

Brazilian Cities: Which City? What Planning?

Ronald F. A. Vasconcelos¹, Ana M. F. Ramalho², Rosa M. C. Lima³

(1. Department of Architecture and Urbanism, Federal University of Pernambuco, Brazil;

2. Faculdade Damas da Instrução Cristã, Brazil;

3. Department of Social Service, Federal University of Pernambuco, Brazil)

Abstract: This article seeks to analyze and discuss the concepts of urban and city applied to the Brazilian reality. It has as references different studies anchored in methodologies and analytical perspectives adopted by scholars, academics, and researchers. It seeks to enhance the debate and considers the typologies of several Brazilian cities, as well as the current characteristics of the country's cities as a whole, with a view to deciphering urban Brazil and its peculiarities. In addition, the paper discusses and reflects on the need to adapt the instruments for planning and urban management frequently used in municipal government interventions carried out in urban areas, guided by this reality, given that the concerns of planners, academics, researchers and public institutions still target large urban centers, while neglecting smaller municipalities and towns and, consequently, leaving these on the margins of urban planning and management.

Key words : city; urban; urban planning; urban management

JEL code : R58

1. Introduction

In Brazil, the idea that the majority of the country's population lives in cities has been consolidated, and it is thus announced that the Brazilian population is predominantly urban. The last demographic Census conducted by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística — IBGE, 2010), according to the methodology adopted, indicates that 84.35% of Brazil's population lives in urban areas and resides in the country's universe of 5,570 municipalities. However, there are different questions about what characterizes the urban, and the city, according to the methodological and analytical starting point examined by a number of scholars, academics, researchers and research bodies. (2005).

Diverse studies also address the classification criteria adopted or the legal provisions that guide this classification of cities and consider that Brazil is less urban than is generally imagined and, thus, there have been initiatives to seek to define typology for the cities for the purpose of implementing urban development policy (IBGE, 2017; Bitoun & Miranda, 2009).

Ronald F. A. Vasconcelos, Civil Engineer, Professor, Department of Architecture and Urbanism, Federal University of Pernambuco; research areas: situation and housing for the low income. E-mail: ronald_vacon79@yahoo.com.

Ana M. F. Ramalho, Architect and Urban Planner, Professor, Faculdade Damas da Instrução Cristã; research areas: urban and regional planning, urban legislation, housing policy. E-mail: ana.mramalho@yahoo.com.br.

Rosa M. C. Lima, Social Assistant, Professor, Department of Social Service, Federal University of Pernambuco; research areas: city, housing, public policies. E-mail: cortez.rosa@gmail.com.

This discussion gains relevance, among other factors, in the face of the regulatory framework of urban planning defined by the Brazilian Constitution of 1988, as well as by Federal Law No. 10.257/2001 — known as the City Statute, legal norms applied equally for all municipalities regardless of their territorial dimension, the specific features and urban population, in addition to the restricted way of conceptualizing what is understood as a city. Such factors may imply great distortions and the reproduction of formal mechanisms for such disparate realities.

This article proposes to enhance the debate on the following points: first, to analyze and discuss the concepts of urban and city, applied to the Brazilian reality, from the typologies of several of the country's cities; second, to discuss the current characteristics of Brazilian cities in general, in order to unveil urban Brazil and its peculiarities. In view of this, it is necessary to broaden this discussion, as well as to reflect on the need to adapt the urban planning and management instruments commonly used in interventions carried out by municipal governments in urban centers in the country. The concern of planners, academics, researchers and public institutions still focuses on large urban centers, neglecting smaller municipalities and towns and, consequently, leaving these as marginal with regard to urban planning and management.

2. The Urban in Discussion

According to the latest Brazilian demographic census, in 2010, through the criteria adopted by the IBGE, Brazil currently has 5,570 municipalities, in which 84.35% of the inhabitants live in areas considered urban. According to the official projections of the same Institute, this urban population is expected to reach 100% by 2030. The definition of the concept of the urban population and its rural counterpart is established by the IBGE from what is called the home location, that is, if the domicile is located in an urban or in a rural area.

The IBGE still points out three situations to classify what is considered urban, these being: the cities (municipal headquarters), the towns (district headquarters) and the isolated urban areas. In the case of what is rural, by exception, this is comprised of the whole area situated outside these limits. However, it is worth discussing the criteria considered for this classification of urban and rural municipalities in Brazil.

From a legal point of view, this criterion was adopted by the New State (Estado Novo), when Getúlio Vargas — president of Brazil from 1930 to 1945 — promulgated Decree-Law No. 311/38, dated March 2, 1938, which disposed of the division which meant that, overnight, small towns or villages in Brazil turned into cities, despite their incipient institutional evolution. In addition, it is the responsibility of the municipal public power to define its urban and rural areas, in addition to the areas of urban expansion, through the Urban Perimeter Law, adopting its own criteria. Not even the City Statute, Federal Law No. 10.257/2001, which deals with Brazilian urban policy, defines criteria for such classification.

However, it is necessary to think about the criteria of what is urban and what is rural, in addition to legal and institutional aspects. This discussion has been debated by many scholars and researchers. And there is still no consensus that expresses the Brazilian urban reality.

2.1 The Brazilian Urban Reality

Due to inaccuracies in the definition of what is urban, the network of Brazilian cities becomes very heterogeneous. Urban cities, such as Rio de Janeiro, with a population of 6,323,037 and São Paulo with 11,125,243, according to the 2010 census, both with 100% urban populations and the urban nucleus of the municipalities such as União da Serra, in Rio Grande do Sul, where the 2010 demographic census found only 280

inhabitants in the urban area and Serra da Sauda, in Minas Gerais, where only 527 inhabitants were found. This small example is sufficiently illustrative to note that there is something wrong with the criterion adopted to define what is truly urban in Brazil, and consequently prevents a good understanding of the country's urbanization process.

Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the urban areas of São Paulo and União da Serra, which show the distinction between these respective urban areas.



Figure 1 União da Serra-RS - Brazil

Source: <http://www.uniaodaserra.rs.gov.br/>, 2018



Figure 2 São Paulo-SP - Brazil

Source: Personal archive, 2016

In fact, in Brazil, the whole municipal center — city/town — and district — village, regardless of its characteristics, is considered urban. Factors such as density, number of voters or quantities of collective facilities — health post, pharmacy, cultural center, post office, commercial establishments, schools or bank branches — are

not taken into account.

Table 1 shows the reality of the Brazilian municipalities with regard to their total populations. It is clear that there are many more municipalities characterized as small and medium size, than large. However, it should be noted that, by contrast, municipalities with a population between 1 million and over 10 million inhabitants, in a total of 15 municipalities, considered metropolis and megacity, have an urban population varying from 99 to 100% of their territory, which demonstrates another urban dynamic, whose actions of urban planning and management must be specially directed.

Table 1 Number of Municipalities and Population in the 2010 Census, According to the Classifications of Population Size

Population in the Demographic Census	Number of municipalities
Up to 10,000	2,515
10,001-50,000	2,443
50,001-100,000	324
100,001-500,000	245
500,001-1,000,000	23
1,000,000-2,000,000	9
2,000,001-5,000,000	4
5,000,000-10,000,000	1
Over 10,000,000	1
Total	5,565*

*In the 2010 demographic census (IBGE), the number of municipalities was 5,565. In 2018, there are already 5,570.

Source: Adapted by the authors from the 2010 IBGE census data.

The study carried out by the IBGE and the Institute of Applied Research (*Instituto de Pesquisa Aplicada — IPEA*) and the Nucleus of Social, Urban and Regional Economics (*Núcleo de Economia Social Urbana e Regional — NESUR*), research center of the Institute of Economics of the State University of Campinas (*UNICAMP*), published in 2002, which sought to characterize the urban network of Brazilian cities, shows that it comprises a little more than half the country's population. According to this classification, only 57% of the population is part of the urban network: 34% in 12 metropolitan agglomerations, 13% in 37 non-metropolitan agglomerations and 10% in 77 isolated urban centers, making a total of 455 municipalities, which unequivocally make up the Brazilian urban grid. In addition to these municipalities, there are 567 ambivalent classifications and there another 4,485, where 30% of the population live, which cannot assume the status of town/city.

The classification criterion previously presented has been supported, on the one hand, by rigorous research conducted by IBGE/ IPEA/ Nesur-Unicamp, and, on the other, in studies on internationally used criteria and on recent trends in rural development, always cited by Veiga (2003) and Favareto (2005). An important consequence of the exercise undertaken by Veiga is the demonstration that mere change, in this case perfection, of criterion leads to a dramatic difference in the results ascertained. In the case of the application of the typology to Brazil, the population that could be considered rural in the official statistics jumps from 18% to approximately 35%.

According to this classification, in 2000 there were 1,176 municipalities with less than 2,000 inhabitants, 3,887 with fewer than 10 thousand and 4,642 with less than 20 thousand with legal *city* status, when in fact they constitute a group of urban nuclei of essentially rural characteristics. Although these data are reported to the 2000 Census, for the purpose of what this article wished to demonstrate, they can be considered updated, since the

population growth of Brazil is occurring at a very slow pace, and according to projections should stop growing around the year 2035.

It is also noteworthy that most Brazilian municipalities with less than 20 thousand inhabitants are exempt from the constitutional requirement to elaborate Master Plans, as an instrument of urban planning and management. Defining centers with a population of less than 20,000 inhabitants as urban, introduces economic and fiscal issues, from the point of view of the balance of public accounts, but also regarding access to public policies in the field of social rights, as advocated by the Brazilian Constitutional Charter of 1988.

In fact, about 30% of these municipalities can not raise 30% of their expenses. And, an even larger number live exclusively from transfers from the Municipal Participation Fund and resources from Social Security through the transfer of benefits to their retired inhabitants. Strictly speaking, the reduced economic dynamics of these municipalities of urban centers and small populations, does not allow a sufficient tax collection to bear their municipal expenditure.

Another example of social injustice in these municipalities is the cost of their Municipal Councils, whose expenses with legislation consume around R\$ 32.30 per capita, while in medium and large centers this figure reaches R\$ 18.50 and 23, This fact should lead the National Congress to end this remuneration, as was the procedure adopted prior to the Brazilian Federal Constitution of 1988, in which, in municipalities with less than 30,000 inhabitants, there was no remuneration for mayors and councilors. Such a procedure would contribute to ending the “spree” of creating municipalities, since in the last 30 years Brazil had almost doubled its number of municipalities.

On the other hand, the administrative capacity installed in small municipalities leaves much to be desired. The public machine, as a rule, is disqualified for the management of complex mechanisms of control, supervision and transparency of public administration such as territorial planning, budget, bidding processes and fiscal responsibility, which causes problems of approval of accounts and poses obstacles to intergovernmental transfers.

Another point that serves to be highlighted in this approach is the general conclusion that, in the small and medium municipalities with rural characteristics, a negative migratory balance has been occurring in all regions. This is a fact, but it is not a rule; quite the contrary, it is surprising that there has been strong population growth in almost a quarter of small rural municipalities. In view of the above, it should be made clear that it is not desired here to attribute responsibility for the current urbanization trends in Brazil to the small and medium municipalities.

What is sought is to shed light on this contrasting and contradictory urban reality in order to generation discussion; from a strategic point of view, the definition of a typology for the Brazilian urban network, which can contribute to the creation of planning tools suited to the multiplicity and complexity of this country, is of strategic importance. For, studies and current trends show serious challenges to be faced, over the next decades, due to proposals for development alternatives adopted by agribusiness and fourth generation industries which may be established in areas of smaller urban agglomerations, with economic and social repercussions. The absence of these definitions associated with development strategies favors a combination of appropriate urban policy instruments and planning with State action, given the current problems of the role of agriculture, concern with the environment and development in different nuclei, in particular the smaller ones with stronger rural characteristics and ties.

In this perspective, as Veiga (2003) points out, one of the biggest problems of small municipalities is the lack of a planned action that leads to the definition of an institutional mechanism that will help the municipal

articulation initiatives in order to diagnose their main problems, plan integrated development actions, and raise funds for implementation. This process is characterized as a strong measure to be leveraged by the Federal and State governments, in order to advance and configure processes capable of incorporating dynamism in these small urban nuclei, including access to education, health, land and other social policies, in accordance with their different territorial scales.

The following items will discuss the urban planning practices adopted in Brazil in its development process, its current legal instruments and apparatus, seeking to highlight the need to revise them in order to adapt them to the reality of the network of Brazilian cities.

3. Brazilian Urban Planning Practices

Urbanization in Brazil since its inception has shown socio-spatial inequality. According to Santos (2005, p. 11), the Brazilian urbanization process has revealed a growing association with poverty, whose locus is becoming, increasingly, the city, especially the state capitals. Still according to the author, Brazilian urbanization does not take place in a homogeneous way, due to the different degrees of development and occupation in the country's various regions.

In the 18th century, urbanization was already developing in Brazil, but its growth was minimal until the 1920s. Between the 1920s and 1940s, the rate of urbanization tripled. And between the years of 1940 and 1980, is the true inversion of the place of residence of the Brazilian population, reaching the alarming numbers of the current century, distributed over different types of towns and cities. However, Brazilian urban planning practices during these decades have undergone several models and experiences, as discussed below. With the advent of the Republican period — in the 20th century — the State began to intervene in a directed way in the urban scenario of Brazilian cities.

However, over almost a hundred years, given the structural changes that have occurred, it is possible to identify several changes in the matrix of urban planning in Brazil. In the period of the Old Republic until the 1940s, the urban interventions carried out were characterized by a Plan of Urban Works to be implemented, which expressed the content of the new science of cities: modern urbanism. This set of works was influenced by the ideology of the hygienist movement and by the ideas of utopian urbanists, with the purpose of inserting the country into a period of modernity glimpsed in the twentieth century.

These planned works referred especially to the improvement and beautification of the cities, and were an expression of the urban project of the new Republican elite. To the extent that many of them were executed by successive governments, although the implementation of these plans has been limited to the country's main urban centers, capitals of the states of greater importance in the regional economic dynamics. Another feature of these plans that should be stressed is that they were implemented in their entirety, not merely in the areas predominantly inhabited by the urban elite. As Villaça (1999) recalls, it was under the aegis of urban embellishment that urban planning was born in Brazil, the inspiration of which was fundamentally European and most markedly French.

In the beginning of the post-war years, planning, as an instrument of governmental action, began to take on a prominent role in Brazil's development process. From this moment on, the Brazilian State began to assume an interventionist character in economic terms, since the laissez-faire of classical economic policy, based on market laws, no longer responded sufficiently to the dynamics of capitalism underway. In its urban version, planning — in this period from the mid-1940s to the end of the 1960s — assumes a predominantly physical-territorial

character, focused on the problems of urban spatial planning and the question of the use and occupation. Under the coordination of the Federal Service of Housing and Urban Planning (Serviço Federal de Habitação e Urbanismo — SERFHAU — 1964/1975), many plans were drawn up, in considerable detail, containing recommendations and guidelines for the various levels of government.

But it is precisely in this moment that a period of uselessness begins for most of the plans designed in Brazil, which more often than not become “library pieces”. As Maricato (2000) observes, on one side was the impossibility of ignoring urban problems and on the other, of facing the debate openly without criticism. When social concern begins to be considered the plan is not fulfilled.

However, it is under the military regime that the planning activity most develops in Brazil. Under the inspiration of the National Development Plan (Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento - II PND), the guidelines of the National Urban Development Policy (Política Nacional de Desenvolvimento Urbano - PNDU) were established and implemented by the National Commission for Urban Policy and Metropolitan Regions. It should be noted that in the 1960s, under the military regime, the metropolitan regions were created by decree. Although in that period there was a concentration of conurbation that served special treatment, this decision also represented a form of control on the part of the regime, since it concentrated a significant part of the Brazilian population in the metropolitan regions.

At this moment, Brazil established a planning system and guidelines that were in force until the middle of the 1980s, a period in which an unprecedented amount of plans were produced for Brazilian towns and cities of all sizes, under the conviction that the planning of a comprehensive — rationalist nature would be the solution to the urban chaos and uncontrolled growth of Brazilian cities. Although under the aegis of the military regime, the planning process developed in this period recognizes the seriousness of social and economic problems, and shifts the perspective of the physical-territorial issue, adopting a more comprehensive perspective, which is called Integrated Urban Planning. This planning model had, according to Ferrari (1979, p. 9):

“the method, the rationality of this method, the ordered prediction and anticipation of its underlying consequences; and was said to be integrated by intervening in the market, through the allocation of resources, in order to reduce distortions in the system; for implementing programs aimed at encouraging, stimulating, coordinating, supplying and integrating the action of individuals and intermediary organizations, and on the other, by seeking the efficient ordering of the territory”.

Subsequent and vehement criticism of this planning model is that most of the plans devised were made by specialists (technocrats) who were little involved in the local socio-cultural reality. The population was not heard and, often, not even the municipal technicians; in addition to the lack of political legitimacy to the governments that led these plans.

On the other hand, the ideas contained in these plans sought to disguise the conflicts and the real driving forces behind the urban disorder of Brazilian cities. The political, economic and social crisis that has plagued the country since the end of the 1970s is associated with a crisis of legitimacy of the military regime, which has, among other consequences, a complete dismantling of this planning structure. In this crisis, which culminated in the end of the military dictatorship, new actors enter the scene. Politically engaged planners and advisors, sectors linked to the Catholic Church, non-governmental advisory bodies and leaders of popular movements mobilize and claim new practices of inclusion, participation and decision with respect to the destiny of Brazilian cities.

In the country's re-democratization process, these actors will meet in the Urban Reform Forum (FNRU) in the early 1980s, which brings to the fore and resurrects the pillars of the urban reform project drawn up in the

1960s in the context of the basic reforms. At this moment, a new urban reform agenda is being developed, in which priority will be given to expanding the achievements related to the right to the city and the fulfillment of the city's social functions and urban property.

In the framework of the constituent works, the FNUR fought an inglorious battle with the conservative sectors and lobbies linked to the real estate market, and was responsible for including urban planning in the agenda of the constitutional works, emphasizing the basic principle of the search for the full development of social functions of cities, through the executive plans, the design of which became mandatory, by constitutional provision, for towns of over 20 thousand inhabitants.

In the post-constituent period following 1988, and beginning of the 1990s, by virtue of the constitutional charter (*Carta Maior*), many master plans are produced. In many cities, especially in the capitals of important Federal states such as Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo and Recife, the debate on the master plan gains visibility. In the theoretical construction of these blueprints, the city should no longer be treated as the object or center of capitalist accumulation, becoming the locus of democracy, acting the State and organized society in the sense of reducing inequalities caused by the capitalist production regime. The idea was also to broaden the concept of citizenship to the extent that civil society, through its representative entities, became co-responsible for city management.

However, after being transformed into a law, few guidelines for these plans were actually implemented, since these plans did not actually become a management tool. The unified discourse of the various sectors of society on the need for the master plan as an instrument of urban reform, albeit well-intentioned, becomes distant from practice in a country where laws are applied according to circumstances.

Another fact that will significantly contribute to the failure of these executive plans is the advance of the neoliberal avalanche in Brazil in the early 1990s. Inducted by the federal government, the new municipal governments begin to buy the thesis of regulation, whose objective is to ensure freedom for market forces, since equilibrium would result. The end of interventionism, of bureaucratization, of inefficiency, of certainties and of recipes, is thus advocated.

It is in this context that many Brazilian town councils, particularly in the capitals of the most dynamic urban centers, shelve their newly elaborated master plans and begin to produce new planning instruments, conventionally called strategic plans. With the latter, whose most paradigmatic example is to be that of Rio de Janeiro, the aim was to use a new city planning scheme, introduced by international consultants, aiming at more efficient and effective management by entrepreneur governments, that is, acting as local development agents, bringing together human and financial resources, in close articulation with the private sector, owner of large capital, for a previously defined city project.

The theoretical orientation for the city project contained in these strategic plans comes from Europe, under the direct influence of Barcelona. The "strategic city" is a response to the economic crisis and changes in the economy, characterized by the growing importance of technology and information in production; flexibilization and reorganization of production to follow demand and a systemic globalization where the elements are organized in supranational fluxes. This planning model results from business management-based practices applied in the city. It is essentially economic, non-regulatory, and has the role of promoting economic development via the articulation of public and private sectors to form a partnership in the realization of projects within the city.

In summary, words such as public-private partnerships, strategy, city sales, urban marketing, image production, megaprojects, competitiveness, attractiveness and social consensus are terms that summarize the strategic plans and the proposal of a strategic management for cities, aiming at inserting them in a global network

of cities as nodal points of the planetary market.

Although conceived for only a few Brazilian cities, this model of strategic planning, similar to the post-Constitution master plans, has not been obtaining consensus as a planning instrument (as a technique, process and apparatus of regulation) in the urban context of Brazilian cities, since the characteristics, specificities, location and the typology of the country's urban reality, as shown in the first part of this text, are profusely illustrative of the unlikelihood that this planning practice be consolidated in the city network here.

These last two models — the first plans for cities after the process of state redemocratization — resulted in a certain degree of political centralization, giving municipal governments more autonomy, and their main novelty was to rescue planning as a effective instrument for thinking and acting on the city, promoting urban transformation. In the case of the master, or executive, plans, the novelty introduced refers to the “new” concept of the social function of the city, in an urban environment marked by the reproduction of social inequalities. In the case of strategic plans, the novelty has corresponded to the incorporation of private agents into the planning activity, a function previously reserved exclusively to the State.

4. Brazilian Cities: What Planning?

The current Brazilian moment, marked by a deep crisis of a political and economic nature, is one of profound changes, arising in the economic field through the restructuring of production. These are changes in economic activities; in the technological composition of production, in labor relations, in the increase of capital mobility and in the control of business and the Fordist *modus operandi*. This significant set of changes has, as immediate consequence, alterations in the reproduction locus of capital accumulation, which are expressed through urban and city planning changes.

Thus, given the characteristics of the Brazilian city network presented in the first part of this article and the urban planning matrices experimented in the country with their corresponding results, the current matrix of urban planning is bound to be obliged to change, so the inquiry made in the subtitle of this item 4 is well founded. In fact, although the scale and size of the urban nucleus under consideration varies, the Brazilian urban reality is marked by a profound urban exclusion, represented by the gigantic informal/illegal occupation of urban land, by favelas, shanties, or whatever you wish to call them, which are ignored in the representation of the “official city”. It is an illegality that is both functional and dysfunctional. It is functional for archaic — patrimonial — political relations, for a narrow and speculative real estate market, for the arbitrary application of the law, according to the clientele. It is dysfunctional for society as a whole: for environmental sustainability, for democratic and more egalitarian relations, for the quality of urban life and for the expansion of citizenship and impacts on the lives of poor population segments, who are denied the right to the city and the quality of urban life.

The segregation of part of the territory of Brazilian cities characterized by a lack of access to land and decent housing, environmental sanitation and other infrastructure services, urban violence and the occupation of areas at risk of landslides or floods is the product of a political, social, economic and legal dynamic whose consequences are the territories of inequalities in which Brazilian cities have become.

Research agencies, municipal governments and teams of urban planners, along with multi-professional technical teams — social, legal, engineering — and university teaching cadres, have limited information on the favelas, or the informal part of Brazilian cities, because these areas, which are similar, with pre-modern urban forms, do not fit into the categories of urban/functionalist planning.

It is important to emphasize that the lack of urban planning is not the cause of Brazilian cities' serious problems, but this is related to rapid growth, which has accelerated considerably over the last decades, and is ignored by the approved plans that meet the traditional interests of policies that compete to cover up the engines driving urban investment. Above all, these problems are linked to the economic aspects of the mode of production, the political decisions taken by the governments in the cities, in Brazil and in peripheral countries.

In fact, as Maricato (2000) observes, the practice of urban planning in Brazil has not been committed to the concrete reality of the country's network of cities, but to an order that represents only a portion, that is usually nominated as a formal scheme, and hence it can be considered as a planning matrix. As something that refuses to be hushed, this leads us to ask again, in the current context of changes, if there will be any way out/is there potential for the formulation and practice of a new urban planning in Brazil? This planning is more appropriate to the network of cities and capable of accounting for the main problems of large, medium and large Brazilian cities.

The informal occupation of urban land in Brazilian cities of all sizes is an intrinsic part of their socio-historical background and impacts upon urbanization. In the largest urban centers, this urbanization reaches gigantic percentages. According to the 2000 Census, in Rio Janeiro, Belo Horizonte and Porto Alegre, about 25% of the population are slum dwellers who have occupied land to live in. In Fortaleza and Salvador, this contingent already reaches 28% and 33% of the population, respectively. And, in Recife, it is estimated that in these areas almost 50% of the population live.

However, these areas are treated by the public power as non-cities, since public investments and urban management are directed to the part of the city where the elite lives, deepening and concentrating income and, therefore, accentuating inequality in the occupation process, use and appropriation of urban space. The city of the elite represents and covers the real city. From this perspective, it strengthens the accumulation in the urban.

If extensive, precarious and peripheral areas can be classified and even treated as non-cities, there is no other way than to reverse this equation, in order to seek in the reflexive activity of rethinking the city, propositions of solutions to the problems of the majority of its inhabitants, which has remained excluded from the benefits of the urban way of life.

The performance of macroeconomic variables plays an important role in urban development, since it can point to investment capacity, growth level, but also point to the process of financialization and accumulation in the intensified urban space today. However, there is always room at the level of local governments for reversing priorities regarding the distribution of socially produced wealth in order to prioritize poor segments of the population, away from profitability criteria, which is certainly easier to make viable. smaller cities.

In the context of this article, it is not intended to outline a tailed agenda for the planning of the network of Brazilian cities, but only to contribute to the search for a new paradigm of urban planning and management, pointing out suggestions for a change of course in relation to the reality of the network of cities in the country.

In this sense, the construction of a new urban matrix is, first of all, the elimination of the distance between planning and management, that is, planning as a process that is not exhausted in the drafting of local plans, in the construction of participatory decision-making process of centralization of urban management.

In addition to the previous guideline, the following are some equally important ones to be carried out by municipal governments, but far from constituting a general urban planning practice:

- create a space for democratic debate with the participation of the excluded;
- sign action plans rather than the traditional master plans; prioritize the implementation of adequate instruments to control and control land use and occupation;

- integrate social, environmental and economic actions;
- tailor executive plans in the field of housing, transport, environment and basic sanitation; deploying powerful information systems;
- consolidate the sphere of political participation of the different actors;
- promote effective linkage between urban and urban management;
- promote integration between the Plan of Action and the Municipal Budget;
- implement the Participatory Budget as a means of income distribution;
- encourage the formation and renewal of the staff in order to select professionals engaged in reform and democratic urban management, which implies a commitment to real and concrete action;
- take into account the general characteristics of urban centers and their size.

5. Conclusion

As a conclusion, it can be affirmed that, as a focal point, the planned action for the development of the network of Brazilian cities, or for the multiplicity of future growth orientations in a more balanced and adequate way for the reality of the country, as well as less exclusionary, in order to hasten to address the inequalities and to favor the dialogue and the articulated action between the three federal government spheres. In this perspective, the role of the State is an irreplaceable factor in the structuring of the network, in the definition of planning and management instruments appropriate to its size and in guaranteeing the equalization of opportunities.

In this sense, it is the responsibility of urban planners — in the technical teams, in view of the characteristics of the Brazilian city network, to adopt urban planning tools adapted to reality, based on the multiple mosaics that characterize it, seeking, as seen, to face the distance between planning and management, through the construction of participatory decision-making bodies and a centralized process of urban management.

In addition, it is essential that municipal administrations seek to provide for integration between action plans and the municipal budget, so as to make the planning instrument into effective actions that meet the population's needs.

The imprecision or even the limits faced for the definition of what is urban and rural in Brazil, has contributed to the country's city network's coexistence with heterogeneity. It is important and challenging to improve the criteria to be adopted for this definition, considering the differences present in a continental country, the regional inequalities, the dynamics and speed of the changes characteristic of the current century: situations that have repercussions in the urban and rural dynamics, but also in the intermediate portions between these realities.

References

- Bitoun J. and Miranda Livia (orgs.) (2009). *Tipologia Das Cidades Brasileiras*, Rio Janeiro, Letra Capital.
- Brasil (1988). *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil*, Senado, Federal, Brasília.
- Brasil (1938). "Decreto-Lei Nº 311/38, 2 março 1938. Dispõe sobre a divisão territorial do país, e dá outras providências", *Diário Oficial da União*, Seção 1 - 7/3/1938, (Publicação Original), Rio Janeiro, p. 4249.
- Brasil (2001). "Lei Federal Nº 10.257 - Estatuto da-Cidade", Senado Feral, Brasília.
- Carlos A. F. A. (2003). "Seria o Brasil menos urbano do que se calcula?", *Revista Geosp*, No. 13, São Paulo.
- Favaret A. (2005). "Seria a geografia mais urbana do que se calcula?", *Revista Geosp - Espaço e Tempo*, São Paulo, No. 18, pp. 189-194.
- Ferrari C. (1979). *Curso Planejamento Municipal Integrado* (2nd ed.), Livraria Pioneira Editora, São Paulo.

- Instituto Brasileiro Geografia e Estatística (IBGE) (2010). *Censo , Demográfico, 2010*, Ministério do Planejamento e Gestão, Brasília.
- Instituto Brasileiro Geografia e Estatística (IBGE) (2017). *Classificação e caracterização dos espaços rurais e urbanos do Brasil: uma primeira aproximação/IBGE*,Coord. Geografia, Rio Janeiro: IBGE.
- Instituto pesquisa Econômica Aplicada-IPEA, Instituto Brasileiro Geografia e Estatística-IBGE, UNICAMP/IE/NESUR UNICAMP/IE/NESUR (2001). *Caracterização e tendência da rede urbana do Brasil: desenvolvimento regional e estrutura da rede urbana*, Brasília: IPEA.
- Maricato E. (2000). “As idéias fora do lugar e o lugar fora das idéias”,in: *A Cidade do Pensamento Único: Desmanchando Consensos*, Editora Vozes, Petrópolis-Rio Janeiro, pp.121-192.
- Santos M. (2005). *A Urbanização Brasileira* (5th ed.), Editora da USP, São Paulo.
- Veiga J. E. (2003). ÷ *Cidades Imaginárias: O Brasil é Menos Urbano do que se Calcula*, Editora Autores Associados, Campinas, São Paulo.
- Veiga J. E. (2005). *Desenvolvimento Sustentável: O Desafio do Século XXI*, Editora Garamond, Rio Janeiro.
- Villaça F. (1999). *Uma Contribuição para a História do Planejamento Urbano no Brasil*, Deak, C. & Schiffer, S. São Paulo.