

Fall 12-31-1997

Brazil and Globalization: Rome of the Tropics or Nowhere?

José Luiz dos Santos
State University of Campinas, Brazil

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/macintl>

Recommended Citation

Luiz dos Santos, José (1997) "Brazil and Globalization: Rome of the Tropics or Nowhere?," *Macalester International*: Vol. 5, Article 9.
Available at: <http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/macintl/vol5/iss1/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Institute for Global Citizenship at DigitalCommons@Macalester College. It has been accepted for inclusion in Macalester International by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Macalester College. For more information, please contact scholarpub@macalester.edu.

BRAZIL AND GLOBALIZATION: Rome of the Tropics or Nowhere?

José Luiz dos Santos

I. Concepts and Realities

There is a long Brazilian tradition of studying Brazil — its people; its social, political, and economic structures; its culture. The interpretations thus produced have had ideological consequences, mainly as justification for the social order, or aiming at its transformation.¹

Authors such as Gilberto Freyre and Darcy Ribeiro, despite their different approaches and emphases, have labored to identify traits of culture and people that are specifically Brazilian. Their analyses have focused on processes, social practices, and symbols that are held to be pervasive throughout the large population and vast territory of the country.² Such interest may seem oddly out of focus when related to the contemporary fixation on so-called globalization. For these debates seem to refer more to abstract structures and flows than to people and their social relations and organization. National or regional peculiarity is often considered of secondary importance when confronted with world structures thought to shape every society, as well as constrain social processes everywhere. And yet people go on living their daily lives, speaking and transforming their languages, embedded in their history and legacy of knowledge and symbolism. Societies are still organized according to lines of conflict and tension. Inequality, discrimination, and violence persist as integral parts of class societies and international relations.

There is, at the same time, a tendency to propose new ways of looking at societies. Thus, the apparent chaos of Brazilian cities or the complexities of social life in the country might be captured through a series of fluidly organized pictures amenable to different perceptions according to a variety of perspectives, landscapes relating to each other in elegant disconnections and superpositions. This might provide a sophisticated snapshot of social realities.³ However, it is doubtful that it could have lasting heuristic value. Social tension is strong and visible; relations of power and hierarchy are transparent. When the processes associated with globalization are presented as imperative, they are an invitation to concentrate our observations on the global structure rather than to pursue the dynamics and logic of the social relations.

The intellectual efforts to interpret Brazil help us to understand that, now as in the past, the chaotic aspects of social life make sense; that violence, discrimination, and poverty are the result of a deep class structure, marked by the historical exploitation of slaves and the extermination of native populations. This internal situation is, furthermore, connected to the international relations of the country — the result of European conquest, which has left enduring traits. In Brazil, then, very clearly, what might be presented as the global features of the contemporary world are part of social life: they are not external, as they are present in the social relations. They have an external aspect, however, insofar as the country and its people are subject to asymmetric relations and suffer the consequences of decisions taken elsewhere by hegemonic powers and forces. This duality is not restricted to these final years of the twentieth century; they are part of Brazilian history.

As a theory, globalization, as seen from Brazil, is largely a conceptual project to be confronted with the realities of the country; as a theme, globalization is part of the current political agenda in Brazil. For instance, unemployment and downsizing may be attributed to globalization; the various reforms being proposed by the federal government, such as the privatization of state-owned companies, may be explained as effects of globalization. This phenomenon is increasingly related to cultural affairs, especially in connection with the new technologies of communication that are becoming available.

It is interesting to note that the debate on globalization proceeds despite the lack of consensus on what is exactly meant by this term. In the absence of conceptual clarity, globalization may become a kind of magical word to be related to any contemporary social process. Such a discussion often includes culture as a central issue, and, here again, it depends on a vaguely defined notion. It seems, thus, that some conceptual issues have to be pursued in order to better evaluate the importance of this debate for the analysis of a country like Brazil.

II. The Emergence of Globalization

The vagueness surrounding the idea of globalization seems to be no obstacle to the use of the term among scholars as well as practitioners. Nonetheless, although the nature of present capitalist economies is at the core of the debate, it is also concerned with political organization and culture. A liberal understanding of the market is, certainly, common and seems to overflow the economy to encompass social life as a whole. In fact, the term globalization is often deployed in connection to whatever may be deemed international, that is, going beyond the boundaries of nations, states, ethnic groups, religions and regions of the planet. Globalization is presented as a new and overwhelming reality bound to generate a new world. It is, in this sense, seen both as a process and as the common destiny of the different societies that exist in the world.

By the mid-1980s, the notion of globalization started to appear in studies concerning economy, culture, society, and international relations.⁴ With the end of the Cold War, this use of the term became even more widespread. At the core of this notion are speed and technological innovation, which intensify communication along the new planetary paths of capitalist investment, production, and consumption. It is often assumed that a powerful capitalism, in alliance with fast communication, is capable of generating political and social transformations across the world in the image of Western models.⁵ These changes would be followed by the internationalization of common cultural tendencies.

Numerous dates are proposed for the beginning of the process of globalization, ranging from the sixteenth century to

the end of the nineteenth.⁶ Nonetheless, it is usually held that the phase of history the world has entered into during these final years of the present century demands new theories of society and culture.⁷

Globalization is, then, often presented as a macro-structure, powerful and self-propelling, unavoidable and capable of determination over social life. It would have its own autonomy and logic.⁸

Theories of this genre often employ quasi-religious language;⁹ the idea of globalization might be compared to that of spirit. In other words, the limit of what is held to be global cannot be totally comprehended, as something conceived as absolute. Consequently, it is not surprising that almost everything can be attributed to globalization — nations, cultures, histories are transformed into aspects of an almost transcendental phenomenon. So heavily preoccupied with very abstract structures, the debate on globalization does not seem interested in or even capable of considering social relations. As a result, there is hardly any concern with social reality, the continuous result of the collective action of human agents. This deprives the concept of the necessary examination of a particular zone so as to give the general theory spatial footing.

Perhaps due to the obvious eminence of science and technology, it seems sometimes that globalization is reduced to a fixation on modes of communication. Not surprisingly, one feels the return of the familiar idea of technological determinism in this debate. An implication of this reasoning is the acceptance that the new technologies are capable, by themselves, of changing social life and producing a new era for the world and humanity. Enter, then, futurology: if social forms can be determined by technology, the future of society can be gleaned from technological diffusion and development. A further point here is that the global world is presented as having some degree of homogenization, in which the new structures of capital and communications are thought to be boundless and pervasive. Such forces are destined to encompass every sphere of social life and culture.¹⁰

Authors such as Geyer and Bright help us to understand how conceptions of this type emerge from the expectations and theoretical references of scholars in the major capitalist countries.¹¹ Thus, the idea of globalization as something that overwhelms

and homogenizes might be related to the projections produced by European and American scholars in the early twentieth century. By the end of this century, they expected, the world would be fully Westernized, turning what started as the European expansion of the sixteenth century into a full transnational way of life. However, we now know that these historical interactions run along unexpected paths, resulting in a complex world that demands more than elusive notions or simplistic theories.

The debate on globalization might benefit from the tradition of research and knowledge best exemplified by anthropology, with its strong emphasis on the study of micro social and cultural units.

Anthropology is ready to show, based on its theories and vast number of empirical studies, that the idea of cultural homogeneity is naïve and does not correspond to the dynamics of social life. Diversity, as opposed to homogeneity, is an important analytical tool for understanding the complex world that the theories of globalization are concerned with. Anthropological studies draw our attention to how heterogeneity is produced and reproduced in inter-/intra-societies; how imported objects, symbols, and systems are subject to translation. Diversity, in fact, tends to crystallize insofar as the expansion of capitalism produces endless cycles of asymmetries of power and subsequent inequality, even within dominant societies.¹² This kind of diversity, which could be said to be structural, assumes varying forms and expressions according to the society in question. In the end, the idea of a thorough homogenization connected to globalization does not seem to correspond to a world pervaded by differences between groups, categories, classes, peoples, nations, states, and regions. It could, however, reveal an ideological background, one that exalts the economic and political processes that, at present, are internationally dominant. It may bear, or at least imply, the promise of an impossible equality.

But lest we seem totally negative, the reality with which the debate on globalization is concerned doubtless has a liberatory facet. The accelerating communication across the boundaries of societies and nations involve discrete social units and their diversified problems, conceptions, and experience. These new encounters could be used to develop a new notion of humanity

and may help to overcome racism, discrimination, and prejudice, and to fight the irrational exploitation of the natural world.

III. The System and Its Parts

The relation between the system and its parts presents many of the difficulties concerning globalization. One of its most common topics is related to the nation-state. It is often asserted that, as interconnections dictated by global capitalism spread, intensify, and diversify, national sovereignty will become less relevant. Although the nation-state continues to be an operational unit of observation and analysis, its controlling and regulatory power is considered to be waning. This is the result of increasing subscription to numerous international agreements that chip away at the authority of the national state. Further, sovereignty would also be challenged by the tendency to organize multinational blocks, of which the European Community is the main example.¹³

One can even easily find suggestions that urge the poorer nations to abandon their states and entirely give up their sovereignty in order to benefit from cascading international flows. However, and according to Lomnitz, this is not a possibility at present, as most countries are condemned to hold on to their sovereignty.¹⁴ Even the United States and Japan, the economic powerhouses of the world, remain attached to their states and are convinced of the necessity of controlling their frontiers. International relations still seem to be driven by differential national power, rather than by the transnationalism suggested by globalization theorists. This is, of course, a reality that affects Brazil.

Capitalism is certainly undergoing a breathtaking expansion, conquering new markets and incorporating new societies. Those countries (e.g., Central and Eastern Europe) newly inducted into the sphere of late-capitalism are undergoing structural transformations, as new social classes emerge in a redefined social space and organization. This is not the case with Brazil, an underdeveloped capitalist society. Here, very clearly, the deep dynamics of social change cannot be solely associated with the current trends of globalization — particularly of the euphoric type. On the contrary, there is, for instance, an important social move-

ment in the country—nationally organized and with wide support—in favor of comprehensive agrarian reform, a phenomenon that challenges dominant economic proclivities, with its emphasis on the concentration of capital and property. Brazil is not now entering the sphere of international capitalism; rather, it is a direct creature of such a historical project. At present, however, there is a strong tendency to accelerate the privatization of state companies, attract new foreign investment, and increase international trade. On the one hand, it must be noted that external investment has been present in the country since the beginning of the nineteenth century. On the other, privatization is a traditional recipe of economic liberalism, a doctrine that has been strengthened by the end of the Cold War. If the Brazilian elites are following guidelines related to the present organization of capital, this, again, does not represent any novelty or structural transformation of Brazilian society.

There are, however, arguments in favor of social and political changes that may directly affect Brazilian society. Castells agrees with other authors in that there is a “centrality of knowledge, information processing and symbol manipulation in generating wealth and power in our societies.”¹⁵ The concern here is with knowledge, information, and symbols related to the new technologies of communications, and to the present modalities of capital. These depend largely on scientific and technological research, on formal education, and on other organized forms of transmitting knowledge. In this respect, one might point to the concentration of these wealth- and power-related capabilities in some countries and in certain social spheres in each country. His argument could be inverted thus: Knowledge, information processing, and symbolic manipulation depend upon wealth and power. What is new, then, is the fact that such acceleration is an expression of changes in economic production, now increasingly based on highly automated regimes and skilled labor forces.

While there is a growing premium on skills, the economic history and growth of Brazil has for centuries depended heavily upon cheap, abundant, and unskilled labor. Nonetheless, as knowledge undergoes new forms of concentration and control driven by intense competitions, Brazil is bound to face novel challenges. For instance, education in Brazil is notorious for its

poor quality and inaccessibility, particularly when compared to both developed societies and newly industrializing countries. Since the social forces willing to democratize Brazilian society have always promoted a better and more inclusive educational system, the new global competition might compel the majority to make this into a common and urgent political agenda.

IV. Flows of People

The new international order, particularly after the collapse of the Soviet Union, has increased the movement of people throughout the world. But there is a hidden paradox here: the dominant economic policies prescribe, particularly for the poorer countries, free markets for capital, commodities and services, while, at the same time, there is an organized opposition to anything similar to a worldwide free movement of labor.

Poverty, war, and the increasing gap between rich and poor countries have led to new migratory flows prompting restrictive legislation in the main capitalist countries. Brazil has changed, in the last decades, from a country of immigration to a country of emigration. Around 1 percent of the Brazilian population has migrated to other countries — mainly to Europe, the United States, and Japan — in recent years. Apparently, most Brazilian emigrants come from the middle classes. The number of immigrants to Brazil is small, limited to nationals of other South American countries, such as Bolivia. In recent times, there has been a small influx of Asian migrants, especially from South Korea.¹⁶

The dominant capitalist countries tend to be, albeit unwillingly, recipients of large and constant immigrant flows. Susser points out that the First World receives migrants to supply the need for unskilled workers in order to perform activities that are not accepted by locals. However, an important part of that immigrant flow are skilled migrants who come to improve their own skills.¹⁷ At the same time, the dominant capitalist countries continue to downsize their work forces, as well as export manufacturing work to less developed societies such as Brazil.

It is difficult to find a single functional explanation for the present flows of people. Perhaps this is more in line with what Castells defines as a new world disorder,¹⁸ whose consequences

include the presence of diversified groups of immigrants in most First World metropolises. As in the past, these immigrants bring their languages, religions, and customs — only now their cultures are reinforced by constant additions of new arrivals. The proclaimed global era seems, thus, to produce new cultural diversities in the very societies that are supposed to export cultural patterns. As a result, the challenge of incorporating these new migrants often weighs heavily on the metropolises, often creating new and difficult social complications.¹⁹

This phenomenon affects Brazil differently. The country has successfully integrated the immigrants that arrived in large flows in the past. The remaining colonies of immigrants do not form distinctive units in the social processes of the country, merged, as they are, into the general Brazilian population. The conflicts and tensions over race, color, class, and region concern the overall population and cannot be reduced to patterns of recent immigration as may be the case in those countries whose social organizations are the concern of the theoreticians of globalization.

V. Language and Culture

Portuguese is the language of a few countries in the world (Portugal, Brazil, Angola, Mozambique, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau, and East Timor), but Brazil alone accounts for the vast majority of its speakers.

Brazilian history has generated a very impressive linguistic unity. It is interesting to note that for more than a century following the Portuguese Conquest, the main language of colonization was Nheengatu, an idiom derived from the Tupi languages that were spoken in the coastland.²⁰ From the seventeenth century onward, Nheengatu weakened as Portuguese established itself as the language of the expanding Brazilian territory. A variety of African tongues arrived in Brazil with the slave trade, but the social conditions for their reproduction were very unfavorable.

Many idioms are spoken in the country at present, and some Indian groups do not speak Portuguese at all. However, the strength and success of Portuguese in Brazil is undeniable, and,

despite many regional variants, it has not generated mutually incomprehensible dialects.

The question becomes much more complicated when it comes to culture. There is a rich regional diversity of symbolic production in the country. Interpreters of Brazil have often tried to understand the unity underlying this heterogeneity. No one has ever tried to establish a bounded system to characterize it, but rather the focus has been on the implications of the ethnic origins of the population, of miscegenation, and of the social and political organization of the country. The possible definition of a bounded Brazilian culture arises again with the conceptions of globalization. Globalization seems to refer to discrete units that are under constraint or dissolution due to the impact of new global structures. Very often, these units are labeled cultures. Brazil defies this formulation. To make the point more persuasively, a discussion on the category is in order.

VI. Culture and Social Processes

The concept of culture has a rich history and many conflicting interpretations. Anthropology, especially American anthropology, has been its main locus of definition. However, in the last few decades, the use of the term *culture* has been taken up by many well beyond academic discourse. Such uses have not helped to establish a common understanding of the concept.

Writing in 1963, Kroeber and Kluckhohn presented hundreds of different definitions of culture, a list that has continued to grow.²¹ The intellectual investigation of how the concept evolved did not help to solve the question of its definition.²² By the end of the 1980s, in a movement that persists, many anthropologists decided to put an end to the concept of culture, based on a wide range of motives, from its insufficiency as an analytic tool to its connections with racism and with Western political hegemony.²³ The connection of this development to the debate on globalization can be established in two different ways: first, the surrender of the concept and the rise of discussions on globalization have occurred almost simultaneously; second, an intensification of international affairs may put new pressure on anthropology and its main concept of culture.

For anthropology, the use of a vague conception of culture was tolerable while researchers were concerned with specific societies, trying to understand or interpret their internal organizations or symbolic systems. Insofar as the comparison of different societies had little role in the discipline, anthropology was not required to confront the various conceptions of culture used by its specialists.

For those concerned with the debate on globalization, the message from anthropology is clear: the concept of culture is very loose, particularly as a basis for the study of the interrelations of peoples, nations, and societies. Globalization, although presented as having its own dynamics, depends on the understanding that it can go beyond the boundaries of limited units: economies, nations, states, and, in what concerns the production and consumption of symbolic goods, cultures. If the concept of culture is denied, then what can globalization mean for processes concerning symbolism?

Earlier, years before globalization became a common topic of discussion and the concept of culture disowned, I attempted a definition of culture. I think that it may be helpful to recall that effort, especially with regard to a discussion on globalization from a Brazilian standpoint. Based on the history of the concept, I conceived of culture as a dimension of social processes, concerned with knowledge and the processing of information. Culture is, thus, an ever-present aspect of social life. Here, the legacies of symbols, ideas, and information of the past are constantly selected; at the same time, new ones are generated. This understanding preserves culture as an analytic tool and not just as a derivative of empirical investigation. Thus, it is not necessary to reify culture or to trace rigid boundaries to encompass cultural units, either parallel to societies or internal to them. Delimitation focuses on social processes and their nature, processes that are largely contained in societies, nations, and states; they are internally dynamic and are limited by modes of social organization, laws, and customs as well as external relations. Consequently, the increase of international exchanges and acceleration of communication do not happen in a void.²⁴ Such changes concern people, places, classes, groups, countries, federations; they have to do with social confrontation, choices, and strategies. They concern current social processes and, as a result,

can exist only as primarily internal to the different societies they encompass.

Globalization, on the other hand, may be connected to a new version of evolution, an old tendency of the studies on culture. Castells, for instance, presents a model of evolution based on the opposition between nature and culture. In the first phase, nature dominated culture; in the second, culture dominated nature; at present, culture dominates nature.²⁵ In the last phase, nature would be preserved as a cultural form.

Globalization is held to correspond to the last phase—and the definitive one, should the theory that history is coming to an end be accepted. This last phase is presented as inevitable, the fatal destiny of all and everything social. Many authors, however, are aware that what is global for the dominant capitalist countries may not be the same for the rest.²⁶

VII. The Commodification of Culture

The industry of culture, characterized by the internationalization of the marketing of symbolic goods, which has been consolidated since the Second World War, is dominated by the main capitalist countries, especially the United States. There are no barriers to the penetration of such commodities in Brazil, a country in which an industry of culture and mass communication has also been expanding.

Symbolic systems and products coming from other countries—either as commodities or not—have had a constant presence in Brazil and have sometimes resulted in nationalist reactions organized by members of the intellectual and political classes. Based on imported matrices, influences can be localized in Brazil in terms of systems of production and consumption; of technology and scientific knowledge; of music, cinema, television and dance; but also of clothing styles, and conceptions of recreation, as well as basic values such as religion.

Such symbolic elements are imported, imitated, reproduced, and assimilated and have been incorporated into Brazilian social life. Many of them are consumed in connection with that international economy of symbolic goods. The social insertion of such elements involves translation in terms of local patterns. It would be a mistake to suppose that the mere presence of such

symbolic goods implies the elimination of local culture, for this would amount to a belief that imported goods are capable of erasing local social processes and their historical roots, of which culture is a critical dimension. The commodification of culture, an aspect of contemporary Brazil, transforms many old symbolic and cultural endowments into goods fit for the manipulation of the culture industry and mass media. This commodification, however, is not total—there are always some aspects of culture that prove to be recalcitrant or difficult to digest. In this context, it is necessary to point out that Brazil presents a rich cultural legacy; and there is no sign that its particularities are about to be completely swallowed by an internationalized universe of symbolism. The richness and density of products derived from the cultural dimension of the country suggest the possibility that Brazil may have a more active participation in the international market of symbolic goods as a producer and exporter of products, models, and matrices. Such a situation may even result in the valorization of the cultural dimensions of Brazil.

VIII. Rome of the Tropics

According to the Brazilian anthropologist Darcy Ribeiro, Brazil is the new Rome, the creative birthplace of a new tropical and *mestizo* civilization, a civilization that he depicts as “happier because it has suffered much. Better, because it incorporates more humanity. More generous, because it is open to live together with all races and all cultures and because it sits on the most beautiful and luminous province of the Earth.”²⁷

These are the concluding statements of Ribeiro’s book *O Povo Brasileiro* (The Brazilian People), published in 1995, less than two years before his death. It is a culmination of the decades he devoted to the analysis of Brazil and its people, alongside an intense participation in Brazilian political life.

Ribeiro wrote his reflections when the theme of globalization was already present in universities, research centers, and academic publications and on bookstore shelves. With this work, he stressed the unique character of historical, social, and cultural processes that resulted in the creation of a country called Brazil. Ribeiro’s ideas and approach were in marked contrast to the

projections of a relentless and all-powerful globalization, whose tendencies include homogenization. As logged earlier, an idealized stress on current economic changes, with their formidable apparatus of communication, emphasizes flows and processes at the expense of place. In such an analysis, it is difficult to conceive of a Rome of the Tropics. In terms of international flows, structures, and processes, Brazil would instead be nowhere. For the followers of these new theories, globalization is the reality itself. Little attention is paid to social groups, categories, and classes; social contradictions and confrontations, as well as their historical consequences, seem to not preoccupy theories of globalization. The planetary macrostructures are conceived of as so powerful that they sometimes seem to have no place for people.

By contrast, people overflow in the analysis of Darcy Ribeiro. The people he considers fight, suffer, survive extreme adversities, and live in precarious conditions, but they persist and are even capable of smiling and producing a rich and dense culture.

It would not come as a surprise if the unlimited emphasis on globalizing processes would soon come to an end — as a consequence of its conceptual insufficiency and analytic sterility — replaced by some new vogue of ideas. Darcy Ribeiro's approaches, however, tend to have a larger persistence, despite the exaggerations they may contain. They are embedded in the historical processes; and in their contradictions, they move in accordance with the particular cultural dynamic they describe. They try to understand the meaning of the existence of millions of anonymous people who have lived and worked for generations to allow Brazil to become a reality and to face the new challenges of the economy, social organization, and external relations.

Notes

1. See Dante M. Leite, *O Carater Nacional Brasileiro* (São Paulo: Pioneira, 1976).
2. See Gilberto Freyre, *Sobrados e Mucambos*, 2d ed., 3 vols. (Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1951) and *Casa-Grande e Senzala*, 2d ed. (Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília, 1963); and Darcy Ribeiro, *O Povo Brasileiro* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1995).
3. The “-scape” approach seems to derive from Arjun Appadurai, who has suggested that the global cultural flow involves five dimensions: ethnoscaples, mediascaples, technoscaples, finanscaples and ideoscaples. See his “Disjuncture

and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy" in *Public Culture* 2, no. 2 (1990): 6–7.

4. See Roland Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and the Global Culture* (London: Sage, 1992), chap. 1.

5. It is common to refer the debate to the world-system theory developed by Immanuel Wallerstein, who emphasizes the relation between global contemporary capitalism and the West. See Wallerstein, "The West, Capitalism and the Modern World-System" in *Review* 15 (1992): 561–619.

6. In "The West, Capitalism and the Modern World-System," Wallerstein affirms that this global capitalism has been in process for the last 400–500 years (p. 616). For Robertson, the takeoff phase of globalization lasted from the 1870s to the 1920s. See *Globalization*, 59. Jerry H. Bentley warns that "cross-cultural interactions began to influence human affairs from the earliest days of history." See his "Cross-Cultural Interaction and Periodization in World History" in *The American Historical Review* 101, no. 3 (1996): 756.

7. See Appadurai, "Disjuncture and Difference"; Manuel Castells, "The Net and the Self" in *Critique of Anthropology* 16, no. 1 (1996): 9–38; John D. Kelly, "Fijian Indians and 'Commoditization' of Labor" in *American Ethnologist* 9, no. 2 (1992): 97–120; Claudio Lomnitz, "Decadence in Times of Globalization" in *Cultural Anthropology* 9, no. 2 (1994): 257–67; and Wallerstein, "Culture as the Ideological Battleground of the Modern World-System," in *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, ed. Mike Featherstone (London: Sage, 1990).

8. Robertson, "Mapping the Global Condition," in *Global Culture*, 27.

9. Michael Blim points out that Wallerstein's interpretation of global capitalism is "avowedly metaphysical and difficult to sustain." See Michael Blim, "Cultures and the Problems of Capitalisms" in *Critique of Anthropology* 16, no. 1 (1996): 86.

10. Wallerstein, quoting Karl Polanyi, stresses that in the capitalist system "social relations are embedded in the economic system." See Wallerstein, "The West, Capitalism and the Modern World-System," 916.

11. Michael Geyer and Charles Bright, "World History in a Global Age" in *The American Historical Review* 100, no. 4 (1995): 1036.

12. Göran Therborn, "Dialectics of Modernity: On Critical Theory and the Legacy of Twentieth-Century Marxism" in *New Left Review* 215 (1996): 81.

13. Brazil takes part in a regional entity, Mercosul, with Argentina, Uruguay, and Paraguay (full members), as well as Chile and Bolivia (associates). Mercosul forms an economic block with agreements on commerce and customs.

14. Lomnitz, "Decadence in Times of Globalization," 258.

15. Castells, "The Net and the Self," 10.

16. NESUR/NEPO, *Migrações Internacionais: Herança XX, Agenda XXI* (Campinas: FNUAP, 1996), 26, 49, and 50.

17. Ida Susser, "The Shaping of Conflict in the Space of Flows" in *Critique of Anthropology* 16, no. 1 (1996): 44.

18. Castells, "The Net and the Self," 9.
19. Lomnitz, "Decadence in Times of Globalization," 260.
20. For Nheengatu and the native idioms, see Aryon D. Rodrigues, *Líguas Brasileiras* (São Paulo: Loyola, 1986).
21. Alfred Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions* (New York: Vintage Books, 1963).
22. George W. Stocking, *Race, Culture and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).
23. See Joel Kahn, "Culture, Demise or Resurrection?" in *Critique of Anthropology* 9, no. 2 (1989): 5–25; and Robert Brightman, "Forget Culture: Replacement, Transcendence, Relixification" in *Cultural Anthropology* 10, no. 4 (1995): 509–46.
24. Setha Low, "A Response to Castells—An Anthropology of the City" in *Critique of Anthropology* 16, no. 1 (1996): 60, and Geyer and Bright, "World History in a Global Age," 1057.
25. Castells, "The Net and the Self," 34.
26. Lomnitz, "Decadence in Times of Globalization," 263.
27. Ribeiro, *O Povo Brasileiro*, 455 (my translation).

Additional Sources

- Hall, Stuart. "The Meaning of New Times." In *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, ed. David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Hannerz, Ulf. "Notes on the Global Ecumene." In *Public Culture* 1, no. 2 (1989): 66–75.
- Jameson, Frederick. "Postmodernism: or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism." In *New Left Review* 146 (1984): 53–92.
- Rutland, Peter. "Globalization and the Transition in Eastern Europe." In *Macalester International* 2 (Autumn 1995): 5–34.
- Santos, José L. dos. *O Que é Cultura*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1983.
- . *Espiritismo, uma Religião Brasileira*. São Paulo: Moderna, in press.
- Yengoyan, Aran. "Theory in Anthropology: On the Demise of the Concept of Culture." In *Comparative Studies in Society and History* (1986): 369–74.