elaborates on this issue by stating that architecture and the city are symbolic elements that represent society, manifesting the processes that constitute it, be it those of inclusion or exclusion. The author emphasizes that memory is always selective and, consequently, it is a constructed phenomenon. Hence, the built space from an urban imaginary constituted by the coloniality of knowledge produces memories that encounter an echo within select social groups, which ratifies the asymmetries and reinforces social hierarchies. The memory, triggered by the materiality of the urban and architectural space, thus becomes an instrument of domination, also affecting the constitution of identities.

Excluded from the hegemonic processes of preserving the city and situated, therefore, on the margin of this collective memory constituted by urban materiality, the only alternative that these subalternized groups have is the possibility of oral transmissions, which occur "[...]" within the family framework, in associations, in affective and/or political sociability networks" (Pollak, 1989, p. 8, our translation). In opposition and conflicting in relation to the collective memory organized by the ruling classes, the memories of these individuals often remain invisible and inaudible, being preserved only in "[...]" informal communication structures that go unnoticed by the encompassing society" (Idem). The recognition of the potentially problematic character of collective memory, according to Pollak (1989, p. 4), announces a new approach that questions the processes and actors that work in the constitution of memories. In this sense, such an approach enables a new perspective that favors "[...]" the analysis of the excluded, the marginalized and minorities [...]" and thus destabilizes "[...]" the destructive, standardizing, oppressive nature [...]" of a memory selected by the ruling classes.

Seeking ways with which to subvert this process, it is necessary to dispute, democratize and popularize history and collective memory. Because of this, it is necessary to create methods from which it is possible to remove hidden memories from the shadow zones and build other histories of the city and architecture.

Histories that include and dignify the practices and ways of life of those individuals and groups who, given the historical asymmetries of the processes of colonization, modernization, commoditization and homogenization of territories, dispute their spaces in the city and fight for their rights to housing and work. With this in mind, in this work, we seek to unveil the memory woven into the everyday lives of the subordinate population and, mainly, of women in struggle. Exercising "counter-conducts" of everyday practice, they establish practices that "[...] are subversive precisely because they are popular and silent (or even minuscule) everyday procedures - at least in the frequency of listening to institutionalized practices" (Lopes and Silva, 2018, p. 3 our translation).

The observation of everyday life that involves the different manners of life in cities and, in particular, the popular practices of subalternized communities presents itself, then, as a methodological possibility for new approaches in historical studies. According to Heller (2016, p. 38, our translation), everyday life is "[...] at the center of the historical event: it is the true 'essence' of social substance", being composed of both private life and work, leisure, for rest and social activities. Based on the author's reading of everyday life, we could understand it as the sphere of life in which we trigger a certain amount of automation so that the simple continuation of everyday life is guaranteed. For Heller, in everyday life, man manifests various active and receptive capacities, but without giving depth and breadth to any of them. However, she also recognizes that within the structures of the regular ordering of everyday life, there is some field of freedom, in which man may manifest his particularities and shape his own attitudes.

Starting from a more positive sense of everyday life, Certeau (1998) makes a reading that highlights and precisely extols the fields of freedom and the possibilities of deviations present within them. He understands everyday life as the sphere of life in which individuals establish their own, autonomous creative operations based on the appropriation of products offered by the dominant orders. Within this context, in the face of rationalized, centralized and spectacular processes and strategic actions of domination, the so-called "everyday practices" are outstanding in that they are tactical, astute, deviationist and manifest different "ways of operating" that reveal other needs and desires in the face of the possibilities offered in each circumstance. "Dwelling, moving about, speaking, reading, shopping and cooking are activities that seem to correspond to the characteristics of tactical ruses and surprises [...]." (Certeau, 1998, p. 40) These are diverse, heterogeneous actions, undertaken by marginal individuals who operate day after day in the cracks and on the edges of the instituted system.

This elaboration regarding everyday life enables us to infer that, given the hegemonic planning processes that involve the production of space as a project of power and domination, countless other procedures and movements are forged by the popular classes. These, by not having their rights guaranteed in the normative processes of spatial production, weave their own webs of knowledge, establish their own organizations of everyday life, and create their own ways of living, inhabiting and working. And so, they produce their territories, constructing, on the limit, the city as a whole. Thus, on an everyday basis, they modify spaces through imaginative, anti-hegemonic and transgressive practices that challenge and destabilize elitist planning and therefore, expose the gaps in the dominant narratives.

We understand that these processes, reflecting the struggles for the right to urban life, housing and work, need to be constitutive of the city's history so that the collective urban memory becomes more plural and democratic. For this, historical investigations need to include the everyday lives of the subjects that make up the popular classes and their voices. Hence, below, we address those subjects, who fight for the right to housing and work in the port region of Rio de Janeiro.

3 From the oversimplification of identities to popular collective memory

The strategies used in the context of the urban-cultural renovation of Porto Maravilha — an Urban Consortium Operation initiated in 2009 that promised to revitalize the port region of Rio de Janeiro — demonstrate that the demands, which capital imposes onto cities are no longer related only to the production of space, but also to information and communication. The oversimplification of urban identities operated by this type of intervention determines selections, exclusions and omissions that disguise everyday life as a constituent of the space production process and excludes the working class as an agent within this process (Sánchez, 2001). Therefore, our objective here is provide a contribution towards pulling out a thread of memory regarding urban struggles, materialized in popular occupations that have sought to implement the right to housing linked to the right to work, within the context of sporting mega-events ⁶ and, specifically, an intervention in the port region of Rio de Janeiro.

The implementation of the Porto Maravilha project had a profound impact on the dynamics of affordable housing in the city center. In addition, by assuming within its scope the spectacle of public space, it triggered disputes in the fields of culture, identities and, ultimately, memory. The urban interventions promoted by the

project justified the removal of five significant occupations of popular housing, consolidated and organized by social movements in buildings that had been abandoned and had deteriorated over a long period of time, and that were evidently failing to fulfill the property's social function. Furthermore, the growing repression in the region also implied the systematic removal of several smaller occupations spread along the street called Rua do Livramento. Within this process, the forced evictions promoted during the revitalization period affected approximately 860 families (Comitê Popular, 2014). It should be noted that some of the vacant properties, which were the object of repossession actions and accelerated the violent removal of resident families, still remain empty.

During the period, the urban occupations removed were the: I) Casarão Azul occupation, II) Chiquinha Gonzaga occupation, III) Flor do Asfalto occupation, IV) Machado de Assis occupation, V) Quilombo das Guerreiras occupation and VI) Zumbi dos Palmares occupation. In addition to these removals, the implementation of the revitalization project was also responsible for intensifying the repression of informal workers across the region. Despite the evident material and symbolic violence directed towards the working class, the emphasis of the hegemonic discourse was on cultural diversity, which simulated a depoliticizing new harmony of social bonds (Sánchez, 2001). The Chiquinha Gonzaga Occupation, one of the first to become established in the central region of the city, managed to remain, although it continues to be threatened with removals. Its permanence, however, is a reflection of the failure of the revitalization project, which lost its impetus and, for various reasons, was unable to expand territorially into the region known as Central do Brasil, according to the original plan.

The erasure of this popular collective memory intensifies the process of the "[...]" progressive shrinking of that which is negotiable [...]" (Pollak, 1989, p. 6, our translation), in this case, maintaining the experience and identities of female and male workers who effectively inhabit this place of affection and memory. To pull out this thread of active, affective memory, aware of the connection between home and work, we introduce the narrative of Maria dos Camelôs (Figure 1), a militant member of the United Street Venders Movement (MUCA) and former resident of the Chiquinha Gonzaga occupation:

Listening to everyone speaking here, I feel that we begin to fight when our lives begin to feel the squeeze. And I began to fight for the street vendors, and then I went to the occupation, because then I discovered that I have the right to work, I have the right to live. And as I didn't have a home of my own, I had to rent. And so I became part of the occupation because there was no way I could live, so my life for the street vendors' fight was because I got pregnant. I have a 14 year-old son. In fact, I actually have 4 children: I have a girl aged 26, a boy aged 22, a boy aged 14 and a baby now aged 1 year and 4 months. [...] And so, alone, with my 3 children, I was father and mother. I raised my children alone. For me to raise my children, I had to come and work on the street, because I used to work in someone's family home, but the money I earned was not enough for me to eat, to pay the rent and also pay someone to take care of my children. So I decided to come and work on the street. And this street vendor's organization only came about because 15 days after I had been operated on and I had my son — who is Cauê, who is now 14 — the Municipal Guard beat me up in the city, beat me, broke my nose, and hurt me a lot. That was when I really got angry. That gave me a very strong desire to fight. I go to hospital, I'm hospitalized, I go home to have my postpartum rest, because I hadn't had it, had I? But I went home because I was really beaten up, and I came back, gathered my companions together and we went to seek out an organization of life. And then when we started to get organized, the City Hall started to persecute, a lot. That was in 2003, and in 2004 we took over the Chiquinha Gonzaga Occupation. I used to live in Japeri, so I came to live in the Center. For me it was better because I was able to become a militant. I could leave my children in the occupation, which was a very good place to be able to survive. The people in the occupation took care of them, someone took care of the other's children, so that the other could go to work. It was great living there.

The sensitive, objective reflection of a working woman on the importance of the right to housing and work, for the re-existence that is substantiated from the collective construction of an idea of social justice applied to the city, materially implies an understanding of what the right to the city means and how the production of space takes place. It also reveals the refusal of official narratives that build oversimplified, elitist collective memories. Maria's narrative is also the history of the city and, in this sense, it helps us to break with hegemonic logics and envisage new practices of research and knowledge production that contribute to the constitution of more democratic collective memories. In this context, it is important to assume that "building

memories generates a rupture in this totalizing order and recovers the disorder of intersubjective memories, as social life is made up of contradictions, incomplete meanings and diffuse forms" (Lopes and Silva, 2018, p. 9, our translation).



Fig. 1: A record of the II Conversation Circle with Women Affected by Removals – Women Fighting for the Right to Housing! with emphasis on the intervention of Maria dos Camelôs. Source: Luiza Andrade, 2017.

The challenge that arises to ensure that the working class's popular memory becomes vocalized and ultimately to destabilize the epistemic violence that silences peripheral and subordinate voices, culminates in the challenge of transmitting their stories, which has to occupy public, material and symbolic spaces. Thus, the concept of "memory framing", presented by Pollak (1989), is useful to understand which methods and tools for the production of knowledge may contribute both to maintaining inequalities, omissions and silencing and to breaking away from the processes that promote such effects. Thus, the search for other methods and tools for the production of historical knowledge indicates a constant systematic, coherent reinterpretation of the past based on the challenges that present themselves in the present.

It should be emphasized that, in this work, the decolonial perspective, the observation of everyday struggles and listening to the memories and narratives of the working class are presented as possible theoretical-methodological bases. Based on these, we understand that it is possible to expand not only the collective memory, but the very logical structures that guide the construction of historical knowledge on architecture and the city. It is in the everyday struggle and with attentive listening that we in fact discover and bring to the center, the epistemes, categories and logics of the subjects themselves and of the subjects themselves that here, based on the critical theories of the Global South, we understand as subordinated or peripheral.

The present article, therefore, advances in the search for historical approaches that contemplate the debates regarding the Global South in the field of architecture and urbanism, and in the understanding that the construction of memory is inherent to the social organization of life, highlighting social conflicts as a source of understanding the processes of space production. The brief exercise of pulling out a thread of memory concerning the struggles against the removal of urban occupations from the port region, based on the public narrative of those who built the urban struggles in Rio de Janeiro during the period, configures itself as an essay on methodological possibilities. It is also a manifesto against erasures and silencing, as well as a reaffirmation of the link between housing and work. The coloniality of urban thought may only be challenged and overcome through the critique of its basic concepts and assumptions, as well as unveiling the "stories that history does not tell".⁷

The decolonial perspective in the field of historical studies of architecture, the city and urbanism may only be conceived in the dispute for history and for collective memory. Thus, critique is fundamental to the dominant concepts and models, and to re-reading the formation and transformation processes of our territories, understanding that these are not dissociated from the social fabric constituted by the female and male subjects who live there. Likewise, it is essential to exercise critical deconstruction and displacement in the face of theories and methodologies conceived in the Global North. This is because the perception of the world that they imprint onto investigations is based on the construction of a subalternized otherness, reproducing the mechanisms of domination that have marked, and still mark, the construction of our cities. The dominant history presents the processes "as a homogeneous whole" and linear, in which the bodies that have produced the city disappear, ignoring the complexities by privileging the narrative of "[...] an abstract, universal subject, with no marks of class, with no processes of racialization, nor sexual difference [...]” (Lopes and Silva, 2018, p. 9, our translation).

Here, we have sought to explore other possibilities in the conceptual and practical spheres, which may provide such an exercise in our field. Inserting the work into the theoretical debates surrounding the Global South, linked to the concrete experience in the South, we have proposed an approach in relation to everyday life, to the urban struggles of subalternized groups and, particularly, to women in struggle. We have shed light onto the practices that effectively form part of the process of production of spaces and territories and, therefore, of the construction of cities, but which are concealed, invisibilized within the constitution of historical discourses. We thus recognize the importance of the lived experience in the collective construction of critical knowledge (Lao-Montes and Vásquez, 2018).

The exercise of decolonial theoretical critique warns, however, that female and male planners, architects, as well as progressive urbanists, are not authorized to speak on behalf of the subordinate and peripheral population. Moreover, they must radically reassess the signs, codes and values of their professional practice. The theoretical and methodological challenge that presents itself, therefore, and that we seek to herein reveal, indicates the production of dialogic, popular and libertarian knowledge based on the practices and knowledge of those on the front lines in the struggle against the capitalist, racist, patriarchal, neoliberal and financialized city models (Vainer, 2019). We believe that, finally, this would enable the consolidation of a popular collective memory regarding the city and the production of space.

References

Cassian-Yde, N, 2019. Descolonizar las epistemologías urbanas: Saber experto y colectivos por el derecho a la ciudad, ¿quién puede decir "la verdad" sobre los problemas de la ciudad. *Journal of Latin American*, 18 (3), p. 54-84.

Certeau, de M., 1998. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Comitê Popular da Copa e Olimpíadas do Rio de Janeiro, (CPCO-RJ), 2014. *Dossiê Megaeventos e violações dos direitos humanos no Rio de Janeiro*. Rio de Janeiro.

Cosentino, R. and Monteiro, P, 2017. *Rio 2016: projeto, orçamento e (des)legados olímpicos*. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Heinrich Böll.

Cruz, V. C., 2017. *Geografia e pensamento descolonial*: notas sobre um diálogo necessário para a renovação do pensamento crítico. In: Cruz, V. C. and Oliveira, D. A, eds., 2017. *Geografia e Giro Descolonial: experiências, ideias e horizontes de renovação do pensamento crítico*. Rio de Janeiro: Letra Capital, p.15-36.

Heller, A., 2016. *O cotidiano e a história*. 11th ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.

Lao-Montes, A. and Vásquez, J, 2018. Crítica decolonial de la filosofía y doble crítica en clave de Sur. In: Moraña, M, ed. 2018. *Sujeto, decolonización, transmodernidad: debates filosóficos latinoamericanos*. Madrid: Iberoamericana Editorial Vervuert, p. 293-343.

Lefebvre, H, 2011. *O direito à cidade*. 5th ed. São Paulo: Centauro Editora.

Lopes, M. B. Silva, N. A, 2018. Encontra-se: Memórias, feminismos e outras condutas. *VIRUS*, 16. Available at <http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/virus16/?sec=4&item=7&lang=pt/>. Accessed Aug. 10, 2021.

Mazivieiro, M. C, 2018. Memória, práticas sociais e identidade no contexto urbano. *VIRUS*, 16. Available at <http://www.nomads.usp.br/virus/virus16/?sec=4&item=5&lang=pt>. Accessed Aug. 10, 2021.

Mbembe, A, 2003. Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, Winter, 15 (1), p. 11-40 (Article). (Translated by Libby Meintjes).

Pollak, M, 1989. Memória, esquecimento, silêncio. *Revista Estudos Históricos*, 2 (3), p. 3-15.

Quijano, A, 2000. Coloniality of power, ethnocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South*, 1 (3), p. 533-580.

Sánchez, F., 2001. A (in)sustentabilidade das cidades-vitrine. In: H., Acselrad, ed. 2001. *A duração das cidades: sustentabilidade e risco nas políticas urbanas*. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, p. 155-176.

Santos, B. S, 2002. Para uma sociologia das ausências e uma sociologia das emergências. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 63, p. 237-280.

Spivak, G., 2010. Can the Subaltern Speak? Revised edition, from the "History" chapter of Critique of Postcolonial Reason. In: R., Morris, ed. 2010. *Can the Subaltern Speak? Reflections on the History of an Idea*. Columbia UP: JSTOR, p. 21-78.

Vainer, C., 2019. Some Notes and Eight Propositions on the Coloniality and Decoloniality of Urban Tought and Urban Planning. *TheoriSE – Southeastern Approaches to Study the Urban*. London.

Vainer, C., Broudehoux, A. M., Sánchez. and F. Oliveira, F, eds., 2017. *Mega-events and the city: critical perspectives*. Rio de Janeiro: Letra Capital.

¹ This article is a reformulated, revised version of the work previously published in the Proceedings of VI ENANPARQ — Encontro Nacional da Associação de Pesquisa e Pós-graduação em Arquitetura e Urbanismo, 2020 [National Meeting of the Association for Research and Postgraduate Studies in Architecture and Urbanism, 2020].

² The idea of a dispute over collective memory comes from the critique made by Michael Pollak (1989) when elaborating on the concept developed by Maurice Halbwachs in *La mémoire collective*, Paris, PUF, 1968. Pollak identified the standardizing, oppressive character of a collective memory constituted by operations that aim to conceal conflicts and dissonances in order to maintain the supposed cohesion of groups that share common characteristics.

³ Here, we dialogue with the idea of "underground memories" used by Pollak (1989) to deal with marginalized and silenced memories, which are opposed to "official memory", and indicate the selective character that collective memory can manifest.

⁴ With the collaboration of Luiza Andrade, Fernanda Souza Santos, Caroline Santana and Ana Carolina Machado.

⁵ Here, Vainer (2019) is paraphrasing Marx in the Introduction to *A Contribution To The Critique Of Hegel's Philosophy Of Right*.

⁶ For more information on this subject, please see: Vainer, Brodehoux and Sanchez; Oliveira, 2016 and Cosentino and Monteiro, 2017.

⁷ A line from the 2019 samba song by one of Rio's famous samba schools, called Estação Primeira de Mangueira, entitled "Histórias Para Ninhar Gente Grande" [Lullaby Stories for Grown Ups].