
Lefebvre-Freire 1968 connections: crossing the right to the city with the *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*

As ligações do 1968 entre Henri Lefebvre e Paulo Freire: cruzando o direito à cidade com a Pedagogia do Oprimido

Francesco Biagi



Electronic version

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/sociologico/12787>

DOI: 10.4000/14ri7

ISSN: 2182-7427

Publisher

CICS.NOVA - Centro Interdisciplinar de Ciências Sociais Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas
Universidade NOVA de Lisboa

Printed version

Number of pages: 39-50

ISSN: 0872-8380

Electronic reference

Francesco Biagi, "Lefebvre-Freire 1968 connections: crossing the right to the city with the *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*", *Forum Sociológico* [Online], 46 | 2025, Online since 26 September 2025, connection on 09 October 2025. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/sociologico/12787> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/14ri7>



The text only may be used under licence CC BY 4.0. All other elements (illustrations, imported files) may be subject to specific use terms.

LEFEBVRE-FREIRE 1968 CONNECTIONS: CROSSING THE RIGHT TO THE CITY WITH THE *PEDAGOGY OF THE OPPRESSED*

AS LIGAÇÕES DO 1968 ENTRE HENRI LEFEBVRE E PAULO FREIRE: CRUZANDO O DIREITO À CIDADE COM A *PEDAGOGIA DO OPRIMIDO*

<https://doi.org/10.4000/14ri7>

Francesco Biagi

■ CIAUD – Centro de Investigação em Arquitetura, Urbanismo e Design, Faculdade de Arquitetura, Universidade de Lisboa, 1349-063 Lisbon, Portugal. Email: checobiagi@gmail.com | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3733-2706>

Abstract

This article aims to highlight some connections and ties in the work of Henri Lefebvre (1901-1991) with the thought of Paulo Freire (1921-1997). I intend to explain a pedagogical path that can be defined for the socio-political proposal around the notion of the "right to the city". The two authors share, firstly, the same publication date (1968) for their two most famous works (i.e., *The Right to the City* and *Pedagogy of Oppressed*), and, secondly, the fact that they draw on the same Marxist culture, but both rework the legacy of Marx and Engels in a very creative, original way, outside the determinist orthodoxy that has spanned the last century. Against a certain kind of Marxist Scholasticism that presents itself as unquestionable truth of faith, Lefebvre rededicates Marxism in the urban field and Freire in the well-known *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. From their differing viewpoints, the two authors converge in their shared commitment to formulating a theory that aligns with the goal of transforming the world and of enacting emancipative social processes with a clear, democratic-radical political project.

Keywords: right to the city; *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*; Lefebvre; Freire

Resumo

O objetivo deste artigo é evidenciar algumas ligações e vínculos da obra de Henri Lefebvre (1901-1991) com o pensamento de Paulo Freire (1921-1997), pretendendo assim explicitar um caminho pedagógico que pode ser definido para a proposta sociopolítica em torno da noção de "direito à cidade". Os dois autores partilham, em primeiro lugar, a mesma data de publicação (1968) para as suas duas obras mais famosas (i.e., *O Direito à Cidade* e *Pedagogia do Oprimido*), e, em segundo lugar, o facto de se basearem na mesma cultura marxista, mas ambos reelaboram o legado de Marx e Engels de uma forma muito criativa e original, fora da ortodoxia determinista que atravessou o último século. Contra um certo tipo de escolasticismo marxista que se apresenta como verdade de fé inquestionável, Lefebvre pensa o marxismo no campo urbano e Freire na conhecida *Pedagogia do Oprimido*. A partir de pontos de vista diferentes, os dois autores convergem no seu compromisso comum de formular uma teoria que se alinhe com o objetivo de transformar o mundo e de realizar processos sociais emancipatórios com um projeto político claro e democrático-radical.

Palavras-chave: direito à cidade; *Pedagogia do Oprimido*; Lefebvre; Freire

INTRODUCTION

This article aims to highlight some connections and ties in the work of Henri Lefebvre (1901-1991) with the thought of Paulo Freire (1921-1997), so I want to explain what pedagogical path can be defined for the sociopolitical proposal around the notion of the “right to the city”. The two authors share, firstly, the same publication date (1968) for their two most famous works (i.e., *The Right to the City* and *Pedagogy of Oppressed*), and, secondly, the fact that they draw on the same Marxist culture, but both rework the legacy of Marx and Engels in a very creative, original way, outside the determinist orthodoxy that has spanned the last century. Against a certain kind of Marxist Scholasticism that presents itself as unquestionable truth of faith, Lefebvre rededicates Marxism in the urban field and Freire in the well-known *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.

In the first section, I return to the origins of the notion of the right to the city through Lefebvre’s writings and explain how several secondary literatures have misrepresented the original meaning devised by Lefebvre. In the second section, I explain how the notion of the right to the city is very useful in Lefebvre’s project to refresh the Marxist debate. Section three helps to show how I can consider the notion of right to the city as a political theory of emancipation within the spatial domain. In the fourth section, I cross Lefebvre’s reflections on the right to the city with those on self-management, to clarify how I can encounter a political program in the theses on self-management for the concrete practice of the right to the city. In the fifth part, I expound on Freire’s thought regarding the *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and draw the main connections with Lefebvre’s thought, explaining how Freire – in parallel – is also an author who wants to renew Marxist theory with pedagogical tools, above all by politicizing educational practice. In the sixth section, I argue how it is possible to combine Lefebvre’s theory with Freire’s, since in this way, the Marxist issue of Lefebvre finds concrete anthropological and social methods to address the relationships between political leaders and grassroots political activists within the broader framework of the theory of self-management. In this article, I will explore how the renewal of Marxist theory, against determinism and a one-sided view of historical progress inherent in a certain self-proclaimed orthodox Marxism, is one of the crucial perspectives for understanding the connections between the two authors. From their differing viewpoints, they converge in their shared commitment to formulating a theory aligned to transform the world and of enacting emancipative social processes with a clear, democratic-radical political project. In addition, I argue that Lefebvre and Freire reinterpret humanism by wresting it from

the abstract invectives of liberalism and repositioning it within the material reality of people’s everyday existence. Finally, the reader might perceive the discourse developed in the six sections as imbalanced in terms of the space dedicated to Lefebvre compared to that dedicated to Freire. Indeed, the first four sections are almost exclusively devoted to Lefebvre, while Freire’s thought appears mainly in the fifth and sixth sections (Lefebvre thus has one more section than Freire). However, this division was carefully considered because it does not aim to compare the two authors or develop their thinking within the sociological debate, urban studies, or more broadly in the humanities and social sciences. Instead, the goal is to construct a debate in political theory that connects the thinking of both authors regarding a few key concepts and starting from the two volumes by both authors published in the year 1968. The *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* is the work where the political role of Freire’s pedagogy emerges most clearly, which is why it was chosen over other books by the same author. Additionally, Freire devotes many pages to the political question, making it sufficiently clear for our purposes (as a result, for Freire’s thought, I will almost exclusively utilize the volume *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*). As is well known, the *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* is not a short book like the Lefebvre’s *Right to the City*, and I understand that it would be necessary to be contextualized mainly the *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* within the broader space of Freire’s works, I have chosen to focus on those parts of Freire’s work that deal most prominently with the political question or politics regarding pedagogy. Similarly, while it is important to contextualize the book *Right to the City* within the broader space of Lefebvre’s works, my discussion will primarily focus on this specific concept, which is extensively discussed by Lefebvre also in his other works as well, therefore, in this case (unlike the way I utilize Freire’s work), I cannot confine my study almost solely to this text. In summary, my intention is to move Freire beyond the educational and pedagogical realm and to use his work within the broader space of political theory, and only in this way can it engage in dialogue and draw connections with the thought of Lefebvre.

TRACING THE CONCEPT BACK TO ITS BEGINNINGS: EXPLORING THE “RIGHT TO THE CITY” IN HENRI LEFEBVRE’S THINKING

The concept of the “right to the city” stands as one of the most renowned Lefebvrian ideas; however, it has been frequently misconstrued, as I will explore. In the third volume of *Critique of Everyday Life*, Lefebvre underscores the capacity of capitalist modernity to neutralize subversive political concepts

by effectively co-opting them to serve its own general lines of domination. Lefebvre, consequently, develops the notion of *récupération* (Lefebvre, 2014, pp. 779-784) to describe the processes of “washing”, “recycling”, and “reconquest” undertaken by the order of discourse of those in power. This involves extracting some ideas from the “toolbox” of critical theory and repurposing them, often empty of their original sense, within the language and framework of the dominant language. This is the actual destiny of the “right to the city”, which is very often understood in the liberal, Western, and white system of way of life, willfully forgetting the Marxian and anti-colonial background in which the author was formed and where this notion was born.

The book *The Right to the City* serves as a pivotal juncture in the constellation of Lefebvre’s works; nevertheless, that 1968 pamphlet should not, as frequently observed, be examined in isolation from the broader body of Lefebvre’s work. As such, I strongly contend that this pamphlet has to be interpreted within the context of the author’s other works, particularly those related to urban and spatial questions. Most notably, the genesis of *The Right to the City* can be traced back to the extensive volume on the Commune (Lefebvre, 1965), while its subsequent development is an integral component of the inseparable tetralogy comprised of *The Urban Revolution* (1970), *Espace et Politique. Le Droit à la Ville II* (1972), and, finally, *The Production of Space* (1974).

The resurgence of this concept in recent years reveals two notable limitations. The first pertains to the frequent departure from coherence in Lefebvre’s writings by a multitude of interpreters. The second limitation lies in the absence of established criteria for a proper hermeneutic approach. The author is not normally read in his original works, and often, many scholars rely on highly subjective second-hand interpretations. This also applies to Freire’s concept of the “pedagogy of the oppressed”. Hence, my goal is to establish interpretive guidelines that can serve as crucial reference points for the ongoing global debate of both authors.

The genealogical trajectory, as I trace it back to the foundational essence of the notion of the “right to the city”, opens in the second volume devoted to the subject, titled *Space and Politics*. Lefebvre, indeed, four years after initiating his exploration of the themes initially broached in the volume of 1968, elucidated the evolution of his ideas in 1972, and explicitly identified the intended audience of his effort. Lefebvre specifies better in the second volume on the right to the city that the rights of marginalized and isolated peripheral inhabitants are the principal topics in his first volume on the right to the city and the growth of the city leads to a decline in urban architecture, causing dispersion

of its people, especially the workers, away from city centers. Economic, social, and cultural divisions drive this uncontrolled expansion of urban space, and this kind of urbanization of society harms city life (Lefebvre, 2000, pp. 144-145). Hence, it becomes evident that the right to the city is aligned within a continuum of Marxist heritage. Lefebvre maintains coherence with his overarching aim of subjecting Marx’s conceptual framework to the inquiry of urban analysis, thereby reinvigorating and contemporizing Marxism. The right to the city is conceptualized within the context of Lefebvre’s political philosophy as an analytical category in the context of an emancipatory process. Lefebvre’s original insight hinges on a critical examination and contemplation of the Marxist working-class as a social entity, which was closely associated with the conditions of nineteenth-century people. This insight extends its purview to encompass all those workers and residents on the periphery who tangibly experience social segregation stemming from the towering structures designed within the functionalist paradigm during the Fordist reorganization of the banlieue.

THE CONCEPT OF THE “RIGHT TO THE CITY”: A POINT OF VIEW TO REFRESH MARXIAN CATEGORIES

My interpretation is aligned with the notion that Lefebvre refreshes Marxian categories. Notably, when dissecting the concept of the “working class”, the author reconfigures Engels’s investigations into the English proletariat (1845). Engels, rather than Marx, played a pivotal role in forging a reciprocal connection between the socio-economic scrutiny of large-scale industry and the resulting spatial ramifications in the daily lives of workers. Lefebvre’s urban sociology is an update of Engels’ method, in the more general Marxian framework. In this vein, Lefebvre resurrects one of Engels’ ideas, an aspect that has often been overshadowed within the Marxist framework: the significance of class contradictions that manifest within the spatial dimension. Furthermore, Lefebvre, although not dismissing the occasional acrimony inherent in social conflict, primarily underscores the concept of a communal and collective formation of the city (the city as an artistic production) carried out by the hands of the marginalized. In summary, I contend that Lefebvre spatializes Marxian political subjectivity and firmly situates it within the deficiencies of the consumer society orchestrated by the Fordist paradigm of modernity. Hence, through contemplation of the right to the city within the urban landscape shaped by Fordist capitalist spatial strategies, all those social entities living in precarious circumstances on the fringes of the market and consumption are effectively incorporated within the emancipatory framework

laid out in the book *The Right to the City*. This is particularly evident, as previously discussed, in the context of what transpired in the Nanterre periphery of Paris, marked by the precarious habitation of immigrant laborers. Kristin Ross, in the volume *May'68 and Its Afterlives*, describes the situation facing Lefebvre in this way: the functionalist Nanterre campus, built on the site of Paris' worst immigrant slums, provided students with a direct lesson in uneven development. Students had to traverse the slums daily, but those returning took decisive steps, leading to new forms of expression and mobilization of immigrant workers, including rent strikes and hunger strikes (Ross, 2002, pp. 95-96). Ross' observations underscore the overarching context that informs Lefebvre's examination of everyday life and social space, with a specific emphasis on the racial and colonial dimensions of the urban landscape in Paris. It was within the complexities of the Nanterre neighborhood that Lefebvre conceived the notion of the "right to the city". Although this vital aspect is often overlooked by many scholars and in extensive secondary literature, this tangible and lived experience in the Parisian suburbs leaves an indelible impression on Lefebvre's body of work. It distinctly directs his political reflections towards a particular brand of urban sociology: a sociology that serves as a critique of the urban ideology inherent in the capitalist model.

Furthermore, it is imperative to underscore the significance of the term "right", as articulated by Lefebvre: "It is not 'right' in the lawful sense of the term [...] these rights are never literally put in practice, but they are continually mentioned to define the society situation" (Lefebvre, 2000, p. 144). The author harbors no intent to append yet another "right" to the extensive roster of contemporary "human rights". Rather, his objective is to delineate a novel flight of struggle and social conflict, one that is rooted in the tangible production of dialectical relations among the political subjects clashing. Actually, "in the face of this pseudo-right, the right to the city is like a cry and a demand" (Lefebvre, 1996, p. 158). Without a profound critique of the neoliberal system (as the current debate defines it, Lefebvre referred to it as "neo-capitalism"), there exists no room for its genuine materialization. Therefore, what lies before the reader is not merely a legal matter but, rather, a philosophical-political one. Through the notion of the "right to the city", Lefebvre envisions a political theory of emancipation within the spatial domain. However, the impetus for this theory encounters formidable opposition in the voracious intent of the economic and political mechanisms of capitalism.

THE RIGHT TO THE CITY: A POLITICAL THEORY OF EMANCIPATION WITHIN THE SPATIAL DOMAIN

The urban space serves as the productive field for a contest between those who can be visible and express their voices and those who are compelled to remain unseen and voiceless. The establishment of identity, social standing, and political acknowledgment hinges on the democratization and liberation of the spaces inhabited by marginalized communities. The political status, within its spatial dimension, is inherently marked by division, a discord that emerges between those who are excluded and those who engage in exclusion: "the urban presents itself – thus to Lefebvre – as a place of conflict" (Lefebvre, 2003, p. 175). Hence, I contend that one can discuss a notion of the "right to the city" that is inherently marked by conflict. Therefore, it is conceivable to interpret Lefebvre as a theorist of conflict, specifically, the conflict that unfolds within the spatial dimension of urban existence. The realization of the right to the city primarily takes form through political engagement, through political endeavours aimed at achieving genuine democracy, even in matters concerning the control and production of space. It entails the transformation of the city from a mere commodity into a construct that emerges from the *praxis* of the excluded and oppressed. It involves the dialectical reconstruction of a tangible state of coexistence within a shared city and within the framework of the urban space, which is shaped by the collective efforts of those who inhabit it. In this regard, the meaning of the notion of the "right to the city" remains an open landscape, subject to unfolding events. Lefebvre refrains from solidifying a singular meaning or a fixed system; instead, he offers signposts that should be pursued to formulate a theory that invariably emanates from real-world *praxis* and the ongoing dynamics within society.

For Lefebvre, the city is not just a setting, and a product subjected to capitalist commodification. It also represents a substantial opportunity for the revitalization of social space through the engaged involvement of its residents, those who both inhabit and traverse it (this space is their production). The city, therefore, stands as the locus where it becomes feasible to reclaim space and time in alignment with the desires and necessities of its inhabitants, particularly those who find themselves in more vulnerable positions. Viewed through this lens, urban society emerges as "as an *oeuvre*, as an end, as place of free enjoyment, as domain of use value" (Lefebvre, 1996, p. 126) where its inhabitants can embark on a journey toward emancipation and liberation from the burdens of precarity and poverty. A genuine urban revolution will come to fruition when the social space transforms into a realm of *praxis*,

planning, and a collective project driven by those who reside within it and traverse its thoroughfares. It will manifest when there is a prospect for the unencumbered production of space, one that is shared, diverse, democratic, and no longer beholden to private interests and profit.

The city as a “product”, as a “commodity”, in which the principle of “exchange value” dominates, constantly clashes with the concrete utopia of the city as a “work”, in the service of “use value” for those who live and meet urban space. The French author, in defining the right to the city, embeds within it the dialectical principle that Marx delineates in the production and circulation of commodities in the *Capital*. Therefore, the metaphor of urban space as a “work of art” hypothesizes the building of a different kind of urban space that would be experienced and produced within the path of collective concord: an *oeuvre* that is established as “ends” already present in its “means” to realize, as a place of genuine enjoyment, as a field of “use value” in antithetical dialectic with the exchange value characteristic of the merchandising process.

The authentic avenue for putting into practice the utopian yet pragmatic ideal that Lefebvre has coined as the right to the city lies in the transformation of one’s living environment, making it conducive to the needs of all. The city, once seen as a mere commodity, is thereby reconfigured into a city conceived as a bona fide masterpiece, serving the needs of its inhabitants:

the right to the city legitimates the refusal to let oneself be excluded from the urban reality by a discriminating and segregating organization. [...] the right to the city means then the foundation or the reconstruction of a space-time unity [...] instead of disintegration (Lefebvre, 2000, p. 22).

Space, as a crucible of diversity and a nexus for the sharing of knowledge, stands as the precursor to an emancipatory cycle of transformation in the daily lives of individuals. The right to the city consequently represents the entitlement to engage in and benefit from collective resources and services, in opposition to the principles of ownership and privatization inherent in capitalism (Lefebvre, 1996, pp. 173-174). Hence, the city should resemble a work of art much more than a mere commodity or product of the economic cycle of valorization (Lefebvre, 2000, pp. 74-75). Lefebvre envisions urban space as a domain for reappropriating an alternative way of life, for self-determined utilization and collective production (Lefebvre, 2000, p. 23). The portrayal of the city as a work of art is essentially a performative metaphor employed to depict the potential for establishing a novel relationship with space (i.e., its

collective production), free from market forces and profit motives, in favor of its communal and shared utilization. The right to the city, according to the author, materializes in its utopian realm, and the task at hand is to reconstruct its spatial-temporal dimension in defiance of the societal and spatial fragmentation perpetuated by capitalist modernity (Lefebvre, 2000, p. 24). I have, therefore, elucidated the fundamental essence of the notion of the “right to the city” and provided insights into the contextual discourse delineated by Lefebvre.

SELF-MANAGEMENT AND THE RIGHT TO THE CITY: A SYNERGETIC POLITICAL APPROACH

In this framework, the concept of “right to the city” also carries with it a political theory of democratic insurgency (Abensour, 2011). Here, democracy is understood as a concrete and practical process of emancipation; in a nutshell, it is the social conflict par excellence that struggles to completely transform the structure of society. Thus, to the concept of the right to the city I have to join the reflections Lefebvre makes on the idea of “self-management” (“*autogestion*” in French) (1969, 2009a, 2009b, 2009c). As argued by Napoletano, Urquijo, Clark, and Foster (2023, p. 16), in an era where the logic of “there is no alternative” has had devastating consequences but has not yet encountered a sufficient counterforce in a dominant alternative, the route of *autogestion*, surpassing the deadlock between reform and revolution, with its intertwined utopian dialectic of possible/impossible, can offer an original inspiration. Instead of directing our endeavors toward buttressing a capital perceived as too big to fail, *autogestion* places upon the reader the duty to actively reconfigure society in the present moment. Lefebvre wrote: “any revolutionary ‘project’ today, whether utopian or realistic, must, if it is to avoid hopeless banality, make the reappropriation of the body, in association with the reappropriation of space, into a non-negotiable part of its agenda” (Lefebvre, 1991, pp. 165-167). His theorization of self-management can be understood “as a means of struggle, which clears the way, and as a means for the reorganization of society, which transforms it from bottom to top, from everyday life to the state” (Lefebvre, 2009a, p. 149). Lefebvre’s *autogestion* project is not a “republic of small homelands”, but a multi-scale political project, which does not forget international relations and geopolitics. It goes from the micro to the macro, like the program of studies on production of space and critique of everyday life that the author carried out in different volumes. Indeed, the author’s argument is quite clear, and he wrote that *autogestion* “is not a panacea. It has raised and still raises as many problems as it has

resolved”, especially when addressing “the entire social life of a complex society” (Lefebvre, 1969, p. 84). Lefebvre’s main worry is for a recuperation of the practice of self-management in politicized organizational forms, such as co-management, stakeholder participation, and other empty slogans that leave the institution in power, without transforming the economic-political and social order. Borelli (2019) calls it an ideology of “participationism”. This not only sets self-management in opposition to the capitalist state (Lefebvre, 2009a, p. 147, 2009c, p. 135), but also necessitates that self-management be endowed with the capacity to evolve into a new global totality: “Even radicalized, a self-management that only organized itself into partial unities, without achieving globality, would be destined to failure” (Lefebvre, 2009a, p. 150). Totality and the need for “total revolution” (Lefebvre, 1969, p. 60, 2009a, pp. 103, 140) do not deny grassroots organizations, nor do they deny a democratic federative form that holds together the vertical and horizontal levels. Lefebvre’s firm stance on the pursuit of self-management as a global undertaking rejects the notion of absolute localism and the fragmentation of social struggle. This approach recognizes that purely localized efforts have been ineffective in confronting the expansive global influence of capital, as well as its entrenched political, economic, and cultural authority, often intertwined with the state. In this sense, Lefebvre presents a revolutionary utopianism that actively seeks out the possibilities in the current moment and urges the reader to engage in the struggle to bring them to fruition. While this may ultimately involve a total revolution, it is neither the final destination nor the initial point for Lefebvre. Rather, it forms a part of an ongoing revolutionary process rooted in *praxis*. This process is constructed upon the foundation of struggle, the alteration of everyday life, self-management, and the reclamation of space and time. There is no space here to argue Lefebvre’s theory of history, but I need only mention the fact that the “possible-impossible” dialectic (Lefebvre, 1995, pp. 143-144) is not a determinist view and certainly not a statement of a belief in linear and inevitable progress (Lefebvre, 2009d, 2016a), but comprehended as indicating the possibilities hidden in people’s political *praxis*. Lefebvre calls for a new humanism: on the self-management project, Lefebvre talks about the need for a new “social pedagogy” (Lefebvre, 1976, pp. 121-122) that, in the practice of everyday life, can educate people and make them politically literate together in the struggle and practices of grassroots democracy. The humanism of Lefebvre is a “dialectical humanism” (Lefebvre, 2014, p. 394), that is, the author, proposes the idea of a new humanism that builds on Marxist critical theory and locates the emancipation of human beings in the change and contradictions they concretely

experience in their daily lives, against liberal views that produce an order of discourse on human rights and freedoms far removed from lived reality and abstract models of interaction. Lefebvre’s new Marxist humanism is also a fundamental matter for Freire, who thinks of the emancipation of the oppressed as a reappropriation of the dignity of human beings in concrete history, through a pedagogical process that is deeply political.

This call by Lefebvre resonates in concert with the reflections of authors such as Freire, opening new avenues of research for those philosophers and thinkers who want not only to analyse and study the world, but also to transform it, rethinking what is unthinkable for neoliberal ideology (recontextualizing the authors in the contemporary context): revolutionary *praxis*. Finally, Lefebvre was never really concerned with the sociology of education or pedagogy, but within the framework of the critique of everyday life, he points out how “school prepares the proletarians, and university prepares the leaders, technocrats and directors of capitalist production” (Lefebvre, 1976, p. 52). This is a sentence that – as the reader will see in the next section – Freire could have written. On the one hand, the call for a new pedagogy detaches the fact that any political process of emancipation involves a common construction of theory and practice and creates an organization that functions as if it were a collective intellectual, and in practice experiments with and constructs social theory. On the other hand, it is important to point out how Lefebvre – in line with Freire, which we will discuss in the next pages – glimpses the despotic device in official pedagogy and defines it as a key element in continuing to reproduce the oppressive system, that is, the so-called “reproduction of relations of production”.

THE PEDAGOGY OF THE OPPRESSED: RENEWING MARXISM IN PEDAGOGICAL THEORY AND PRACTICE

It is useful here to recall an anecdote about Lefebvre’s life to further tighten the bond I want to explore between the French author and Freire. Lefebvre, at about 40 years of age, during and after World War II, ran a radio programme until approximately 1947, for *Radiodiffusion Française* in the city of Toulouse, where, in a popularizing key, he explained Marx’s *Capital* and, more broadly speaking, Marxist theory (Hess, 1988, pp. 117-118). It is essential to remember that in the second half of the twentieth century, radio was the most popular medium for conveying content and information to all the people. Despite being recognized as one of the French Communist Party’s sharpest intellectuals, Lefebvre was removed from the radio for refusing to feed people Stalinist propaganda, and approximately

ten years later, he was expelled from the party. Thereafter, Lefebvre would always remain a university professor, but without making much of a career of it, remaining peripheral in Academia and in the context of French and international Marxism; nevertheless, he had posed the problem of how Marxism should also be taught through other methods beyond the university classroom. Freire, like Lefebvre but in a different context, was a thinker who similarly renewed Marxist theory in the garb of education and pedagogical theory and practice, against the more orthodox views that were being propagated from the Stalinist point of view. As is well known, Freire created a new theory of alphabetization that co-innovates with political conscientization, a method that is still used in Brazil by the landless peasant movement, that is the pedagogy of the oppressed.

Freire's emancipating vision advocates for a necessity of "humanizing pedagogy" practices (Freire, 1972, p. 44) and, against "education as a practice of domination" (Freire, 1972, p. 52), inciting people to conform to the will of power. To build an emancipating education, Freire advocated the construction of a "dialogical relationship" (Freire, 1972, p. 53) between educator and learner, both "simultaneously teachers and students" (Freire, 1972, p. 46) and similarly as "political subjects" of a critical re-knowledge of reality, both educating each other, mediated by the world, with the oppressed reconquering their right "to name the word" (Freire, 1972, p. 61). Freire wrote: "Liberation is a *praxis*: the action and reflection of men and women upon their world in order to transform it" (Freire, 1972, p. 52). A few lines above, I used a quote from Freire that talks about the relationship between educator and alumnus; however, it would be reductive to take Freire's legacy solely as remaining in the pedagogical field. From the first chapter of his most famous volume (Freire, 1972, pp. 41-44), Freire talks about the liberation struggle and how to carry out a process of political conscientization among the oppressed to create a revolution, as confirmed by other authors as well (Darder, 2018; Gadotti, 1994; McKenna, 2013; McLaren, 2000, 2015; Suoranta, 2022). Freire speaks to the various revolutionary leaders to provide a method where populist forms are excluded and where political practice is built not over the oppressed but with the oppressed, criticizing some avant-garde thrusts. A liberation process is authentic not only if it fights capitalist structures of oppression, but also if it promotes cultural emancipation and collective construction of theory becoming *praxis*. Against closed propaganda, empty "slogans" imposed from above, Freire speaks of a collective construction of political thought and political practice to transform the world. The people have to think, learn, and act together to achieve authentic emancipation. The revolution is a cultural fact, in this sense, not in the

sectorization that some authors and some currents of cultural studies have developed, forgetting the class question and the systemic injustice that results from the economic-political apparatus in which the people live. Freire's concept of "what is to be done" to effect transformation in the world (the great question of Lenin), known as *praxis*, incorporates both theory and practice, reflection, and action. He formulates a "dialogical theory of action" (Freire, 1972, pp. 99-150) that underscores the importance of encounters, dialogue, and intercommunication between subjects, whether they are educators and students or leaders and people. This approach serves as the foundation for the world's transformation through collaborative efforts, perpetual liberation, and humanization. It emphasizes the idea that true transformation and liberation come through a process of active dialogue, critical reflection, and collective action and *praxis*. As previously mentioned, Freire also fell victim to a process of recuperation, like that which Lefebvre experienced. Indeed, the dialogic theory of action does not pertain to the neutralization or erasure of social conflict, and it cannot be employed to quell radical *praxis* of revolt or rebellion. In simplified terms, Freire's dialogic theory cannot be used to accuse the oppressed of being violent in their struggle practices. There are three important words to "name the world" by the oppressed, in Portuguese these are the three "P's": *palavra*, *povo* and *pólvora*, that is "word, people and gunpowder" (Freire, 1972, p. 145). As the reader can observe, Freire does not disavow armed struggle and guerrilla warfare either. In other words, Freire does not extinguish class conflict as certain liberal tendencies have done by manipulating his ideas. The dialogic theory of action is an instrument of the oppressed, working in their favor. Freire challenges official pedagogy to provide new political and social tools for the struggle to break free from structures of dominance. He critiques the relationship between teacher and student or between political leaders and grassroots party and union activists, offering a fresh perspective on these dynamics.

**"WHAT IS TO BE DONE"
WHEN A PEDAGOGICAL TOOL IS CROSSED
WITH THE RIGHT TO THE CITY?
DEMOCRACY, SELF-MANAGEMENT,
AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION**

Suoranta (2022) posited that two prevalent interpretations of Freire's legacy can be categorized, firstly, as the "practical and domesticated perspective" and, secondly, as the "academic and theoretical interpretation" of Freire's ideas. Several academics and educational professionals interpret Freire's writings as a compendium of pedagogical guidelines in the search for suitable instructional

approaches. A pragmatic and domesticated interpretation neglects the core tenet of Freire's thought, which asserts that education functions as a political, potentially revolutionary instrument wielded by the people with the purpose of dismantling capitalism and fostering a socialist/communist democracy. The politically oriented Freire has metamorphosed into a venerable figure, characterized as an advocate and proponent of dialogue, with relatively limited commentary on global injustices and strategies for their rectification. The utilitarian perspective eclipses Freire's revolutionary political ideology. Academic institutions embellish their course programs with the inclusion of Freire's seminal work and the *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, repurposing it as a framework for academic service learning in apparent collaboration with institutions, associations, or other civil society organizations, who have no interest in posing the genuine problem of social and political transformation (García-Linera, 2011).

Freire grew up in Jaboatão dos Guararapes, a city where communist/leftist political organizations were very strong. The local Communist Party sent the cleverest children to study in the Soviet Union, then returned to Brazil to be part of the party leadership that was to organize the struggle in society. Here, Freire notes how these young leaders, after studying in Russia, failed to communicate with the union railway workers and, more generally, with all workers in the territory. The topics that were taught were perceived as foreign and abstract, which is why most workers left the popular evening school or the party and union meetings. It was in this context that Freire matured his pedagogical method, in the face of the inconsistency of communist orthodoxy and the determinism of the party school. In the 1950s, he began his first experience of teaching literacy in the poorer areas of Brazil, until the coup d'état and the beginning of the dictatorship in 1964 forced him into exile in Chile (Freire, 1979, pp. 9-14). There, the Brazilian author extended his Marxist studies and became even more radicalized by experiencing the political and social effervescence that would later set the stage for Salvador Allende's government.¹ The two months or so of imprisonment during the dictatorship and exile allowed a maturation of Freire's dissatisfaction with a pedagogical program that promoted isolated literacy projects, in favor – instead – of a pedagogical theory that shared a desire to transform the world, fight capitalism, and make a revolution. Freire identified with the harshest and crudest pages of Marx's writings on colonialism, exploitation, slavery, and the economic-political system understood as a vampire that sucks the life energy out of people. He then began to theorize a broader critique of educational systems, highlighting how they are the main reproducers of unequal relations of production and proponents of

inevitable alienation in the framework of capitalism. In the 1970s Freire began to collaborate with the governments of African countries that won the liberation struggle (Sao Tome and Principe, Cabo Verde, Angola, Mozambique, Tanzania and Guinea Bissau), he knew Amilcar Cabral and held him in esteem, and often referred in his texts to Ernesto Che Guevara, thus reiterating Marxism within the framework of a democratic socialist renaissance that found the *praxis* of the emancipatory process in political pedagogy (Freire, 2000, pp. 48-49). Freire strongly believed that people are creators of history, and within the dialectical framework of Marx and Hegel, the basis for his pedagogy emerged from the state of minority, as a break and emancipation from the slaver-master relationship speaks openly about the fact that Freire had a revolutionary, Marxist pedagogical project. Consequently, a revolutionary initiative with the objective of fundamentally transforming societal structures cannot categorize its leaders as intellectuals and the oppressed as mere adherents. Freire consistently steered clear of doctrinal rigidity; instead, he aspired to exist, as he articulated it, in a perpetual state of inquiry, receptive to evolution, and resolute in evading the potential entrapment within the convoluted realm of unvarying truths fabricated by his design (Freire, 1993). As Freire wrote: "the future belongs to the Peoples and not to the Empires" (Freire, 2004, p. 56). This is my original interpretation of how I can connect Lefebvre with Freire: Freire's intellectual framework has provided fertile ground for the exploration of social and political reconfigurations, emphasizing human solidarity and the imperative for revolutionary transformations in areas where they are warranted. It underscores the endeavor to create an alternative city, a distinct urban space, and a common shared production of space, following Lefebvre's vision.

Previously, I wrote that the French author, while recognizing a political role for pedagogy, does not fully elaborate on his concept of new "social pedagogy" (Lefebvre, 1976, pp. 121-122). Where Lefebvre falls short, I am convinced that we can turn to Freire. In other words, my hypothesis is to orchestrate a "passing of the torch" between the two authors, akin to the exchange of the baton in the Olympic sport of relay racing. The reason why Freire's thought is a valuable tool for understanding processes and practices of social and political transformation is as follows: Freire does not compartmentalize the pedagogical issue and the field of education but rather connects it in a broader sense to the transformation of the world. He writes that "the revelatory, gnoseological practice of education does not of itself effect the transformation of the world: but it implies it" (Freire, 2014, p. 24). The Brazilian author understands that the pedagogy of

the oppressed is fundamental for the genuine transformation of the world; however, it is not sufficient without a revolutionary and democratically radical political project that incorporates it into its process. Freire does not use the word "self-management" like Lefebvre, yet he arrives at the same conclusion when addressing the issue of democratic management of the education system. He refers to this process as autonomous popular governance of educational policies, but it does not only apply to the field of pedagogy and education. In his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire concretely applies pedagogical *praxis* to the life dynamics of a revolutionary political party or a revolutionary social and anticolonial movement (Freire, 1972, pp. 20, 29-30, 64, 99-100, 116), with a strong awareness of the "dialectical principles" of social reality (Freire, 1972, pp. 26-30), while powerfully distancing himself from the ideologization of dialectic by certain orthodox scholastic point of view (Freire, 1972, pp. 17-18, 26). The Brazilian author wrote: "Men, however, because they are aware of themselves and thus of the world — because they are conscious beings — exist in a dialectical relationship between the determination of limits and their own freedom" (Freire, 1972, p. 71). And then he adds:

An epoch is characterized by a complex of ideas, concepts, hopes, doubts, values, and challenges in dialectical interaction with their opposites, striving towards fulfilment. The concrete representation of many of these ideas, values, concepts and hopes, as well as the obstacles which impede man's full humanization, constitute the themes of that epoch. These themes imply others which are opposing or even antithetical; they also indicate tasks to be carried out and fulfilled. Thus, historical themes are never isolated, independent, disconnected, or static; they are always interacting dialectically with their opposites (Freire, 1972, p. 73).

In addition, Freire (1972, p. 96) explicitly cites Lenin's famous phrase that without revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement, inscribing his pedagogical proposal on the border between theory and *praxis* for revolution, a disposition Lefebvre also fully shares. The Brazilian author also delves into the relationship between revolutionary leadership and the masses, proposing the "dialogical method" as a way to overcome populism or the cult of personality, in order to build a pedagogical method useful for revolutionary political organizations (Freire, 1972, pp. 132-135).

Returning to the Freirean concept of democratic management of education system, it's possible to recognize that his conception of democratic mana-

gement is anchored in the criticisms he directed towards mechanistic, rationalistic, and bureaucratic perspectives of education, towards all forms of purely instrumental organization that reject the political and pedagogical nature of school organization, and towards the bureaucratic and "suffocating centralism" typical of the education systems of many 20th-century States (Freire, 1991, p. 34). In Freire, the issue of democratic management of education is political, administrative, and pedagogical in nature; it is never a technical-managerial question (Freire, 1991, pp. 45-59). That's why he lays the groundwork for criticizing centralism and the "banking" concept of education as anti-dialogical expressions, favoring passivity and domestication. This idea was expressed as early as his dissertation in the late 1950s (Freire, 1959). Even in his early reflections, it is possible to find the statement of a radical democracy and a critical political protagonism of human beings, without which it is impossible to grasp his conception of democratic education (Freire, 1959). His dialogical method introduces central concepts such as "participation" as an act of "invasion" (Freire, 1991, pp. 128-129) in the power relations of society, aiming to obtain a voice in the decisions regarding our own destinies, opposing heteronomous orientations. Discussing, arguing, deciding, among other actions in the *praxis*, are indispensable elements for changing the face of the education system that he proposed (Freire, 1991), namely, for its democratic reinvention. This transformation aims to turn the education system into a site of critical citizenship and collective production of its orientations and rules, moving towards self-governance. Following these considerations, I attempt to extend the framework of Freire's pedagogy beyond the confines of education, broadening his ideas to encompass all political processes and issues. Above, I took the liberty of stating that on the pedagogical issue within the political sphere, Lefebvre passes the torch to Freire, but the Brazilian author can continue the research work of the French author since he shares the same Marxian and revolutionary political vocabulary.

At this point, it is necessary to provide some context to better explain Freire's relationship with institutions. Some may find it contradictory that he promoted ideals such as autonomy, self-management, and social emancipation while collaborating with institutions. At the beginning of the 1980s, it seems evident to me that the collapse of the dictatorial political regime of Brazil instilled great hopes for social and political revolution with radical transformations. Freire remained very optimistic following the fall of the Brazilian dictatorship, and such optimism for a radical renewal of institutions and society persisted. Until his death in 1997, Freire's revolutionary values and ideals remained unchanged, evident even in his final works. The clearest evidence

of this is found in the book titled *Pedagogy of Hope: Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, published in 1992. Here, Freire revisited his writings, particularly *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, and in this book, five years before his death, he did not disavow any ideas expressed in the preceding decades. Choosing to collaborate with the local Brazilian government of São Paulo on issues of pedagogy, education, and educational policies did not entail the renunciation of the Marxist and revolutionary political principles he expressed since 1959 with his dissertation (the thesis for the chair of History and Education, School of Arts of Pernambuco, Recife) titled "*Educação e atualidade brasileira*" (Freire, 1959) and in subsequent works. Additionally, it is necessary to specify that Freire's only effective political role (Freire, 1991) was between 1989 and 1992 as the secretary of education for the municipal prefecture of São Paulo when this city was governed by the Workers' Party (*Partido dos Trabalhadores, P.T.*), namely the organization of the new radical left that was beginning to expand with the democratic transition.

Other forms of collaboration with state or international institutions primarily involved consultancies, where Freire offered his expertise as a renowned expert, gaining increasing recognition worldwide. Apart from working with Brazilian institutions, Freire also collaborated with African governments influenced by Black Marxism – above all, Amílcar Cabral – after their decolonization process (Freire, 2013; Gadotti & Romão, 2012). After fleeing Brazil in 1964 and going into exile, he became involved in the political agitation preceding the Allende government in Chile (See: Freire, 2014, pp. 41-44; Vasconcelos, 2020, pp. 181-245, 2021). Critics of Freire's pedagogy often criticize his collaboration with the populist-reformist Brazilian government of João Belchior Marques Goulart before the 1964 coup d'état. However, Freire's work in institutions was experimental, coordinating pilot projects in Recife, Pernambuco, during a period when Brazil lacked basic social service structures due to its federal system without welfare provisions from the 1940s to the 1960s. It is important not to interpret Freire's actions in institutions ideologically, as if an intellectual with revolutionary principles and ideals could not engage in the practical realities of his country or navigate spaces rich in contradictions. It is natural for intellectuals to seek to contribute to their country's development, especially during periods of democratic transition or when trying to influence educational structures under novel governments. Freire, as a university professor, teacher, and intellectual, operated within the complex dynamics of institutions.

CONCLUSIONS

Firstly, as seen in the fourth section, Lefebvre calls for a new pedagogy in connection with his reflections on self-management, but he does not thoroughly develop the concept, even though his brief remarks align with Freire's thinking. I have shown how it is possible to draw a strong connection between the two authors in the name of the critique of the concrete life in which the oppressed find themselves living and in the name of a new humanism, born in the Marxist tradition and revived from the actuality of the social problems that the two authors studied in the last century. The dialectical humanism of Lefebvre feeds on the pedagogical humanism of Freire, and the political project of self-management in the framework of the right to the city meets in Freire's proposal a method of emancipation to transform the world. Hence, in this article, I have undertaken the task of further elaborating on this idea through the legacy of Freire's thought, which shares the same goal of refreshing Marxism to continue contemplating the possibility of transforming the real. Freirean pedagogy allows for the social clarification of the practice of self-management and the dissemination of democratic practices that can govern all levels of society, from the micro-level of urban spaces to the macro-level on a global scale. The dialogic theory of action provides political leadership with a method for criticism and self-criticism, and, most importantly, a connection with grassroots activism. Clearly, with this article, I aim to initiate debate and reflection. I do not presume to resolve all global problems with Lefebvre and Freire, but I wish to suggest new cultural avenues for contemplating social transformation in the context of the current phase of urban neoliberalism in the 21st century.

Secondly, Freire viewed alphabetization as a tool to empower the oppressed for subsequent political engagement. However, as some stereotypical views believe, I find it overly simplistic to equate political engagement solely with the right to vote and participate in State elections. Freire emphasized political conscientization, allowing those he taught to apply his lessons in their own ways. While voting and participation in elections were significant objectives in the context of extreme right-wing dictatorships in Latin America in XX century, they were not the sole goals. To reduce democracy to merely voting and elections implies a formal democracy lacking substance. Instead, Freire advocated for a substantive transformation in everyday practices, a revolutionary demand that diverges significantly from the liberal democracies as commonly understood in the Global North. In the preceding paragraphs, I have illustrated the importance of situating Freire's work within the Marxist and Marxian framework of social and political revolution. Following the Marxist tradition,

Freire (1981, pp. 78, 80) conceives of revolution as the necessary overcoming of the "class in itself" in favor of the "class for itself". This transition entails moving from transient and naive consciousness to critical consciousness through cultural action oriented towards social and political revolution. As Gadotti and Romão (2012, p. 41) strongly emphasize, Freire advocates for a cultural revolution inseparable from dialectical materialism and the socio-economic transformation of society. In his social theory, the cultural sphere symbolically legitimizes economic-political power, necessitating a pedagogical struggle fought through liberating literacy that unveils social reality. This aspect effectively aligns Freire with Lefebvre.

Finally, the reader lives in a historical period where radical alternatives to the neoliberal system, inaugurated by Margaret Thatcher with the motto "there is no alternative", are notably lacking; as Mark Fisher has termed it, this is the "capitalist realism". This contribution aims to think in a Lefebvrian manner within the dialectical space between the possible and the impossible, offering a political *praxis* for the right to the city that remains consistently within the Marxist framework of Lefebvre with the help of Freire, also a pedagogist, Marxist thinker.

Funding

This work is funded by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, Portugal. Concurso Estímulo ao Emprego Científico Individual - 3.ª Edição. N.º: 2020.00752.CEECIND.

Conflict of interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Author's contribution

The author declares that he/she is responsible for the conceptualization and writing - original draft, revision, and editing - of this work.

Note

¹ Freire lived in Chile from 1964 until 1969, when he was dismissed under pressure from the right-wing faction of the Christian Democrats. In 1967, due to pressure from rural workers and the support of a broad centrist reformist alliance led by the Christian Democrats, Chile approved the first agrarian reform and the possibility of the unionization of peasants, a process that became more radicalized later, from 1970 to 1973, under the Allende government. Since the first agrarian reform of 1967, these laws provided opportunities for unionization and political education, as well as alphabetization programs for rural workers, along with a more equitable distribution of land through cooperative work. In 1969, Freire accepted an invitation to Harvard in the United States for about a year, and then settled in Geneva, Switzerland, where he remained until

the fall of the Brazilian dictatorship. That is in Chile, where he developed two of his most well-known works, *Educação como Prática da Liberdade* (1967) and *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1968). In Chile, Freire worked closely with Jacques Chonchol, the director of the Institute of Agrarian Development, which was part of the larger agency known as the *Instituto de Capacitación y Investigación de la Reforma Agraria* (ICIRA) of the Chilean government, during the reformist presidency of the Christian-Democrat Eduardo Nicanor Frei Montalva. Subsequently, Chonchol became Minister of Agriculture in Allende's government, attempting to radicalize the initial agrarian reform and continuing his political task in the spirit of Freire's vision. As is known, the actions of the Allende government ended in 1973 with the coup d'état by the extreme right-wing dictator Augusto Pinochet (See: Freire, 2014, pp. 41-44; Vasconcelos, 2020, pp. 181-245, 2022).

References

- Abensour, M. (2011). *Democracy against the State: Marx and the Machiavellian moment*. Polity Press.
- Borelli, G. (2019). Lefebvre e l'equivoco della partecipazione: Note sulle recenti riedizioni dei libri di Henri Lefebvre. *Casa della Cultura*. <https://casadellacultura.it/853/lefebvre-e-l-equivoco-della-partecipazione>
- Darder, A. (2018). *The students guide to Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Bloomsbury.
- Engels, F. (1845). *The condition of the working class in England*. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/condition-working-class/>
- Freire, P. (1959). *Educação e atualidade brasileira* [Tese de Concurso para a Cadeira de História e Educação]. Escola de Belas Artes de Pernambuco. <https://acervo.paulofreire.org/handle/7891/1976>
- Freire, P. (1967). *Educação como prática da liberdade*. Paz e Terra.
- Freire, P. (1972 [1968]). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Penguin.
- Freire, P. (1979). *Conscientização: teoria e prática da libertação: uma introdução ao pensamento de Paulo Freire*. Cortez.
- Freire, P. (1981 [1975]). *Ação cultural para a liberdade*. Paz e Terra.
- Freire, P. (1991). *A educação na cidade*. Cortez.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Política e educação: ensaios*. Cortez.
- Freire, P. (2000 [1997]). *Pedagogy of the heart*. Continuum.
- Freire, P. (2004 [2000]). *Pedagogy of indignation*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Freire, P. (2013 [1978]). *Cartas à Guiné-Bissau: registros de uma experiência em processo*. Paz e Terra.
- Freire, P. (2014 [1992]). *Pedagogy of hope: reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury.
- Gadotti, M., (1994). *Reading Paulo Freire: his life and work*. State University of New York Press.

- Gadotti, M., & Romão, J. E. (2012). *Paulo Freire e Amílcar Cabral: a descolonização das mentes*. Editora e Livraria Instituto Paulo Freire.
- García-Linera, A. (2011). *El oenegismo, enfermedad infantil del derechismo*. Editorial de la Vicepresidencia del Estado Plurinacional.
- Hess, R. (1988). *Henri Lefebvre et l'aventure du siècle*. A.M. Métailié.
- Lefebvre, H. (1969 [1968]). *The explosion: Marxism and the French upheaval*. Monthly Review.
- Lefebvre, H. (2000 [1972]). *Espace et politique: le droit à la ville II*. Anthropos.
- Lefebvre, H. (1996 [1968]). The right to the city. In H. Lefebvre, E. Kofman & E. Lebas (Eds.), *Writing on cities* (pp. 147-159). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, H. (2003 [1970]). *The urban revolution*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (2014 [1947, 1962, 1981]). *Critique of everyday life: the one-volume edition*. Verso.
- Lefebvre, H. (1976 [1973]). *The survival of capitalism*. St Martin's Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (1995 [1962]). *Introduction to modernity*. Verso.
- Lefebvre, H. (Ed.) (2009a [1966]). Theoretical problems of autogestion. In *State, space, world* (pp. 138-152). University of Minnesota Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (Ed.) (2009b [1976]). It is the world that has changed: interview with autogestion et socialism. In *State, space, world* (pp. 153-164). University of Minnesota Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (Ed.) (2009c [1979]). Comments on a new State form. In *State, space, world* (pp. 124-137). University of Minnesota Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (2009d [1939]). *Dialectical materialism*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (2016a [1972]). *Marxist thought and the city*. University of Minnesota Press.
- McKenna, B. (2013). Paulo Freire's blunt challenge to anthropology: create a pedagogy of the oppressed for your times. *Critique of Anthropology*, 33(4), 447-475.
- McLaren, P. (2000). *Che Guevara, Paulo Freire and the pedagogy of the revolution*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- McLaren, P. (2015). *The pedagogy of insurrection: from resurrection to revolution*. Peter Lang.
- Napoletano, B. M., Urquijo, P. S., Clark, B., & Foster, J. B. (2023). Henri Lefebvre's conception of nature-society in the revolutionary project of autogestion. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 13(3), 433-452. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20438206221088385>
- Ross, K. (2002). *May '68 and its afterlife*. University of Chicago Press.
- Suoranta, J. (2022). Paulo Freire (1921-1997) as a Marxist revolutionary for education. In A. Maisuria (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Marxism and education* (pp. 267-285). Brill.
- Vasconcelos, J. S. (2020). "O lápis é mais pesado que a enxada": reforma agrária no Chile e pedagogias camponesas para transformação econômica (1955-1973) [Tese de Doutorado em História Econômica]. Universidade de São Paulo. <https://doi.org/10.11606/T.8.2020.tde-13042021-193600>
- Vasconcelos, J. S. (2021). Pedagogia do oprimido: documento da reforma agrária no Chile. *Comunicação & Educação*, 26(2), 89-105.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Licence – Attribution 4.0 Internacional (CC BY 4.0).

Received on 09/11/2023. Accepted for publication on 25/09/2024.