SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY VS. CULTURAL RESPONSIBILITY

SEEKING SOLUTIONS THAT WORK IN OUR CONTEXT

Carmen Migueles

Social Responsability vs. Cultural Responsability: Seeking Solutions that Work in Our Context

Carmen Migueles

A Book for the Brazilian Paradox

Eduardo Eugenio Gouvêa Vieira

The Brazilian paradox, a rich country with an extremely poor population, imposes on us all the pressing challenge to fight social inequality. But how to make economic strength translate into social well-being? This is the question that Carmen Pires Migueles faces in this brilliant book.

Rather than bringing back to the center of debate the old whining about policies that depend on transitional administrations, the work focuses on building actions founded on social responsibility.

The book is the fruit of the thought generated by the Juan Molinos Institute, an institution whose name honors one of the brightest engineers this country has ever had, author Carmen's father. I had the pleasure to meet Juan Molinos, a man who always knew how to turn his inexhaustible optimism and energy into concrete actions for a better Brazil.

Born in Spain and naturalized a Brazilian citizen, Juan Molinos had a professional career linked to Duque de Caxias, a city which is the extreme synthesis of the perverse Brazilian paradox, since while it figures among the country's ten largest municipal economies, it boasts the 1,782nd position in the national HDI ranking. This means a scenario where large companies neighbor a low-education population whose youths have few prospects of breaking the poverty cycle.

The engineer, a specialist in building large industrial compounds, headed COPESUL, COPENE, and supervised operations at Petroflex, in Duque de Caxias. Positions he earned by his own merits, by his belief in studying, and by his work's efficiency. This experience of personal overcoming is the example of life that the Juan Molinos Institute wants to make possible to youths in Baixada Fluminense.

The Institute's actions, which find in this book their guiding line, are very much in tune with the work and thought of the FIRJAN System. To us, debating business problems only makes sense within the discussion of demands and needs of the whole society. Therefore, we have defined our work by establishing as strategic goals to increase the competitiveness of industries in the state of Rio de Janeiro and to implement social responsibility actions, particularly in the fields of education and health. In education, our

focus is social inclusion. In health, prevention. When we talk about incrementing industrial competitivity, our goal is to expand employment and provide income distribution.

In her book, Carmen highlights the importance of culture for building individuals' autonomy. Indeed, valuing the cultural heritage can promote the strengthening of citizens' identity, who thereby become political beings with a greater consciousness and ability to build their own destiny. The author also points to the necessity to increase transparency as a basic condition for a more efficient public management.

I recommend the reading of this book to all who are concerned with the reality of our country and wish to find solutions for effective social inclusion policies. Its ideas, at once original and feasible, have the transformative potential that has always been present in the life of unforgettable Juan Molinos.

Eduardo Eugenio Gouvêa Vieira is the chairman of the FIRJAN System (FIRJAN, CIRJ, SESI, SENAI e IEL).

Acknowledgements

This book is the result of efforts and debates by several people connected to the Duque de Caxias Municipal Department of Culture over the last two years, who participated in the conversations I promoted as the Municipal Secretary of Culture. It's not easy to work with art and culture in the outskirts of big cities. My continuous contact with artists and cultural activists in the city showed me each day a reality of desires to be realized, a great potential mixed with a certain frustration and revolt.

We lived side by side with the dreams that this potential reveals to us and with a terrible feeling of impotence. Each master of folklore who died, like Mr. Sebastião Vicente de Morais, who passed away this year, increased this feeling. A springhead of knowledge was gone with him, one we hadn't been able to record and divulge. Then, a little bit of a great tradition was lost with his passing, and the feeling remained that we had not helped him charm the young and spread a little more of his art.

Many youths and children came to us for courses and an opportunity to participate in workshops, and we could not serve them.

As a group, we tried to understand our reality. We discussed from the apparent uselessness of art to the role of the state in promoting culture. There is very little a municipal department of culture can actually do, and we tried to find out our share of the blame in this situation.

I met with a few businesspeople in the region who showed interest in supporting a few projects. Together, we decided to found an institute, a non-profit organization dedicated to promote local development through culture. The discussion which led to establishing the institute at FIRJAN's regional office – where Berdge kept doors always open to us – shaped some of the ideas this book presents. I'm also grateful for the kind decision to name the Institute after my father, who was connected, during a part of his career, to the municipality, and who had recently passed away. In this respect, I must thank all our founders: Paulo César de Carvalho Cunha, Antônio Berdge Kessedjian, Rosalva Filgueiras Almeida, Rômulo Borges Fonseca, Mauro José Sá Rego Costa, Silvia Pires Migueles, Wilson Chamma Junior, Bernardo da Costa Monteiro de Mello, Rogério Belém

Contents

Introduction

What is social responsibility? Where did the idea first appear and how can we know if it is the best solution in terms of companies' action in society? A landmark event in the emergence of a global concern with questions related with social responsibility was the infamous Union Carbide accident in Bhopal, India, in 1984. Countless people died as a consequence of the accident, and the reputation of the company suffered irreparable damage around the world. It starts to be clear that building reputation in the long term can reduce a company's transaction costs with other agents in its environment and favor its activities. This tendency gains momentum with the collective perception of environmental degradation as a result of the large-scale industrialization occurring in the second half of the 20th century, and the global perception that nation states are not quick and capable enough to anticipate and solve these problems. The question of globalization's sustainability begins to occupy the political agendas of various leaders, and companies need to anticipate legislation in order to prevent an increasingly menacing image from driving societies to choose leaders who pass laws making business unviable.

New forms of communication, global interaction, ecological consciousness and the activism of a few non-government organizations were fundamental to leverage this movement. In the root of this change, however, we find a few, deeper causes which affect companies' performance in the short term. Hypercompetition between companies alters the balance of power between consumers and producers worldwide. In the age of mass production, the cost reduction that scale gains generated was so big that consumers would buy whatever companies offered them because this provided significant comfort and economy. However, an increase in the number of companies alters this dynamic. Free to choose from various competing producers and products, consumers begin to differentiate products which, in essence, are very similar, based on their symbolic attributes: Nestlé products are highly trustworthy, therefore, when it comes to choosing powdered milk for the baby, this reputation of trustworthiness motivates paying more for products of that brand. School books talk about tuna fishing companies that use nets that are safe for

dolphins. Children begin to demand the stamp that certifies environmentally conscious fishing on the can. Faced with this, mothers pay a few extra cents for the ecologically correct tuna, and show their children that they are willing to support moral behaviors. Adolescents assert their values by buying make-up from The Body Shop, which doesn't test products on animals. In Brazil, Natura and Boticário have associated their brands with respect for nature. Organizations' 'intangible assets', such as brand and trustworthiness, begin to have book value and affect the value of their stocks. The market begins to seek reliable information about companies, and measuring mechanisms such as the Dow Jones Sustainability Index[i] start to be used to provide security to investors in their investment decisions.[ii]

Consumers make a similar movement, but in the absence of indices for consumption, they choose based on brands. If we walk into the universe of information which is the supermarket, we realize it's not possible for the consumer to suitably inform itself about each product. The cost of information, in terms of time and effort, is simply too high. Buying by brand is using a simplifying resource: the brand condenses the product's image and facilitates choice. Brands, like people, build reputation. Reputation reduces transaction costs, creates trust and motivates interaction.

Social responsibility, therefore, means the creation of mechanisms to seek solutions for a likely efficiency loss in democratic systems applied to business. In general terms, its principles are anchored in an ethic of social and environmental respect[iii]

Of course, the notion of social responsibility makes sense in Brazil and in the rest of the world. But can it solve the main, most urgent dilemmas of Brazilian companies and Brazilian society? Today, we pay a considerable amount of resources in taxes. We have an expensive, swollen state, one of arguable efficiency, in addition to an endless array of corruption scandals. We have poverty and social exclusion problems for which there are no apparent solutions, at least in the short term. The lack of public security and the state's inefficiency generate additional costs for business. The solution would require our capacity to create consistent public policies, with well-designed strategic plans that might expand the possibilities to effectively deal with these problems.

However, we seem incapable of doing so. Many of us would like to be able to exercise a firmer leadership in transforming this reality, but the chaos seems too big, it

seems to have reached a dimension that paralyzes us. We all feel the shadow of a fatalistic cloud hovering over our heads. There's nothing we can do, we say. But deep inside, there is this hope that some path will become clear and we will finally be able to find a solution. Is there anything we can do? Absolutely. This book is intended to be a contribution to debates in this direction. The first step is to seek to understand the causes of this situation, so we can then seek the solution. The origins of this situation, the most fundamental causes of the problem, are in a very long history of authoritarianism and clientelism, of a state which didn't have to dialogue with the society, and a society without mechanisms to promote a participatory democracy that might work to generate pressure for transparency, efficiency and public governance, as well as a culture of debasing work as a way of getting ahead, and the lack of a meritocratic, egalitarian ethic, and so many other correlate problems which classic works in sociology and Brazilian history have addressed so well[iv]. This historical past inhibited the formation of mechanisms of coordination and organization of the civil society to dialogue with the state from a balanced representation of a plurality of interests. The truth is that, today, in our society, there aren't effective mechanisms to produce this efficiency in government. In the absence of a conscious, organized civil society, of associations of locals, of parents and teachers, of cooperatives, and so many others which serve as checks and balances for democratic systems in countries with low power distance[v], which dialogue closely with the politicians who represent them, we end up wondering how to empower the citizen to dialogue with the state.

We are aware that, in democratic societies, one of the paths to solution necessarily includes improving the quality of votes. But there is a series of barriers to that end. One of the ways of choosing is to have access to quality information. But the cost of information about the politician's activities is too high for the isolated citizen. And it is difficult for the press to fulfill this role in an unbiased way. The press is well prepared to accuse, denounce, and expose the entrails of power, but it has difficulties to speak positively without being fooled. Voters end up knowing who is bad, but not who is good. In addition, there is persistent poverty and a lack of quality public education, which aggravates the already bad hindrances in this process. We enter a vicious circle where a few manipulative, incapable, malicious politicians have great chances of winning elections, particularly in the poorest municipalities, with clientelist, assistencialist and patrimonialist strategies. Unethical and

equally corrupt companies feed the corruption circle by providing resources for these politicians to set up their social centers and create their fiefs. These individuals achieve power through these means, and they don't have any incentives or reasons to change this system. The uneducated poor man cannot see the social centers and assistencialist policies for what they really are: a corruption of the political system and a mechanism of maintenance of the relationship of dependence on unscrupulous politicians. A threat to his rights and citizenship, disguised as mechanisms of access to those very rights. A machine of maintenance of promiscuous relationships between companies and local government. Politicians who want to work well and not resort to these mechanisms face great difficulties of acknowledgement. Many end up using this trickery to get elected, planning to improve their actions later, which makes it difficult to differentiate the good politician from the bad one.

The bill is footed by those who want to work honestly. High taxes, public inefficiency, corruption, lack of investments in infrastructure, persistent violence and poverty. How can we work collectively to solve these historical dilemmas in our country? Who has the transformative potential to address this reality?

While the society asks itself this question, a few city councilors, representatives, senators and mayors reproduce the very inefficiency and poverty they pretend to try hard to fight, appointing their protégés for strategic positions in the government, putting people without competence or qualification at the head of public schools, thus preventing a break with this vicious cycle, or worse: feeding it. The fight waged by politicians with a public management vision against the dishonest distribution of positions has few allies. We have a recent democracy which suffers from the lack of formal and informal institutional mechanisms of participation.

How to produce a change in this situation? The first step is to organize, together with values- and principles-based leaders, actions with a focus on expanding people's consciousness. But what expansion is this, and what qualitative change can we generate? How to create a collectivity interested in monitoring the political process and capable of demanding effective results? These are questions which can be thought about and solved through cultural actions. But what are these actions, and how can they work? How can they widen the notion of social responsibility so that companies can deal with problems

characteristic of the Brazilian society? That's the discussion we intend to conduct in this book. Cultural responsibility is, therefore, a branch of social responsibility. It should also be founded on the pursuit of ethical principles in the business environment, yet conceived as a strategy of collective action by companies, with a view to developing the foundations for building mechanisms to monitor local governments' actions in Brazil. This is based on the idea that competent companies need a competent state to develop, and it is of collective interest to promote these actions.

Culture is a fundamental factor for promoting economic development, as we will see further below. There are multiple aspects in the culture of each people, i.e., values, esthetics, types of knowledge and practices, which can favor economic development. Moreover, in culture lies the potential to produce the break with the vicious circle we have created in our public sphere. Culture is a fundamental factor for building the individual's autonomy, which is a precondition for his action as a conscious, citizen-like voter. However, how these investments in culture can produce the desired results in terms of gains of consciousness and autonomy, is something we need to better discuss and plan. The complexity of non-formal educative processes is huge, as is the difficulty to measure and monitor results. In addition, insufficient qualification on the part of many third-sector organizations prevents them from turning their actions into more than leisure and free, extracurricular activities. The atmosphere of militancy, as well as the passion for social change in some members of the third sector, can sometimes generate a euphoria which reduces the focus on the necessary discipline, planning and monitoring of works to produce systematic results. And several of these organizations lack the necessary knowledge and resources to actually do it.

Companies have knowledge of management and results measurement internalized in a good part of their workforce, but employees seldom participate in or follow closely the social and cultural responsibility efforts of companies. Recognition of these skills in employees, as well as their involvement in monitoring these projects, are fundamental, and companies can organize an internal body of volunteers to participate in these projects' management boards.

Gains in terms of results of third-sector actions are fundamental for the intended political effects. Generally speaking, we can say, based on the work of Geddes,[vi] that the

main obstacle to effectiveness gains by the state in Latin America are related with restrictions in the three levels of government, i.e., municipal, state and federal. These restrictions are as powerful as the lack of experience, competence and technical excellence of the human resources in charge of creating public programs, since they can neutralize the effects of each of these components. Research shows that Latin American politicians tend to have an extremely small autonomy of action. If we accept that one of the main ambitions, if not the main one, of politicians in general is to remain in power, then, in any society, in order to affect their decisions concerning public policies and courses of action, it is necessary to affect the set of forces operating over their decision process. Only thus will the politician have the necessary power and incentives to fight politicians who are more committed to the traditional power game. As studies by economists have been demonstrating, as the number of organized potential voters increase, politicians with no support from established power groups have a greater incentive to expand their support to those voter groups as a way of expanding their own competitiveness against politicians already entrenched in power. By recognizing the role of these organized groups, the more organized parties end up finding an incentive in selecting candidates who allow them to build a reputation of effectiveness in the long term, since these voter groups have a continuing influence over their members, and are capable or retaining collective memory about episodes of interaction with politicians. Improving the state's capacity and solidifying democracy are, therefore, linked to the empowerment of society. However, in the dispersion and disorganization of urban chaos, this process doesn't form naturally, and, besides, ethnic culture prevents us from understanding how to act (as we will see further below). Increasing the state's capacity depends on developing institutions that can shape the incentives of individuals who are in government, affecting the way they choose public policies and courses of action. Reducing the power distance between voter and politician is, thus, fundamental for two reasons: the first is that it makes it possible to influence the politician's decision in an informed way; second, it facilitates the development of transparency mechanisms and reduces the politician's range of discretion, thus increasing the cost (in terms of a career plan) of making decisions which aren't for collective benefit.

Therefore, cultural responsibility is different from cultural marketing. Its foundations and goals are distinct. The aim of cultural marketing is valuing a company's

brand. It is normally associated with sponsoring cultural events. Cultural responsibility is a way of supporting society in valuing its own memory, in building its identity, in expanding the individual's consciousness about how certain ways of seeing the world that are characteristic of the Brazilian culture can lead him to adopt behaviors that, had he thought about them more carefully, he wouldn't have, and helping in building a critical, political and informed mentality. With regard to cultural marketing, from an ethic perspective, it should be made with the company's own funds, avoiding the use of tax incentive laws. The use of such laws, which, in fact, allow companies to use public resources in their actions, should adopt as a criterion the public benefit in those actions. Using tax incentive laws for actions of pure cultural marketing, such as supporting big concerts and events, is using public resources for private benefit. Using tax incentive laws for cultural responsibility actions is participating actively in building actions of partnership between the public and the private. It is an action of citizenship. Of course, sponsoring cultural responsibility actions generates, as an externality, brand valuing, but that is not its central goal. The difference in this type of impact on the brand is that the responsible use of public resources earns the company reputation and trust and, therefore, can be confused with social responsibility.

The returns that cultural responsibility actions can generate for society are innumerous. Studies about the tourism sector show that ethnic, cultural and ecologic tourism are the segments with the highest growth rates. Rio de Janeiro has a huge touristic potential, but tourist per capita spending in the city is low, even compared to other cities in Latina America, such as Buenos Aires. In a study we conducted, the reasons for this are clear: a tourist in Rio de Janeiro has difficulties finding restaurants that sell an ethnic cuisine with different flavors and smells than what he can find in his own country. Places where tourists can appreciate the rhythms of our typical folkloric dances and traditional festivities other than carnival are virtually inexistent, practically disappearing in the outskirts. In our two years at the Duque de Caxias municipal department of culture, it was amazing what we "discovered" in terms of the city's immaterial heritage, confirming what Gilberto Gil had said as head the ministry of culture: "The field is planted, what we need to do is hoe it, weed it, in a word, to look after it". There are groups dedicated to jongo, maculelê, ciranda, folia de reis, boi-bumbá, pastoril, quadrilhas juninas of all types,

struggling to give these traditions a chance to survive in the adversity of big cities' outskirts. Masters who know centennial folkloric traditions and maintain their groups with their modest personal income as temporary workers, among others. Our incapacity to transform these resources in economic wealth is amazing. Culturally responsible actions can ensure the preservation of this national heritage and help turning it into resources that can generate jobs and income in communities. And these actions, as we will see below, can help in building local institutions for cultural production and diffusion with an impact on education and citizenship.

While this wasting takes place, in the wake of government's lack of vision and action, people talk about job creation through vocational schools, as if other, cheaper alternatives to generate income didn't exist. There is a wasting of the potential of popular knowledge, of the country's immaterial heritage, of the potential to generate jobs and income in the tertiary sector with a lower environmental impact, and people talk about industrial development as the driver of development in the region that probably has the greatest touristic potential in the country. It's well known that the potential of industry to create jobs is getting smaller and smaller due to industrial automation. The cost of generating jobs in this sector is the highest, given the large capital investments necessary. In tourism, on the other hand, with some vision and low investments, the scenario is just the opposite. It can also generate externalities in the form of a greater valuing of communities' culture, self-image, self-esteem, social inclusion and critical consciousness. We certainly need to support industrial development as a wealth generator, but not with the purpose of generating jobs and income for the poor, as this purpose can hardly be achieved through this means in an economic and environmentally sustainable way. The case of the municipality of Duque de Caxias, as we will see below, shows this well. Within this effort, it's still possible to make social relationship networks denser in the outskirts of big cities and in poor communities, bringing non-school education to a large number of people.

But the heart of this question lies deeper down. The human being is a being which builds himself both as a human being in himself and as a social being as he operates the synthesis of identity and difference. It's in this articulation that he produces the process of self-unveiling, of getting to know himself, of building this being who becomes unveiled to himself while understanding the other. Becoming conscious of oneself is only possible

from one's recognition of one's position in the world, from this recognition of the subject in relation to others and through others. This process of becoming conscious, of forming an identity in the relationship with the other (therefore recognizing difference) is fundamental for engaging in an ethical dialogue with the other. It is the basis and the foundation of a democratic and inclusive state. This is the only way of participating in building a society on equal footing. Power distance, social distance, non-recognition of the other as an equal, all so close to our authoritarian tradition, have hindered this process. This question emerges on an everyday basis, in the way 'nation's saviors' present solutions to 'save the people' without ever consulting it, without giving it the power to speak up. That is a historical tradition that reveals itself in its peculiarity by comparison: when we look at the case of Switzerland, for example, whose first democratic developments consolidate as early as in the Middle Age, with multiple forms of participation, association and freedom, formation of cooperatives and their participation in politics,[vii] we realize how distant we are from being a society with democratic institutional bases out of the sphere of the state per se. In its recent publications, the World Bank points to the same direction: listening to the poor is the safest, cheapest way to produce sustainable local development, but we don't know through what mechanisms to do it, nor what to produce from this dialogue. Not only because of a lack of tradition in this type of encounter, but because of the institutional disorganization of Brazilian poverty and the difficulty facing isolated poor people in urban chaos to articulate their demands and points of view based on how they think about themselves and their reality. The poor are not articulated in extended families, clans, tribes, or organized communities of any kind. Disorganized migration and the growth of favelas created concentrations of people who share the same neighborhood but don't form a cohesive social group capable of transmitting values and worldviews and of articulating as a sphere of power. On the contrary, what we have seen are isolated poor people who are fragilized in their poverty situation. It's in this context that we must reflect about the question of identity and culture and their relationship with democracy.

Culture is produced through individuals' social interaction. In social encounters, individuals build their ways of thinking and acting, their values, their beliefs, their identity and they recognize differences. It's in this process that collective learning takes place, it's where power and coordination mechanisms operate, where one becomes conscious of rights

and duties, and action strategies are formulated. In the historical process of societies, shared ways of interpreting the world become fixed through social interaction. In our case, as we will see below, we have created ways of acting and thinking which allow living with authoritarianism and clientelism, thus hindering processes of collective learning for a democratic life in common.

A quick visit to the outskirts warns us about an issue: there is an appalling absence of places for being together around cultural activities, debating, meeting, reflecting and transmitting traditions. In the mass of small, poor dwellings, masters of old cultural traditions cannot reach youths. This is where clientelist, assistencialist politics operates as the only resort for the individual isolated from the resources of civilization. Individual isolation amidst chaos is conspicuous. However, the local level is the closest one to cultural practices, and it is from effective actions at that level that we can think about building conditions for fully exercising citizenship. It's at a local level that memory is retained and identity built, and it's also at a local level that all this is forgotten due to a lack of recording, transmission and preservation mechanisms. Memory and identity are fundamental for building freedom and autonomy.

The example of Duque de Caxias can help us think about this question: recent historical and archeological surveys show us that various historical routes crossed the territory where the city is now located. Baroque buildings and art emerged due to its position as an important logistic and trade station. There were also various quilombos, most of them sheltered in the lands of the old São Bento farm, which belonged to Benedictine monks. There is much evidence that the priests supported black people in their struggle for freedom. But present inhabitants don't know this. This history and this memory were lost. Many inhabitants see themselves as poor people, outskirts dwellers, lacking basic conditions and without a job. They often see themselves as destitute and incapable of transforming their situation. And so they engage in assistencialist relations. They vote like slaves or beggars, in exchange for a consumer basket or a denture. This behavior is only possible for those who see themselves in this way: with no past and no future. This behavior is not equally possible for people who see themselves as heirs of an epic tradition of struggle for freedom. An heir of this tradition won't sell himself so easily. Dealing with

culture, memory and identity, therefore, can help creating the position of a subject in the world, of a being with a past to honor and a future to struggle for.

When we think about the question of identity, we agree with Castells (1996: 23): identity is the process of construction of meaning on the basis of a cultural attribute, or a related set of cultural attributes, that is given priority over other sources of meaning. Identity is, therefore, a source of meaning and experience of a people.

He quotes Calhoun (1994:9-10):

We know of no people without names, no languages or cultures in which some manner of distinctions between self and other, we and they are not made [...] Self-knowledge – always a construction, no matter how much it feels like a discovery – is never altogether separable from claims to be known in specific ways by others.

Without these sets of meanings, many of which were erased from the collective memory of the Brazilian poor[viii] due to the lack of recording and diffusion mechanisms, without knowledge or parameters to assess the value of popular cultures, legends, stories and traditions, the youth from the outskirt will not be without an identity: he will identify himself with the drug dealer, with the *funkeiro* who praises criminality, with the hard, laborer-like trajectory of his parents, with the consumption of middle-class youths (which becomes a measure of his exclusion).

Not that by rescuing those meanings we can determine or ensure the way youths from outskirts will identify with them. But in so doing, we will be building alternatives. They will have an option, they will glimpse choices, they will be able to position themselves before paths that are not visible to them now.

Still according with Castells, it's important to understand that identities organize the meanings and symbolic identification a social actor attributes to the purpose of his actions, and that, in a society increasingly organized as a network, meaning organizes around a primary identity (an identity that can structure others) which is self-sustainable over time and space. Situating oneself in the network and ensuring one's employability depends on this identity – this ability to understand who one is. And this basis is socially built. But

when society stops doing it, it stops playing its role in containing and mediating social and institutional relations. And that's precisely the process we observe in the outskirts. In this context, citizens feel adrift, acting individually or in bands without rules or based on the law of the jungle.

We've observed this process in our efforts to implement cultural actions in Duque de Caxias. There's a considerable difficulty in having the poor cooperate between themselves, understand the importance of orchestrated actions, invest efforts in associative or cooperative projects which allow them to change their situation and believe in the future. Many don't trust themselves nor believe they can, and they don't believe in others. They don't recognize themselves as part of a same society and don't see, whether in themselves or in others, values that can produce cooperation and trust. We've observed the extremely small trust that individuals have in one another, the operation of a very short-term logic based on a "grab what you can and let the devil take the hindmost" strategy. But we have also observed that this situation can change with orderly efforts. SEBRAE's action has been important, albeit not sufficient, in more severe poverty situations, such as that of the artisans and seamstresses connected with the municipal department of culture. Combined efforts are necessary so that effective, lasting results can be realized.

In this book, we will organize our reading and interpretation of the causes and features of these local development problems we've observed. The idea is to structure an understanding of the question that can serve as a basis for the action of business leaders. We have founded the Juan Molinos Institute to work as a group in developing these ideas and in elaborating these programs in partnership with companies, universities and other third-sector organizations. In the government sphere, the ministry of culture has been coordinating the creation and implementation of the national system of culture, which has a huge transformative potential. Tax incentive laws can give us the means to use this transformative potential at a local level. But the task is too great and requires the collaboration of many. The tools are available. It's necessary to move into action.

The Separation between Culture & Education and Authoritarianism in Action

The poor, ragamuffin boy feels his feet throbbing .... for hours, he's tried to sell his cheap candies downtown. Dirty. Poor. Ugly.
He asks a well-shaved, upright, perfumed passer-by the time. He feels his icy, complex glance: fear, disgust and repulse mix up in the picture of indifference that composes his expression.

Oh, if the eye could not speak. If its wet surface weren't such a crystal-clear mirror, the poor wretch might have managed to ask the time without having to confront himself.

But now is too late – like a Narcissus inside-out, he moves away from his contrary. In his chest, a whirlpool of confused feelings that always haunt these situations. Inferiority, impotence, angst and the desire to be that other, to inhabit his place in the world. A desire that transfigures into hate for everything that other says about himself.

He looks around and sees streets, and crowds who seem to know where to go and what to do. What about him? Where is the starting point? What is the possible finishing point?

The man doesn't notice his angst. He is invisible. And it's this invisibility that gives him irrefutable evidence of his exclusion.

From the comfort of our distance, we think: the way for these youths is education. If we can educate them, keep them in school, they will be able to fight for their own living, to build their place in the sun. But if we look at this solution from their viewpoint, does this alternative make sense? And if it doesn't, how to make them understand the importance of education so they can appropriate the school as a personal trajectory? Many of us think: it's not the youth or the child we must convince, but the parents! But suppose the parents have had similar trajectories, what is the alternative?

Our proposal here is to discuss precisely this distance – a subjective one – in relation to the school so we can investigate its causes. Why some families do not appropriate the school? Or still, why many of our youths, kept by their families in school, have been showing an increasing lack of interest for school contents, generating a dropping out situation that families are not always able to avoid? What does this mean as a behavior tendency in cultural and sociological terms?

The answer lies, we will try to demonstrate, in culture, in two ways: in the ethnic culture, which, unlike Confucianism in Japan, China and Korea, did not develop a set of articulate values which promote the valuing of education; and in one of the consequences

thereof: the authoritarian model of relationship with the other, particularly with the poor, which we have created in Brazil. The very separation between culture and education is, in our view, a product of this authoritarianism, and reduces education to the schooling necessary to enter the labor market, removing from it part of the process of formation of values and critical reflection about the world which is fundamental for appropriating education as a trajectory of life[ix].

If we understand culture as the symbolic process which makes being human possible (p. 17/18) – i.e., if we understand culture as the ways of making sense of the world and of acting on it which differentiate us from animals – it is possible to understand that education is one of the spheres of culture, one of the ways in which we think about the formation of human beings to join society, as well as the means we have created to do it. If we think of culture in terms of ethnic culture, in an anthropological way, then we must ask ourselves what kind of logical reasoning do we Brazilians use to separate culture – as a broad way of thinking about the world and the individual within it – from education, which are forms through which the society transmits, in an organized, explicit way, the necessary contents for this "becoming" of the subject. In other words, to understand what paradigms of thought we have been using to solve our problems, which have been keeping us as though in a vicious circle we would like to get out of.

Much of the difficulty to keep children in schools, to motivate youths to participate more actively in it and to engage families in this effort derives, in the end, from this artificial and premature separation. There is no education that is empowering, transformative of the subject, producer of consciousness and will, without culture. Culture gives sense to being educated. And it's in this respect that we intend to explore here the authoritarianism underlying this separation. In so doing, i.e., in separating these two spheres of life not only in two ministries, two departments, but also in terms of public policies and processes of teaching and reflecting about pedagogical methodologies in classroom, we create a break where the one who is being educated must believe that, at some point in the future, what he is learning today, which is detached from his concrete reality and has no apparent meaning, will help him in his way of being in the world and in his way of situating himself as a subject in the battle of life. It's the same as wanting the motivation to study to come from an act of faith: the belief that authorities know what they

are talking about, and that, in 10 or 15 years' time, I, a poor ignorant child, will see the light and say they were right. Until then, I should be satisfied in obeying without seeing how the things I do can make any sense in my daily life. Well, this is denying the deepest human need for sense! It's annihilating the incessant desire for meaning.[x] In his trajectory, Paulo Freire pointed, in a clear, ineluctable way, to the inefficiency of this educational process. When he formulated his pedagogy of autonomy and his pedagogy of freedom, he explored this question from various perspectives. To think about culture is fundamental for building the autonomous, creative subject. This subject is fundamental for the society of knowledge, which needs people who are motivated to innovate and create, rather than docile subjects trained by an authoritarian education, who are capable of obedience and personal loyalty to their bosses. To think about these questions is fundamental for forming people who can ensure their living in an economic context which seems to move towards the end of formal employment, as we will discuss further below.

From observing the way culture – contained as it is in its ministry and its departments – is thought about in the country, we should ponder: to us, is culture the synonym for art, folklore, popular knowledge and heritage? Is it a way of creating public policies to foment artists' work? Should this professional category have a ministry to ensure them work conditions in a differentiated way from others? Is the entertainment industry different from others, or is there something deeper about the question of culture which escapes us?

The arbitrariness of this separation between culture and education has been recognized in recent efforts. The Ministry of Culture, along with the Commission on Education and Culture (CEC), held preparatory sectoral seminars for the 1st National Conference on Culture and for reviewing the National Education Plan[xi]. But the ministry itself acknowledges that it alone doesn't have the means to solve these questions. It needs the civil society's articulation to institutionalize these solutions. What can we do to help?

We can start by reflecting on why, when we think about educating middle- and upper-class youths, we think of culture as the access to knowledge, values and intellectual sophistication, while to youths from the outskirts we think of "keeping them busy" so they won't get involved with drugs, but will improve their own self-esteem and keep busy. Understanding this can by the first step towards change.

Culture

What is Culture and What is its Relationship with Economic Action:

But what is culture, after all? What forms this concept at once apparently obvious and with a depth that is felt, yet hidden? Many works about the subject of culture tend to acknowledge that the difficulty to approach it comes from the way "culture" is conceptualized. The term culture is presented as a huge umbrella under which all sorts of phenomena are placed. This problem is well approached by Geertz (1989) for anthropology, but it hasn't been examined in terms of the relationship between culture and economy in an adequate way, or in terms of a reflection on the role of culture in the functioning of democracy.

Historically, the word culture primarily referred to the sciences-arts-letters triangle. Public culture policies and the public interest in culture were dedicated to animate and develop these areas and provide support for the intellectual worker. Today, the National Culture Conference, which is the basis of discussions for the implementation of the National Culture System, proposes that, in terms of public policies, we should regard culture in two dimensions: the anthropological dimension, which is the more comprehensive one, where individuals' ways of thinking and feeling, as well as their values, are elaborated through their social interaction, and which is the field where their identities and differences are built and managed; and culture in its more restricted dimension, i.e., as the production that is elaborated with the purpose of building certain meanings and reaching a certain type of public.[xii] In this book, we will be dealing fundamentally with the former dimension.

What is culture in this anthropological sense? Culture is an extremely complex phenomenon. To approach the relationship of this phenomenon with development, it is necessary to reduce it. If we take a more concrete object, e.g., a favela, the importance of reducing the field and thinking about the usefulness, rather than the "truthfulness" of a

concept about the object becomes clear: an architect conceptualizing a favela will probably build a concept like "a group of popular dwellings with no urban planning"; a geologist, something like: "a group of dwellings built on unstable ground"; a sociologist will use the idea of exclusion: "a set of dwellings of a socio-economically excluded group"; a spiritist, perhaps something like "a group of people who have come to the world to pay back a karma debt", etc. There are as many concepts as the necessary uses for them, and none will ever be the "right" one in absolute terms. The concept, as this instance indicates, delimits a cutting that is made in reality to learn more about it[xiii]. It's within the limits of this cut that a given subject will work. This cut often includes a value judgement which guides action. Therefore, the architectural concept that the favela lacks urban planning already indicates the architect's purpose to intervene with reality. The same holds for the geologist (who wants to stabilize the ground) or the sociologist, who believes in the necessity of social inclusion. Therefore, as we think about a concept of culture, before investigating what "culture really is", we must first ask ourselves what we want to do with our study.

Therefore, when we speak of culture, the fundamental problem is not only to rewrite the concept, but to decide what, after all, is our object of study about, and what is its relevance for understanding the phenomenon we want to study.

According with Eliot (1988), the word culture has different associations depending on whether we are thinking about the development of an individual, a group or class, or a whole society. The culture of the individual depends on the culture of the group, which in turn depends on the culture of the society. On the other hand, the culture of the society doesn't determine that of the group, nor the group's that of individuals, who process the information they get through language, rituals and material culture in a personal, characteristic way, and although the individual keeps general tendencies of his society on ways of seeing the world and acting on it, he has a field of action of his own. Because he is a being with consciousness and reason, the human being can reflect about his reality and about himself and act on both.

Here, I propose for us to start from the concept of culture in anthropology so we can understand the role of culture in the formation of human thought, then widen this concept to

think about the relationship between culture and education, and then move into public culture policies and the action of companies

If our study goal is to understand the logic that informs human behaviors in society, our object of study is the symbolic grammar of this group. Geertz proposes the idea that a culture is, fundamentally, a stratified hierarchy of signifying structures in terms of which the human action is produced, perceived and interpreted – i.e., the study of culture is a search for structures of significance, while also determining their social basis and their importance. I believe this is a good starting point to untie this knot: in other words, culture is not a synonym for shared feelings, values or beliefs, but rather shared forms of perceiving reality, shared forms in terms of which those individual values and beliefs can be understood. But what would these structures be?

According with Geertz, the human being is an animal entangled in webs of meanings that he himself has woven. Semiotics, the general science of signs, is the field of knowledge that studies these webs and human communication, not only regarding its ability to transmit messages, but also to build them through symbolic means. For example, we watch an Indian mother pointing his child to a cow and saying, 'Look, the cow!" We watch a Brazilian mother doing the same thing. We look it up in the dictionary. The words, both in Portuguese and in Hindi are synonyms, but only with regard to the reality they denote: the animal which moos and grazes. The words are not equivalent with regard to what they connote or to the cultural meaning of a cow in both cultures (in one, the raw-material of beef, in the other, a sacred animal). Cow only has these meanings in these two cultures because the social imagery of these two societies has produced these meanings, and they are so understood because they are woven in a web along with other meanings, such that these symbolic contents make sense. These meanings form a grammar, which is a structured framework of perception of the world (or various frameworks, often superposed, as proposed by Eco (1997 and 200)). The analogy with grammar can be useful here: just as grammar has a code, a lexicon and innumerous norms and rules, i.e., it forms a framework, but it doesn't determine what can be said or how the language can be used by the speaker, so does culture in the way it works: it is formed by various elements which form a complex framework, but it doesn't determine the human behavior. By understanding these cultural logics, we can understand why a starving Indian won't eat a cow, and very rightly so, and

why a Brazilian will. By knowing the arbitrariness of cultural constructions, we can, as Brazilians, choose to be vegetarian. Or not.

Culture and Behavior

So, by analogy, we can think of culture as the notion of force in physics. Force is present, it affects the way objects behave, but it's invisible. It's necessary to use equipment, certain procedures and strategies to "see" it and understand it. A force acts within a field, which provides the context it operates in.

With culture, it's very much the same. It always exists, there's no human being without a culture. It structures and organizes social behaviors, but it takes a certain effort to see it and understand it. The way it acts is related with a context, which is created by the flow of social interaction. Culture shapes the context, and the context thus shaped helps in maintaining and reproducing culture. Understanding this mechanism is important for thinking about it critically.

Generally speaking, it works as a lens that shows us what to see, and how to see reality. Because it works as a lens, we are unable to see it. Therefore, to study it, anthropologists resort to comparisons: when we understand another culture, we get to know another possible way of being a human being. To proceed with these comparisons, it's important to draw a sort of map, and for this we use semiotics. Semiotics[xiv] fundamentally studies how an understanding of the world, of objects and of relations in human societies is structured and communicated. It starts from the idea that human communication, like the entire human understanding of the world, is mediated by a symbolic grammar, which organizes perceptions, understanding and action. Human understanding of the world is built through language and experiences within a given society. Language structures the perception we have of the real world, according to how culture teaches us to. And it does so through the process of symbolization. Thus, our understanding of the world is built as we learn to name things and experiences and to use this learning to think about them. This process occurs through the mediation of signs.[xv] A sign is the material basis of a symbol or an abstract idea. In the example with the cow, the sign is the word cow, or the sound of cow, which is the material basis through which our senses catch the stimulus. This material

basis is arbitrary, i.e., there is nothing in the animal's nature which indicates that it should be called this way, and it varies from culture to culture and from language to language. Its primary function is to be the vehicle that enables communicating the abstract idea it carries. The carried idea is the meaning. This meaning, in turn, is fixed by a cultural code, a symbolic grammar, and it only makes sense in relation with other elements in that grammar. Therefore, the cow isn't sacred in India for no particular reason, but because this makes sense in a highly complex religious cosmology. The behavior of Brazilians and Indians in relation to cows only makes sense within the logic of these countries' respective cultures, their symbolic grammars, and the specific context where they occur.

The relationship between culture and behavior is a dense and complex one. If, to us, cow is edible, then we create a whole economic structure to produce it. If instead of cow, our culture informs us that dog is food, as it does to Koreans, then we will have other property sizes and other ways of breeding dogs. If dog is not food, we won't organize ourselves to produce it, and if we do, there won't be any demand for it. Culture precedes economic rationality and informs in what ways individuals will organize to produce. We make huge economic efforts because of culture. Bovine cattle didn't originate in the Americas. It was brought from Europe into the New World, despite all the abundance in the tropics, precisely because of the cultural perception of its importance for European food habits.

Likewise, the cultural meanings of person, individual, work, power, social order, among others, also vary from culture to culture, structuring different logics of perception of the world and of action on it. It's precisely through the analysis of the *main* (and not the only) meanings of these terms that we can explain many behaviors of Brazilians we want to analyze. However, like in the example with the cow, we can only perceive culture by comparison, since it's necessary to produce a certain distance, a certain strangeness towards it by comparing it with other cultures in order to study it. To explain the Brazilian culture, we will resort to the American and Japanese cultures to produce this strangeness. It is important to stress here that by no means does the comparison imply the notion of superiority of one culture over another. It is simply a method of analysis.

About the Notion of Individual and Work in American Culture, and its Relationship with the Logic of Meritocracy:

To understand the relationship between culture and economic actions, it is worth reflecting about this relationship in Brazilian companies, which is a more familiar world to the target audience of this book. Barbosa (1999) demonstrates how, in American, Brazilian and Japanese cultures, the concept of merit is related with a certain understanding of what the human being is, and what type of equality must be produced between human beings.

In *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Max Weber affirms that there is something about the lifestyle of those who profess Protestantism that favors capitalism. The religious practices associated with the Protestant Reformation produced psycho-social transformations in the society, which eventually established moral standards and norms that favored saving, hard work, and accumulation. The Christian (Puritan) asceticism transformed work into a cult to the Lord. Weber speaks of the notion of individual in Protestant cultures as related with the religious logic of immanence. According with this logic, God manifests Himself in the world through men, who can apprehend Him from their innermost being and externalize their obedience to Him in actions. This individual, a free, autonomous being on which an axis of responsibility befalls, is perceived as fundamentally formed by two realities: a psychic one and a moral one. From this notion derive several others, about what a full human life is or about what the purpose of human action is. Parekh (2000) explores this question quite well as he demonstrates how liberal thought and some of its main theorists, such as John Stuart Mill, John Locke, Montesquieu and Tocqueville, consider that the ideal of human life necessarily involves the defense of the right to self-determination and autonomy based on the defense of individualism as a higher value.[xvi]

As to Catholic popular piety and Eastern religions, according to Weber, as they create a certain resignation in face of the world, they didn't produce the same effect. As Puritans considered themselves chosen by God, they found in faith the motivation for ethical, intellectual and professional enhancement in an individual way. Weber insinuates that, because of their religiosity, the English were able to produce institutions which

favored trade and freedom (here, it's important to note that Weber is speaking of how local cultures appropriate certain religious ethics, rather than religions per se).

In order to start understanding the weight of a culture over a way of thinking about the world and acting on it, and to understand a little better the importance of understanding culture in a globalization process, it's important to realize that this perception of individual, shaped in the heart of Protestantism, is so culturally specific as that of Indians about cows mentioned earlier, and that the logic of action in these cultures, and particularly in the American culture, takes this culturally specific subject as a given, as they see it through the lens of their culture. A good part of the difficulty to understand the cultural phenomenon comes from the difficulty to perceive human being as a social being, a being of culture and, consequently, to understand the way in which culture provides a logic of action that is behind behaviors. This reduction of subjects to their psychic reality inadvertently drives a reduction of the question of culture to the world of individual representations and imaginary, making it impossible to understand its sociological variables and creating apparently unsurmountable difficulties to the study of the question of culture. Much of economic theories and human development theories start from this culturally specific notion of human being as a given and then generalizes it to the whole of humanity.

But the studies of culture show how this perspective "tortures" reality, in a way, instead of shedding light on it. This autonomous individual, originally Protestant, has a very characteristic vision of economy and economic action. He tends to believe that economic resources are scarce and that he must work hard and accumulate, as his future will be terrible if he doesn't, and that there's nobody in the planet who will take care of him. He is alone and must provide for himself in a world short of everything. Now, in other cultures, economy is not seen this way. Sahlins'[xvii] studies show that Paleolithic societies are the truly affluent ones, if we think of affluence as referring to a productive system capable of providing what people desire. Paleolithic hunters believe that the forest and nature have everything they need and, therefore, there is no need to accumulate or produce more than what is necessary for daily survival. They tend to consume everything they can hunt or provide for all at once, in the certainty that tomorrow they will be able to get it all again. When they aren't, they attribute this difficulty to questions of a religious and spiritual nature. The cause of economic difficulties is metaphysic, rather than economic. In

societies without the basic notion of scarcity, there is no possibility for individuals to maximize resources in the way they do in the market society, and economic rationality is built on totally different foundations. The ability to economically maximize, as some economists say, depends on a perception of economic rationality, of time as a resource, and of the virtues of hard work and accumulation which are not common to every culture. Economic behavior is therefore built on worldviews and values that precede it and give it a meaning.

When we look at the behavior of the poor in Brazil, we also find a marked tendency to wasting and prodigality, similar to what Sahlins finds in his studies. The future depends less on work, effort and continuous saving than on other variables. Simply observing certain behaviors in our society is enough to confirm this: we know that some poor people spend considerable amounts of resources on carnival. But we know this is not an isolated behavior. In Brazil, it is common for low-income families to run into debt to have their daughters' fifteenth birthday parties. What does this behavior mean in terms of externalizing a worldview? What rationality informs it?

The notion of an American protestant individual finds correspondence in other notions, such as those of work and labor, which are also culturally specific and without a precise Portuguese translation. The concepts of work and labor are translated into Portuguese through a single word, *trabalho*, which combines the meanings of both terms, although they are not synonyms in English. A work is a creative activity which generates fruits, resulting from the action of the subject who perceives himself through a logic of immanence, who has God within himself and answers His call, externalizing it through his productive action. It's the free man's work. In turn, a labor is the activity which is done painfully, the punishment for the original sin, a hard, repetitive, non-creative work. The English word for the childbirth process is labor, not work. In the notion of work is contained the idea that, by means of it, God acts through the human being, which is thus invited to participate in the creation. Therefore, one can be a workaholic, i.e., someone addicted to work, but not a "laborholic". It's also important to note that, in Protestant societies, there is a convergence between work and virtue which is not equally conceived of in Brazil, and which, in the former, is associated precisely with this idea of a "divine call". In Brazil, virtue is much more associated with an abstract notion of ethics and moral than

with a concrete interaction with the world, except, perhaps, for the question of solidarity, which has very direct implications for the political choices of Brazilian voters, without a clear counterpart in the American society.

In the logic of American culture, merit is something the hero has, hero being the subject who, against everything and everybody, and relying on himself only, achieves a result, inspired by this internal moral force, which derives from the logic of immanence (Barbosa, 1999). Simply watching an American police movie is enough to see how this logic works: the officer has a feeling that the suspect is innocent. He struggles with all his might to help him. His superior forbids him to continue investigating. He disobeys the superior, destroys half a dozen of the institution's cars and, after breaking various rules and confronting the superior's authority, proves he was right and is acknowledged by everybody. In a society like the Brazilian, he would probably be punished, regardless of being right or not about the suspect. This logic of action wouldn't be accepted, let alone applauded. The understanding of merit as an individual capacity to produce results is, in many ways, net-woven with this understanding of what an individual is and what is expected of his action (it's important, however, to understand that these conceptions presented here in such a clear-cut way are, in fact, an oversimplification of reality, a caricature. In the flow of social life, these conceptions are fluid and deeply affected by the context (Eco, 1997) where concrete social interaction takes place, and it's perfectly possible to find spheres of American social life where these concepts about work, labor and individual have multiple, mutually contradictory connotations in relation to the ones presented here).

Person, Work and Merit in the Japanese Society

Barbosa (1999) proceeds with the comparison between Brazil, USA and Japan, and points to the idea that there are web-like relationships between the concepts of equality, person/individual and the logic of merit in these three cultures, and that these relationships define how the social organization and ethical and moral values are understood in each of them. In Japan, the notion of an individual as described earlier for the American culture,

doesn't exist. The human being isn't perceived as an isolated atom, but rather as somebody who exists through a network of relationships with other subjects, like a part of a wider whole. There is the notion that the Japanese society was built through the collective effort and sacrifice of innumerous generations of ancestors, whose efforts the contemporary reality results from. Somebody who achieves a special result in his work does so by interacting or collaborating with innumerous other efforts by innumerous other people, without which his result wouldn't have been possible. A Japanese is a relational being who constitutes himself into a social being by fusion with, rather than denial of, others.[xviii] Society tends to be a greater value than the individual, even though, in political terms, democracy, with its individual safeguards, has become successfully established as a system in the country (although quite differently from the American system). We will not develop here the whole complexity of anthropological research on the social construction of identity in the Japanese culture, already widely debated in specialist bibliography (Chie, 1973, Befu, 1985, Clammer, 1997, De Vos, 1975, Lebra, 1986 and Kondo, 1990), but rather point to a few elements in this process to facilitate a shared understanding of how culture can be viewed.

While an American perceives himself as an autonomous being who is born and grows up free, and whose autonomy is a value, a Japanese perceives himself as part of a broader whole. In the whole socialization process, an American mother tends to highlight and reinforce her child's personal characteristics, while a Japanese mother socializes her child so he can perceive himself as somebody who relies on the effort and good will of others and who must ideally give up the selfishness of using "I" as the starting point to dialogue with others. In the socialization process of Japanese people, it's common for a youth to be informed and constantly reminded about the effort his parents and all his ancestors made so he could have what he has today, as well as about the dedication he gets from teachers, seniors and related others in general. If a Japanese grows up to be a moral being within the parameters of his society and culture, he will establish himself as an adult as he recognizes the moral debts he has accumulated over life, as well as the necessity to repay them. Therefore, while a self-confident person with a proactive stance in confronting the world, who is sure about his own opinions and capable of differentiating himself from others in the course of social interactions is perceived as mature by Americans, in Japan, a

subject with these characteristics would tend to be perceived as *nama-iki*, or "raw-spirited", immature in the sense of somebody who still hasn't clearly realized his own limitations or the virtue of consensus and receptiveness to others.

Therefore, while in American society the notion of merit refers primarily and fundamentally to the outcome of individual action, in Japan, the notion of merit refers, more directly, to the individual's ability to sacrifice himself for a collectivity, or to help the collectivity achieve its goals.

Obviously, if a management method or a social intervention tool is acritically imported from the USA to Japan, or vice-versa, the chances that it will be perceived as unfair and violative of deep-rooted cultural values are quite high, precisely because the behavior defined as meritorious is not the same in both cultures A technique that confronts values can't be expected to produce, in this society, the same results that it produced in the one where it was generated and where it is an expression of cultural values. The same occurs with public policies. Solutions are hardly exportable, because we seldom understand all the factors that cooperate for their results in the original context.

Another example of this cultural variation involves the concept of work. What Americans understand by work and labor is not the same as what the Japanese understand by *shigoto*, *hataraki*, or even *roudou* (which appears in dictionaries as hand labor – although it's also associated with the notion of providing care for someone, and the notion of serving in the sense of being useful). *Shigoto* (work, job, lit. "things to do"), or *hataraki* (work), are associated with the nature of the activity – in the sense that the activity is part of human nature and is inexorable in life. There is no association between this terms and the same metaphysic weight associated with the notion of work in Christian societies in general, whether Catholic or Protestant.

It's through work that a Japanese finds his place in the world and builds relationships with the society he lives in. His identity as a member of a society or community is concretely expressed through this common participation in collective projects. Work and other forms of sociability and leisure are not dissociated in Japan as they are in the West in general, nor are work and leisure opposed in the same way and through the same logic that opposes them in the West. In addition, belonging to a same community, which is, in many ways, materialized through this common participation in

productive activities, produces, in Japan, ties of belonging, mutual help and psychological comfort that are much greater than in the West in general (Doi, 1973).

Obviously, when we talk about motivation to work in this context, we are talking about very different things than motivating somebody in the USA to work (which is theoretically a contradiction in a logic of immanence, since work is an expression of the individual's inner, creative force) or to labor, and something absolutely different from motivating somebody to work in Brazil.

Person, Work and Merit in Brazil

Unlike the USA and Japan, in Brazil, social subjects perceive themselves now as an individual, at certain quite well-defined times and circumstances, now as a person, as somebody who is, paraphrasing Ortega y Gasset, "me plus my circumstances". In contrast with the USA, where the religious logic of immanence ultimately prevails over other possible ways of thinking about the human being, in Brazil, the prevailing logic is that of transcendence, of a God not only superior, elevated and sublime (as Protestants also see Him), but also a reality that transcends from the subject outwards; this subject, which is guided by a power superior to him, has only a partial, limited degree of control and responsibility over his own destiny.

In Brazilian culture, the subject is perceived as built by his circumstances, which have a quite defining weight over who he may become. Therefore, outcomes are perceived as resulting less from the action of the subject per se than from a sum of factors, of which effort or individual genius is only another, seldom critical determinant. Circumstances are perceived as having a greater weight over actions' outcomes than the effort or intent of the one who executes them. And here, there is the perception that the action of power or of those with access to material and political resources to make a difference at the level of human concrete activities, have a disproportionally greater weight in shaping circumstances than the action of someone who doesn't have any of that. The common perception is that there is very little a subordinate can do outside the limits proposed by those who have power. Much of the American literature on leadership also makes sense only partially in Brazil. Social subjects' perception of themselves as free, autonomous individuals makes

the question of power much different than how it is thought of in a society with another understanding of the human being. In much of American management bibliography, the question of power appears reduced to the question of leadership, as this is the most acceptable and least coercive possible form of power in a society of free individuals who, theoretically, will only bend to the power of a hierarchic superior by recognizing in him a legitimate leadership. Of course, this is not always so in practical daily life, but it is how the logic of culture guides the perception of this phenomenon. Much of the literature on leadership sounds like far-fetched fantasy when we think about our work reality and our interaction with our bosses or hierarchic superiors. Nor does this notion of leadership explain the personal loyalty to *coronéis* [Locally dominant oligarchs – T.N.] in Brazilian history, or to local politicians who dispense favors to those who come to them

And because these perceptions are not isolated, but woven together with others in webs of meaning, these perceptions about the autonomy and limits of the subject's action are confirmed in practice through exercises of power, which tend to be more egalitarian and less coercive in the USA, while in Brazil they acquire quite paternalistic and authoritarian shades. These Brazilian ways of exercising power can be explained when we reflect about our view of the human being: if men are fragile and moldable by circumstances, or if we perceive them predominantly in this way over other possible cultural ways of perceiving the human being, it's natural for power systems to form which can control and protect these subjects from occasional temptations. Formalism and legalism, marked features of our way of managing social order, can also be explained in relation with these same ways of perceiving the world.

With regard to our conceptions of work, we can see in our culture a deep influence from the logic of Greek culture in distinguishing intellectual work from hand labor, thus opposing elite work and factory work (or slave work); clean work and dirty work; noble and common; creative and repetitive; directed to the spirit and directed to life maintenance; meritorious in itself and meritorious in relation to the final cause it serves, and so on. This dichotomy is in the root of the way we hierarchize people, in the origin of our logic of social segregation, and in the way we create a huge abyss between the wages of white-collar positions and blue-collar workers in general. But the most outstanding feature in our culture's conception of work is the fact that work is thought of indissociably as a condition

for life and an act of creation, on the one hand, and as a punishment for a sin and a survival imperative, on the other. Our notion of work refers much less to the nature of the activity that's carried out than to the perception that we are obliged to do it. To Brazilians, work is fundamentally an activity circumscribed in time and space, and organized by power relations.

Thus, a Japanese will tend to have an enormous motivation for a given activity, e.g., planting tomatoes, if he likes it, regardless of whether or not he needs the money it yields. With a Brazilian, motivation will tend to be quite different if he is planting tomatoes because he is employed in a farm to do it, of if he is doing it for pleasure in his countryside house, on weekends. There is a very direct relationship between the subjective feeling associated with an activity and the meaning it has to the one executing it – a meaning that is generally provided by culture. Likewise, the main motivation for intellectuals and others who perform work involving conception is less associated with its meaning as work, as it would be to Americans, but rather with its meaning as a superior activity, which justifies itself, like in classic Greek culture – which doesn't necessarily imply the idea of results and productivity that underlies the notion of *work*, but not the notion of intellectual or qualified work in general in Brazil.

About the Question of Power in the Three Cultures

As Americans build their self-image and identity as individuals, they generally tend to reduce the weight of power and circumstances over them, and to reject forms of control that are not identifiable with the notion of leadership. If I perceive myself as an autonomous, self-determined being, I cannot logically conceive a force with powers to control my action. The power distance is smaller and there are socially valid forms of "disobedience", the major one being, compared with Brazil, the very small social legitimacy of personalism, understood as a form which demands loyalty to persons (particularly those in power positions) rather than to results or to oneself. Competition, including with those in power, is recognized as a positive social value.

The Japanese, in turn, have different forms of power and social ordering. Between these forms, social rules and culture itself create the foundations of a certain conformity

with, and acceptance of, norms which is unthinkable in Brazil or the USA. There is a deep feeling of commitment to the group which is reinforced in the social interaction among equals, thus reducing the need for direct intervention of superiors. This collective feeling of commitment is the basis of a logic of action built on consensus, and it's also a democratizing factor, in that it gives voice to the group and to subordinates in general to pressure leaders to act in benefit of the collectivity. Therefore, while there is paternalism and personalism in Japan, the power distance is smaller compared to Brazil, and the voice of subordinates is much more powerful due to the action of informal institutional mechanisms of consultation and consensus-building. Work community's commitment to results is another powerful form of social discipline, with a very low tolerance by peers towards any lack of responsibility or commitment to the organization. Formal superiors' leadership is exercised more as an exercise of reaching consensus about a strategy of action than an exercise of control over specific actions. Therefore, while paternalism may be common in Japan, the form it acquires in that society is extremely different from Brazilian-style paternalism. Since, generically speaking, a Japanese paternalist superior, for various cultural and logic-institutional reasons, tends to seek the best result for his clan (*iie*, or his company), and to do so inspired by a "path", in a metaphysical sense (*dou*), hierarchy and conformity to it are valued as forms of cultivating a series of virtues, such as tolerance and harmony with others, moderation, humbleness, modesty, patience, courtesy and kindness. Obedience to bureaucratic norms is a way of self-enhancement. Confucianism teaches an ethics without a religious content which values inequality as a form of wisdom.

Therefore, when we observe Japanese quality management models, we realize that quality groups are but the formalization of pre-existing practices that are deep-rooted in social behaviors. When these models are formalized in management methodologies in Japan, the question of plant-floor relationship democratization or the historical trust that workers receive from managers is not even raised, as they are so natural and obvious in this context. In a society where belonging is slowly built over time through demonstrations of commitment to the group, the ties of belonging between workers and the organizations they are employed in are much stronger than their Brazilian counterparts. And because this society doesn't hierarchize subjects socially in the same way as Brazilians do (i.e., by opposing intellectual to hand work, and the strategies thereof), defining who has a position

of trust in the organization depends less on the work nature than on subjects' ability to express sacrifices for the collective cause. Organizations' ties of trust with the plant-floor have no parallel in Brazil. These relations generate continuous improvement and add knowledge to products and processes in a continuous way, which is optimized by formal management processes. In Brazil, we import formal management processes, and some companies were even able to achieve good results through them, but nothing comparable to what might have been achieved through a more conscious cultural adaptation. In some companies, quality circles even drove a greater plant-floor democratization and an increase in communication powers at the bottom of the organization, but this process is constantly threatened by centralizing tendencies of various natures, and it's necessary to create adequate control and surveillance mechanisms to prevent the destruction of the outcomes of invested efforts.

In Brazil, the relationship with power in organizations is quite ambiguous. Managers tend to exercise it in a personalist way, while officially demanding autonomy and results from subordinates (even though they hardly ever provide the latter with resources for producing these results). On the one hand, we can see a clear demand, particularly on the workers' side, for "more humanity in relationships", which, when interpreted in this context, almost always means that the quality of relationships and personal considerations should be above merely professional questions. On the other hand, there is a strong demand for participation and acknowledgement and, consequently, for greater autonomy, but an equally strong reaction against liability for negative results. Generally, there is a huge concentration of power in the hands of managers, although not a conscious, deliberate one, but rather resulting from the fear of delegating and being unable to control results. Part of this ambiguity is owing to this suspicion by subordinates, which is not verbally revealed, also because of the logic of transcendence, while another part is owing to managers' awareness that subordinates will systematically transfer upwards the responsibility for results, since this is the other face of our forms of power concentration. Because employees rarely feel responsible for results, their degree of commitment tends to be much lower than that of the Japanese, and there is little or no peer pressure for dedication and productivity. Generally speaking, there's a lack of internalized normative controls to orient subjects towards the direction desired by managers.

Therefore, culture does tend to be a world of self-fulfilling prophecies, in the sense that it is an integrated way of action and perception of the world which shapes the socially experienced reality and confirms itself in practice, since it is a structuring element of social behavior in various spheres.

These different conceptions of work, subject and power can structure a company's life far beyond what our everyday gaze, contaminated by these logics, is capable of perceiving. The way Brazilian culture views hand labor is responsible, for example, for the re-creation of a "slave-like" category within cutting-edge technology companies, a re-creation which took place with the outsourcing of activities such as cleaning and other, not highly qualified ones. In these companies, one commonly hears that they are totally in line with the latest models of people management and quality of life at work, while the employees of the companies they outsource to are working in extremely precarious conditions within their facilities. Of course, outsourcing didn't generate the same degree of precarization in the societies it was conceived in, where the main goal was to increase focus on the firm's core competences or on its central processes, also because wage disparity wasn't so great to the point it might have generated the same cost reduction it did in Brazil.[xix] The curious thing here is to realize that there is a collective blindness to the conditions of these groups, which are socially invisible to the eyes of members of the outsourcing organization. A blindness that also derives from our "Masters and Slaves" way of seeing the world. This creates difficulties to implement norms of safety and quality of life at work that are very characteristic in our society, and brings us problems related to the co-responsibility for these workers which require us to create our own projects of solution.

Responsibility Transfer, Proactiveness and Entrepreneurship in Brazil

In his comparison between Brazil, USA and Japan, Barbosa (1999) already points to the fact that, in either of the last two, for all types of reasons, the weight of responsibility tends to fall back on subjects at any point of the hierarchy. One does perceive, in general, a much smaller transfer or responsibility upwards in these countries, as in one of them, responsibility for results is individual and non-transferable, while in the other, a subject must give all of himself so the group can achieve its goals. Empirical observations in

Brazilian companies produce abundant evidence of this transfer, but that doesn't necessarily mean that this is an immutable reality or an essentially negative element of Brazilian culture. In many ways, this transfer occurs due to the articulation between culture and power which normally develops within companies, but which can be managed to stimulate dedication towards results, i.e., the difficulty in transferring the responsibility for results downwards stems much more from how power operates within organization than from unsurmountable cultural barriers (although we recognize that these forms of power are legitimized by culture).

Historically living under paternalist and personalist power relations where all that was expected from subordinates was performing the activities prescribed by the bureaucratic division of tasks and by superiors, and where the meritocratic logic of rewarding results was either inexistent or secondary in relation to a hierarchic superior's subjective perceptions[xx] of merit, which have always tended to privilege the quality of personal relationships and/or loyalty relationships, rather than the actual production of results, subordinates learned to associate merit with anticipating the desires of whoever possessed power. Since, historically, if the subordinate dared to do things differently than prescribed by superiors, he would be punished, in most cases, regardless of the outcome of his actions, particularly if he wasn't a friend of the boss, and would be preserved, despite the lack of results, if he was a friend the boss, the logic of entrepreneurial action has never, nor could it ever have, made sense in Brazilian companies. In such a political scenario, entrepreneurial action tends to act against the one who conducts it.

This articulation between culture and power regarding the desirable type of action within organizations obviously affects and is affected by the understanding of what a meritorious behavior is. Research in the oil and petrochemical sector (which might not be generalizable to the other industrial sectors in Brazil, due to the exceptionally high technical qualification of its personnel compared to other segments) indicates the following perceptions of merit, in the order in which they spontaneously appeared: 1) technical capacity (the sector has a very strong technocratic culture); 2) loyalty to the organization; 3) responsibility; 4) punctuality and assiduity; 5) adequate routine fulfillment; 6) good relationship with people; 7) doing what is there to be done without requiring to be told; 8) good-will to cooperate with other areas; 9) a commitment to quality, the environment and

safety; and 10) courage (the importance attributed to this item refers to the risk perception in these industries and the fact that operators are members of the fire and rescue teams).

It's curious to see that in none of the items listed above is there a clear, direct relationship with results, although all items are, in a way, related with them, or are conditions to achieving them. Within this industry, which tends to be a leader in terms of management innovation, merit is much more associated to the notion of proactiveness than to entrepreneurship, in the sense that an entrepreneur is precisely the person who can use the available resources to obtain results.

Looking again for terms' meanings within the context in which they are used, we realize that every time 'proactiveness' was used in the surveyed companies, it refers to the employee's ability to anticipate his hierarchic superior's orders, i.e., to do what he knows his boss expects to be done, without requiring his boss to tell him to. If we compare this conception of proactiveness with the one that normally appears in American bibliography, we can see that the terms are not synonyms regarding their connotative meaning. In English, proactiveness and entrepreneurship are very close terms and, in both, there is a connotation of plunging into action to obtain results. Being proactive is anticipating events, not relaxing, not losing a vigilant attitude necessary to an entrepreneur. In Brazil, this cultural relationship between these concepts is not necessarily established.

Therefore, it is no coincidence that the notion of proactiveness is so directly linked to accepting order and fulfilling duties. The notion of proactiveness is the employee's counterpart for the acceptance of personalist power, in the sense that he will execute each task he's given in the best possible way, but it's not his to think of alternative or better ways of doing the same thing, although many instances can be seen where improvements are proposed and actually put into practice, particularly after the implementation of quality norms.

But while at first it might seem that valuing proactiveness as one of the cores of the perception of merit is a synonym for non-resistance to power, it is wrong to imagine that the perception of the logic of proactiveness is a synonym for passive acceptance of the established order. Accusations – often concealed – can circulate about a lack of competence by the person in power to capitalize on the efforts invested by the team, as well as various forms of pressure for the flexibilization of norms and various forms of limiting

the boss' influence over subordinates' fates. This feeds the creation of power alliances across the organizational structure, as well as various forms of negative conflicts (by which we understand those conflicts which work against organizational goals and steal human resources' focus away from strategy, while positive conflicts are the ones which lead to learning and to the pursuit of solutions in line with organizational goals). Thus, there is an interrelation between various elements of culture, integrated in a complex logic within which human rationality and thought operate. In the same way as culture interferes with the functioning of companies, it also interferes with the economy.

In his article *Attitudes, Values, Beliefs and the Microeconomics of Prosperity*,[xxi] Michael Porter says that, in many cultures, monopolies are seen as beneficial, power determines rewards, strict hierarchy is valued as necessary for maintaining control, family relations must determine partnerships, etc., while in others, development is seen as something which depends on prosperity, which in turn depends on productivity, rather than on control over resources, the scale of government favors or military power. In these cultures, there is the belief that wealth potential is infinite, and that by encouraging competition, responsibility, high regulatory standards and investment in capacities and technology, innumerous benefits will be produced for the whole of society. If people see wealth potential as infinite, they'll tend to allocate efforts into economic production, but if they see it as extremely limited, they'll allocate their efforts into building relationships with those in power so they can get a slice of the fixed pie. There are good works on how this worldview affects economic dynamics in Brazil, such as Barbosa (1999) and Prates & Barros (1997). And works like that of Hofstede (2001), which compares cultures in terms of how they affect economic interaction, demonstrating, among others, how power distance in certain societies can affect autonomy and collective action capacity (with obvious consequences for the formation of both citizenship and proactive, entrepreneurial action). Working with these aspects of culture to produce the critical consciousness of how we all reproduce a model of dependence on power by reinforcing these values in our daily practices is one of the main attributions of leaders in promoting economic and social development from the development of citizens' consciousness and ability to choose.

Culture and Power in the Public Sphere:

The value we give to culture is the one we have learned to give it. In a society where personal relations' ambiguity is privileged, critical consciousness loses relevance. Hence the historically meager investments in this sector. This same cultural logic allows building paternalist relationships with very peculiar traits in government. Let's take the campaign slogan of a recent Rio de Janeiro governor: "making our people happier" – and let's see what it says about our culture.

What this slogan reveals about the type of relationship the politician establishes with "the people": first, it implies the politician's far superior power and capacity compared to the citizen. Here, the politician's role is to know the desires and needs of "the people", this amorphous, needy, unhappy mass and, with his superior capacity, to produce the happiness of a collective of millions of people. The citizen must hope for the success of the former's action and rejoice. Now, in a society where individuals perceive themselves as equal, or where a citizen perceives himself as an autonomous being, the master of his own life, this slogan would never be possible. Citizens would probably say: "Dear governor, look after your and your family's happiness and let us look after ours. If you are able to manage public affairs with some degree of effectiveness, you'll be fulfilling your role well. And we'll be vigilant!"

But, on the contrary, we are always waiting for a charismatic leader, the great father, to come up and save us from our own incapacity to act. The progress of the country is constantly thought about in terms of a governor's "political will". A will that won't happen, as the vicious cycle we've created in our politics is incapable of producing that will. Only through participation, vigilance and pressure for transparency and governance is it possible to produce such a politician, but the lens of our culture somehow hinders this vision. Not that we haven't progressed in this direction. On the contrary. Brazil has changed a lot in the last few decades. But there is still a lot of work to be done.

With these transformations, it becomes clearer and clearer that these changes will only come from a collective action that exerts pressure in this direction, and this will only be possible in partnership with the poor, and not in spite of them. It's a change that will be made with people, through them, dialoguing with them.

In line with Porter, we realize that, in many ways, our culture sets the bases for "unproductive values". By creating the power concentration it creates, and by suspecting "subordinates" as it does, it ends up transferring the ability to regulate society into an excess of formal norms and rules. This excess or norms and rules ends up increasing bureaucracy and hindering entrepreneurial and egalitarian actions, while disguising the system's vices and increasing its costs. Simply observing the effects of Law 8,666 of 06.21.1993 is enough to see this process in action. This law, which aims to regulate the government's action concerning public bids and contracts, is not able to prevent all the deviations we know in the public sphere. A good part of public bids and contracts are informally solved with much decision discretion by heads of government departments, and attorneys-general and controllers-general only correct the formal aspects. In the government's daily affairs, it's common to see "public bids" where the one who's already been chosen to win is required to "get two other offers to cover it up", thus ensuring a purely formal compliance with the law, the fundamental principal of which is ignored in practice – this is done and talked about naturally, as people informally acknowledge that the law petrifies the decision maker's action. This is the country's best kept "secret": everybody knows but pretends not to. Nobody will talk about it, and it is acknowledged that if the law was formally obeyed, then the goals were achieved. The discretion of those in power is ensured in the name of "efficiency", behind society's back.

The development of mechanisms to curb these abuses depends on building transparency and participation mechanisms. But how to generate transparency and participation without citizens who are active, autonomous and interested in improving the state, or also, who understand that their participation is the only way to improve the state?

Culture as a Factor of Coordination and Production

Historically, when economics examined the question of coordinating actions for production, it took into account two factors: price and hierarchies. According with economists, price agreements cause the "market's invisible hand" to work in an orderly manner. When the market doesn't provide what man needs, or when it does so at a price

people aren't willing to pay, there is the alternative of organizing production into a hierarchy: a company is established, a slave-based unit like so many in history, a feudal system or a socialist state, and the desired good, whatever it is, can be produced.

Recently, the question of trust appears as another possible coordination factor: if people trust one another, they associate for certain purposes and cooperate until these purposes are achieved at a low transaction cost; if people don't trust one another, and if they don't fully keep their promises, then the fool who agrees to cooperate will work in vain without being able to produce results. Thus, trust is seen as an asset in some communities, as it creates the bases for cooperation and innumerous possible forms of managing productive activities.

Culture is another coordination factor, although one that's a bit more invisible. When we ask: "Shall we start a meatballs factory?", a series of cultural and social understandings is behind our question. "Shall we" means we are in a market society where associations of this nature are possible. The "factory" part means that this type of production organization is viable (there are laws to ensure agreements, property rights, among others), that beef is food, and that we have the right and the desire to start an enterprise, which means we have a series of values oriented to promoting autonomy and economic freedom. Therefore, each speech act summarizes a huge set of anthropological, sociological and economic understandings from a society that is the precondition for the intelligibility of what was said. Culture is the basis for decoding the speaker's messages, for forming an agreement of minds, and for building the values upon which cooperation and trust can rest. Culture also fixes the concepts of right and wrong and the adequate punishment and reward strategies for each behavior that is to be avoided or promoted.

When we talk about culture as a coordination factor, a question we can ask ourselves is: does our ethnical culture produce the necessary cooperation and trust for collective action? Do the poor see, in association and free initiative, opportunities to change their lives? Do we have these values?

What we have observed from the artisans and seamstresses we have worked with is that the answer to both questions is no. We have followed a group of about 250 women involved in handicraft making and sewing who depend on these activities to support their families or complement their incomes. The women fight between themselves for better

places in the market and for innumerous other minor questions, and they can't see the benefits of cooperation. They don't trust, and they don't expect the others to firmly commit to cooperative actions, therefore, they don't cooperate either. Consequently, they aren't able to organize themselves to buy cheap and accept large orders which might ensure a cooperative's sustainability in the mid and long term. They don't believe in themselves enough to take on a leading role in a process of this nature which might lead to a better collective organization.

Our history can explain part of this phenomenon, although only to a very limited, partial degree. We need much research in anthropology to better understand this process. In a society where social ascension relied heavily on relations with those in power, the competition of the poor between themselves for the favors of the rich and the political elite consolidates as a strategy of life.

Historically, Brazilian lands were owned by a small elite who had received them as hereditary captaincies from the kings of Portugal. This small elite ruled Brazilian politics through deals with the metropolis. Labor was slave. Working hard didn't get anybody ahead. Property was extremely concentrated and prevented any form of accumulation by work-based merit. This reality lasts in Brazil for over three hundred years. It wasn't until the late 19th century, with the immigration of Europeans, that we can see some concrete possibility of social ascension through work.

Slavery ended with the signing of a law, throwing a huge mass of workers into extreme poverty. Progress with some equality ends up taking place predominantly in the regions with a significant immigration, where access to property, means of getting ahead through work and a culture of entrepreneurship prevailed. In the rest of the country, the mass of former slaves can't find other means of subsistence but to seek, in personalist alliances with the same elite which freed them, some way of social integration.

The mass of freed black people didn't form a community, a society or a set of people organized by any common element. The only thing they shared was a certain identity (a negative one, at the time) based on the color of their skin, which gave them a measure of their inferiority and a past of oppression.

History books talk about how, in order to weaken possible resistance projects, the colonizer intentionally mixed black people of different origins, ethnicities and languages in

a same property so they wouldn't be able to communicate and plan rebellions. They preferably mixed black people of rival ethnicities so that conflicts between slaves, as well as their origin-based hate, could serve landowners' interests. Families were dissolved, women were impregnated to produce abundant labor, and negative values regarding labor were created. In other words, there was a continuous work of dissolution of common cultural bases, with no compensatory efforts for the production of new meanings.

Of course, these people didn't live in a cultural vacuum: religions, Candomblé, Umbanda, and even Catholicism provided explanations for the situation, offered symbolic means of action and spiritual comfort, but religions alone couldn't (nor was it their role to) reconstruct everything that was disorganized by slavery in terms of positive meanings for life and work.

The dissolution of sociability ties that was caused by our history requires, in a way, that it be counterbalanced by the development of institutions, organizations or communities which allow these people to acquire their capacity to act collectively and to have their collective interest systematically represented. Democracy is, in reality, this: a set of collective action mechanisms oriented so that the will of the majority can prevail.

Cultural projects that are well-designed for the outskirts of large cities have the capacity to produce that organizing movement, being at once a space of dialogue and discussion, of education and continuing learning, and of political articulation. Canclini, in his studies about Mexico, which, due to the similarities with our reality, seem to explain much of what we see in Brazil, shows that the challenge is smaller than it appears. Outskirts produce a lot culturally. They need some support and a few management methodologies so their efforts can yield more fruits. What's more, people are increasingly willing to participate in these local cultural movements: long distances, hellish traffic in megalopolises in countries like ours, violence, among others, have driven more and more people in large cities to seek activities in the area they live in. There's already a clear movement that seeks to value local things. With the new media, new digital technologies and new means of communication, it's becoming cheaper and cheaper to carry out this distribution in various city areas. Not that people will stop wanting to go to the city's main theater venues and large concerts. But these places are facing more and more competition from localities as territories of cultural production and enjoyment.

It's also in localities that families need most support to educate their children and provide them with guidance in life, and where the effect of the dissolution of values is most present. Many parents in outskirts find themselves without resources, for example, to keep their children away from the lure of drugs and funk baile parties, as well as to protect them from adolescent pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases. But in those very outskirts, boys and girls associate in hip hop groups to fight this movement. And they are alone in this effort.

When we think about culture, art and our children's education, we can't help agreeing with Gilberto Freyre when he regrets that other elements can drag our children's attention very early, and we are so used to it that we don't even realize it. In *The Masters and the Slaves* (p. 473), he already pointed to Brazilian boys' precocious initiation in erotic life. In the same work (p. 504 and 505), he points to the difficulty of a content-centered, memorization-guided education as the reason for the lack of "intelligence elasticity" and spirit of curiosity in our boys. He affirms (p. 505) that the importance for schools to form a "scientific mind" in Brazil was already talked about as early as in the 17th century.

From the heart of our indifference (as Buarque de Holanda[xxii] would say) artistic and protest movements are born in the outskirts, movements that cast new eyes over Brazilian youths' everyday reality: funk, hip hop, graffiti, among others, but the difficulty to dialogue with these movements ends up facilitating isolation or radicalization. Youths from outskirts can't find a way to communicate with society – in the political economy of communicative rights that is established in an authoritarian society, they are sentenced to mutism – as excluded people, they only talk to themselves. They form ghettos and, abandoned to their own fate, use art as a way of letting their frustration or indifference out. At baile funk parties, they turn their backs to our society's already loose morality, and take irresponsibility to the limit with their own bodies. They are victims of their own rebellion and of the lack of meaning and direction in their lives. The apparent hedonism guiding their actions is a way of affiliation to urban tribes, and an unreflective pursuit of belonging, rather than a life option. In Brazilian society, adults in the outskirts abandon their youths

and children to let them discover, through trial and error, through the most painful and harmful ways, how to act in the world.

Anthropologists tend to agree on one point: the greatest threat to human societies is chaos. Chaos is the absence of the order and principles that allow us to perceive reality in an intelligible way. With a little bit or reflection, we can see that culture primarily allows us to classify things and experiences to think about them. In so doing, culture allows us to include an element of nature into a social relation, and to act.

If by virtue of some accident we are thrown in the middle of the Amazon jungle, we will probably die, unless we are rescued in time. If we survive, our life will be one of hardships and deprivation. Why? Why it's not so with Indians? Because they've learned to name and classify plants and animals in the forest. As they name each of them, they apprehend the attributes of the object: if it's good for eating, for healing, if it's poisonous or not. An Indian hears forest sounds and he can tell whether it's a dangerous animal approaching or not. With language, he has learned not only to speak, but to classify, organize and act over that world.

Language is a tool for thought and action. First, we must name things in order to think about a given reality, to only then act over it. If our language tells us, 'it's poisonous', we'll avoid it. If it tells us, 'it's food', we'll eat it. For those who don't "possess that technology", the jungle will kill them. Chaos is the absence of a system that allows giving order to the world. Therefore, over the course of evolution, the symbolic process replaced our instinct as the species' survival strategy. We don't know by instinct whether we can eat something or not, or what our natural enemies are.

Leonardo Boff starts his book *O despertar da Águia* [*The Awakening of the Eagle*] with some interesting remarks about the question of symbols. Searching for its origin, he says that the words sym-bolic and dia-bolic are antonyms. Symbol/symbolic comes from *symbállein* or *symbállesthai*, which means: to throw (bállein) together (syn). The meaning is: throwing things in such a way that they remain together. In a complex process, he completes, it means to reunite realities, congregate them from different points and to cause forces to converge in a single bundle.

Other meanings of symbol have derived from this original one, such as symbol as a distinction signal, a symbol of faith, etc. In turn, dia-bolic comes from *dia-bálein*. It means,

literally: to throw something far away, in a disaggregated, directionless manner; to throw away carelessly. Therefore, diabolic is the opposite of symbolic. It's everything that disconcerts, disunites, separates and opposes. Both social life and personal life are woven by the symbolic and diabolic dimensions: love, solidarity, union and convergence on the one hand, and enmity, hate, impiety, disunion and divergence on the other.

When we talk about values-based leadership in companies, when we talk about the importance of firm action by people who share life missions oriented towards social transformation, what are we talking about but a personal decision to work for the symbolic and to fight the diabolic? Isn't this the deepest dimension of good? Isn't this the essence of a transformative leadership? Our history has promoted the victory of the diabolic dimension in the way it has produced exclusion and poverty. We must reverse this scenario by acting in precisely the opposite direction.

Culture and Art

How can this dimension be found in art? Plato, in one of his most famous texts, the Allegory of the Cave, talks about human ignorance and the pursuit of truth in an imaginary dialogue in which the philosopher Socrates and Plato's brothers Glaucon and Adeimantus participate. Socrates speaks of the myth of the cave as an image of human ignorance. He asks Glaucon to imagine men who have been chained from birth by their legs and necks within a cave with a single entrance for light. All the reality they can see is shadows projected by the light on the bottom of the cave. Because the shadows are the only thing they can see, the men believe those shadows are the reality of things.

In a free interpretation of Plato, what can we associate the cave to? The cave can be the human body itself. The human being cannot apprehend reality in itself, but only through extremely imprecise sensorial impressions. We have seen this in the concepts of language: the words of a language are tools for thought. What is the reality of a cow? What is the truth about it? The Indian, the Brazilian, the Chinese, or the American truth? All of them. And none of them. Like with the concept of favela, the way we understand reality is a projection of our systems of thought.

To believe that the way of seeing reality that our culture produces is reality itself is to be chained in the cave and confuse shadows with the real.

Our own body can be the cave: our eyes don't see reality as it is. If they had a greater precision and range, we would see other things and with another definition. If they were like telescopes, we would be seeing details of the universe; if they were like microscopes, details of matter; if they covered a 180-degree angle over our head, like with insects, we would be able to see other angles at once; if we had another "lens kit", we would see other colors. What we hear is also much more defined by our ear as an instrument than by the sounds that exist in the world. If we were like dogs, we would hear other things and in different frequencies. The same holds for our touch and taste. Thus, our body allows us to perceive certain aspects of reality, but not reality in itself. The edges of our table wouldn't be straight if we could see at the molecular level.

We are beings tied to a series of limitations. First, to our body, then to our culture and language, to the systems of power and status, to the logic of sociability, among others. In terms of language and culture, it's easy to see how we are unable to think of a cow as a sacred animal or to communicate that to another human being using Portuguese language. When I say 'vaca' [cow] in Portuguese, I transmit, whether intentionally or not, the set of possible meanings in our language, which is cow as an animal, cow as food, and cow as an insult. In this sense, Umberto Eco says that, rather than speaking language, we are "spoken by it". We can't think without the concepts of language, nor to communicate outside it.

But other languages produce other understandings of the world, different from ours. More than to learn to communicate the same contents, to learn another language is to learn to think through other means. We've seen this in the examples above. There are infinite others.

Art and science widen these domains of language, create new languages and expand the limits of our body. With Cubism, Picasso allows us to see an object from all its angles at once. Something our eyes don't allow us. Literature puts us in contact with other ways of thinking and feeling about the world, thus facilitating our understanding of other realities. Music takes us to other esthetic dimensions. Science allows me to conceive the atom, the molecule, microeconomics, to know what quantum means, and measures that my senses don't allow me to apprehend and that my mind can't conceive by itself. Science produces

words, and in producing them, it widens our universe of thought about the world. I can't conceive a billion, but I can calculate it and have a notion of its measure. Something that somebody with less education cannot. In this sense, education, culture and art mix up in an inseparable way. They are ways of thinking about the world, of creating consciousness of its context, of seeing the limits of existing knowledge, and of exceeding the limits of the cave we live in.

Art and culture allow experiencing and building civilization. They are forms of unveiling of the world to human beings, of expanding their capacities. Our necessity of art is such that philosophy, in all its effort to explain it, often falls back on arguments of a metaphysical nature: art brings us closer to God, it allows us to exercise our most divine capacity: to Create.

Therefore, public culture policies are fundamental for various reasons. One of them is that art's exploratory aspects have very small chances of being acknowledged and valued by the market. Another one is that institutions which preserve collective memory and traditions are necessary. And still a third one is that the diffusion of culture needs to be promoted for its own sake, for is educative, civilizing aspect, regardless of its ability to generate box-office revenue. All these aspects are obviously of public interest, and they are very different from the promotion of spectacles and entertainment pure and simple. A public culture policy must be different from the logic of bread and circuses that ancient Romans viewed as a strategy to keep masses under control. They are strategies for widening human consciousness, for empowerment and freedom. As the example of the cave shows, freedom depends on knowledge, as only through it can we see other dimensions of our reality.

These relations are not always clear. In his book, *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective*, Peter Berger states something worth repeating, i.e., culture is like sociological systems (of power, status, roles, etc.) in general, also in that the less individuals know about it, the greater its power over them. As they understand the logic of a culture, subjects have their possibilities of choice widened, because they come to understand how their culture shapes their worldview, and can thus seek to break those limits. He goes as far as to say that, in ignorance, we are like puppets, manipulated by

forces we ignore. Only when we are capable of seeing the strings that move us are we capable of cutting them. Thus, understanding culture can help to form a free subject.

Art and science are fundamental means for expanding this human capacity of seeing new questions related to the world. Generally speaking, an object is defined as artistic when complex factors such as individual intention, the interpretive context of art works and the definition of what art is in its institutional context concur for this object to be seen as singular. To fulfill its role in widening the human world, art must be understood with regard to these intentions. Many artists and critics challenge this notion: they argue that all the audience needs is artistic sensitivity. However, in his study of the fields of art production, Bourdieu demonstrates that this is a logical impossibility, as each artistic expression has a code, a lexicon, and makes statements that can only be read within the broader context in which it was created.[xxiii] Educating for art is to introduce the student in this world. Something that, looking at today, no institution is doing in an adequate, systematic way for the whole population of youths and children we need to educate.

The argument that sensitivity alone is enough to appreciate art and to grow with it is in the basis of an elitist vision of art according to which some people are born with a special sensitivity to understand it, while others can't due to a lack of these natural, individual attributes. In his struggle against what he called symbolic violence, Bourdieu sought to expose this fiction. According with him, the reproduction of social inequality in educational systems is carried out precisely through these means: When we deny that the elite's "sensitivity" derives from a long educational process, and reduce it to natural attributes and virtues of these people, we are legitimizing inequality. To him, investigating and fighting this logic is the way to produce equality of access. The sensitivity of those who "love" art is cultivated within a family system of class and values that educates the senses in this direction. Accusing those who didn't have access to that of lacking sensitivity is a terrible form of violence, as it directly attacks the essence of the ones who, supposedly for some flaw or deficiency on their part, are uncappable of seeing this obviousness that other, so naturally enlightened beings can see so well. It brings down their self-esteem and their possibility to dream about having access to this knowledge, as it builds a feeling that it's out of their reach and it's not for people like them. It is fundamental, Bourdieu said, to change the words or the representations about this question. This is the great step to

transform things. The education that reproduces inequality is that which denies the poor access to the noblest resources of the spirit under pretext of giving them a more pragmatic education oriented to putting food in their plates. This "good intention", apparently more rational in terms of how to employ social resources to remove persistent poverty, unintentionally maintains it by allowing the reproduction of ignorance about fundamental elements of life. It sentences the poor to a life that is humanly less worthy, poorer of meanings and values and with less alternatives.

But access to art and culture doesn't have to be access to the Louvre or to European art, it doesn't require huge capital investments or exceptional human skills. Access to art and culture is, fundamentally, access to the linguistic competences and complex systems of thought that form the capacity to decipher and intellectually handle logic and esthetic systems that can be approached anywhere and with different types of resources. They can be approached in a visit to a baroque church in town or to a public library with its art books, in participating in folklore and popular arts, in discussions about the trajectory of science and techniques in companies in the area, and with innumerous resources available.

Today, the difficulty to proceed in this way is related with two central elements: first, teachers' qualification and sensitivity to do it, and second, the inexistence of didactic, artistic and cultural material available for these communities and for qualifying these teachers.[xxiv] There is abundant raw-material, but a lack of investments in turning them into "educative resources".

In a city like Duque de Caxias and others in Baixada Fluminense, for example, there are no public or private places to house the research and production of material to that end, nor resources to turn them into finished products to ensure the enjoyment of videos, books, digital games, cultural tours, among others. The government's lack of resources and vision to make these investments is historical in Brazil, as is the accumulated demand.

The historical underinvestment in this area creates difficulties which today are unsurmountable for teachers individually. Historical churches and monasteries in the region are destroyed by the weather and by insufficient maintenance resources. The lack of a basic museological structure has forced the church to hide its art works to avoid thefts, which have already impoverished its heritage; the inexistence of places and resources for education is already severe in schools themselves, where there are no classrooms or

resources for extracurricular activities. The lack of resources to open and keep museums and art venues is paralyzing. The lack of qualified teams to approach these contents in a ludic and motivating way is clear. The difficulties of access to this knowledge are much greater than one can imagine by looking from outside.

Other Questions about Art:

Leaving the objectivity of historical and sociological knowledge aside and plunging more deeply into the world of art, we can ask: what is the role of music in our lives? Who hasn't found in music a deep comfort for his suffering? Who didn't have a better understanding of the question of love by learning from Djavan that love is a desert and its fears? Or from Caetano Veloso when he says that language is my nation? Who wasn't able to understand the horrors of war by watching a film, or wasn't touched by the suffering seen and then changed his point of view on violence? Art has the capacity to turn suffering into happiness through the way it produces the reprocessing of emotions. It allows the cultivation of sensitivity, which teaches us to relate with the other. It shows us the value of innumerous things we wouldn't value without this cultivation. How to conceive the combat against violence without art? How to form non-violent generations without this cultivation of sensitivity to the other's pain? Without the bases to respect difference?

Art allows us, in an exceptional way, to understand the other's point of view, to plunge in his subjective world, to integrate ourselves with esthetic domains, to understand and value beauty, to share our views on beauty based on the forms we materially represent it through. Art teaches us to exceed the world of animality to integrate ourselves into more sublime spheres of human life. In this perspective, it grants us humanity. Given these questions, how can we not understand the role of art in the combat against violence, in producing understanding between peoples, in respect for difference?

In addition, art can help us organize perception, organize and express what we consider valuable, and record our experiences – i.e., to share what makes us more essentially human, which is our capacity to produce representations about the world and communicate them.

The change in the viewpoint on public policies regarding art is not without a motive. Until the 1970's, in our academic production, culture appeared as subordinate to economic development. Today, it appears as a factor of man's liberation. The understanding of the role of art and culture in human being's harmonic and integral development is such that UNESCO, in its cultural citizenship principles, seeks to ensure the right to one's own culture, the right to cultural production and access to culture as fundamental rights of human being. In the appendix at the end of this book, we reproduce the contents of Agenda 21 for Culture, in case the reader wishes to know the UN's and UNESCO's commitment to the subject.

According with Nietzsche, art is a creating force, a life drive which defines man as an artistic being, one which, through creation, experiences and transforms chaos and conflicts. The symbolic is, therefore, of the nature of art.

Culture and Identity

Who am I? What am I entitled to? What are my duties? What relationship should I establish with others? How far can I go in pursuit of my self-interest? Who can I become?

Human identity is the fruit of a process in which cultural dimensions, the socialization process and individual personality dimensions interrelate. Anthropologists and sociologists don't grow tired of repeating that the origin of identity is social. If we are born to an indigenous tribe, we will be Terenas, Tupinambás, Guaranis – with their characteristic ways of thinking about the world and acting on it. If we are indigenous women, we will be the women of warriors, we'll collect food and raise our children according with their traditions. If we are men, we will be warriors, we will fish, hunt and fight. Indigenous children play at being indigenous adults. They practice, first in imagination and at play, and later in more organized practices, the contents of the professions which will make them who they will be. Along with learning the necessary contents for this "who they will be", they practice and learn how to build this future. Who they owe respect to, who they owe obedience to, who they must protect, what their mission in life is, and what the strategies

are to achieve it. Learning the contents of the art of being a hunter or a potter is not detached from the art of building oneself as a human being in a given society.

Poole differentiates these forces as follows: the socialization process is natural to the whole human species; it's a requisite of the species whereby an individual is educated to participate in a society, which consists of interaction patterns pragmatically formed, negotiated over history, and coordinated and replicated in a standardized way. In the socialization process, children and youths learn what the society's structures are and how status and roles are distributed in it. Culture consists of the types of knowledge that are (more or less) socially distributed (including the knowledge about social interactions) and manifested in perceptions, understandings, assessments, intentions and other orientations that inform and form the imagination and pragmatics of social life from the always imperfect viewpoint of this society's members. And individual meanings are the characteristic forms in which individuals attribute meanings to these social experiences and knowledge, as well as the psychological forces affecting how individuals configure the learning of social interaction processes and culture.

On the other hand, certain cultural and social forms only exist because individuals put them in practice in their interaction with others. A living culture, unlike dead ones, exists only because people use the meanings it fixes for understanding themselves and others in a given society. Therefore, cultural and social processes provide the bases and contexts on which human personality will develop and individuals thus formed by culture and socialization forms will reproduce them over time, forming institutions that fix these forms of thought and action. The socialization process facilitates the learning of certain contents and gives them a meaning. Culture guides certain socialization processes. There is a circle of production and reproduction of contents, meanings and interaction forms which are reinforced over an individual's concrete experience. Massages about personality and character, about the I and individuality are, for the most part, tacitly taught and learned in this process of socialization and cultural learning. It's in the interaction with other members of society that these tacit contents are negotiated, interpreted, and finally internalized[xxv]. The process of enculturation is the process of adaptation (or maladaptation) of individuals to the interpretations, representations, expectations, assessments, feelings and intentions in

their sociocultural environment. Research of enculturation seeks to understand how these cultural schemes are acquired. As a result of this effort, we can say that these schemes, which are widely shared in a society, are fundamental to form the perception, recognition, interpretation and apprehension of other ways of processing information which allow someone to situate himself in a context where he must act and guide his actions. Cultural schemes, as we saw above, consist of a certain number of conceptual elements connected by a semantic network.

Mary Douglas, after years working with this question, affirms: it's the institutions which confer identity. According with her, "It is well said that individuals suffer from the bounding of their rationality, and it is true that by making organizations they extend the limits of their capacity for handling information". Institutions, in turn, are established by cognitive apparatuses (the example of how to think about a favela can show us how this institutional/cognitive logic works – the architect sees the world in certain way, as a member of a certain profession, the economist in another, and so forth, i.e., our belonging to certain institutions organizes our way of seeing the world).

In order for us to understand one another and to dialogue, we must have common categories of language and thought (which obviously doesn't mean agreeing on everything). It's the institutions which provide the bases for the agreement of minds. Institutions reduce disorder and incoherence, but they do so by means of a process of continuous effort through which they allow gains of complexity in an orderly manner. In large urban agglomerations, with the continuous exposition to the media and sociability-disorganizing social movements, as well as the lack of public spaces and venues for building a ludic sociability, cooperation doesn't develop naturally. Observing poor people shows, in fact, a life with a lot of isolation and individual struggling to solve problems. The so acclaimed sociability of the poor is but a set of negotiated reciprocity actions between individuals to solve isolated, specific problems; these are palliative, short-term actions. Through these mechanisms, the sense of similarity, of belonging, of communion of values and principles is not established with enough strength to fight the symbolic disorganization in these individuals' lives. A complex ordination of the values and types of knowledge in these groups depends on a continuous effort (Douglas, 1998: 64), and this continuous effort must be maintained by coordinating institutions and other, more complex orderings,

otherwise, the collectivity in question won't be able to neutralize the hostile forces that operate to destabilize them. These hostile forces can be of various natures: the hedonist, individualist appeal of advertisements, the lure of drug dealing, the frustrated desire for consumption goods, which personal economic means don't allow to satisfy, the size of difficulties to be faced for survival, the lack of trust in peers because of a habit of taking advantage in the short term, ignorance and the lack of formal education leading people to distrust what they don't understand. As individuals unconsciously select what they believe and what they don't, they also select their allies and adversaries. This process, which is natural to the human being, starts already in babies' efforts to learn what is good or bad for them[xxvi].

Man doesn't only think, he also acts. He doesn't only have ideas, but also values. To adopt a value is to hierarchize.[xxvii] This is fundamental for social life and for imposing order on experience. Values guide us not only about what to do or not to do, but they also help us allocate the resources we have in one direction or another. Let's return to our boy: returning home with the meager resources he earned selling his candies, he goes up the alleys in the favelas and sees other boys like him, but respected like drug traffic heroes who fight the police. They wear fancy trainers. They don't look ugly, dirty or shabby. The downtown man, with his icy glance, told him very clearly who he is. Should he now tolerate the rejection, his low self-esteem, hand the money from the candies to his parents, change clothes (??) and go to school? How will he build this iron will? What values will allow him to do that? What would be the meaning of this action in his context of life?

Were he well-dressed and in fine trainers, the downtown man would have treated him better. Boys and girls in his school would respect him. Will education lead him to that? Yes, probably, if he can stand this situation for the next 10 years. But we must pose two questions: 1) is this bearable? 2) does he see this alternative as a valid one? The most likely answer is no to both. Which poses a third question: can we help him? I am totally convinced we can, as long as we can look at this situation differently than we have historically done.

Culture for the Left and for the Right: Anomy, Alienation and Superfluous

Thinking in an organized way about public policies and strategies of collective action for culture is not easy. Complex societies' difficulty dealing with the question of autonomy in a systemic way is old. Both the conservative right (associated with economic liberalism) and the Marxist left, for different reasons, are anchored in paradigms of thought that prevent this discussion from progressing.

The Marxist left has in Marx's very theoretical framework the greatest obstacle. Marx needed to justify workers' collaboration with their employers. In a contract-based, apparently free society, why was the working class acting against its own interests? He asked himself. The answer came from the concept of alienation. The concept of alienation has been used by various disciplines, often denoting quite different phenomena. The history of the concept of alienation is long, with references to it appearing as early as in Greek philosophy and medieval theology. In its more direct relationship with contemporary concerns, this concepts appears in Hegel and, later, in Marx. In both cases, there are metaphysical presuppositions about human nature which serve as basis to think about the construction of the ideal, unalienated human life[xxviii].

In contemporary writings, a few psycho-social approaches have been used in which a vague association predominates between factors of modern society, such as mass consumption, mass production and others, and feelings of anxiety, lack of power, lack of meaning, lack of norms, etc., experienced by individuals.

The authoritarian core of the notion of alienation lies in the idea that a core of people, a party or leaders, can claim to know the true interests of people whose consciousness is not valid as a parameter. Obviously, this superior ability to interpret is possible on grounds of a Marxist interpretation of history that alienated people ignore and which is a logical precondition to affirm that these people's conception of real is the product of an ideology and, therefore, susceptible of denial. Because it viewed superstructure (the system of values, beliefs, myths, legends and religion) as the dominant ideology, Marxism had logical difficulties to conceive a public culture policy that valued these elements.

This may sound similar to what we propose when we suggest the possibility of intervening in this domain and when we affirm the importance of the action of transformative leaderships, but it differs in essence. We believe that people should be

understood in their own terms. They are what they say they are, they believe what they claim to believe. The idea of cultural responsibility lies in helping them to learn about the trajectory of their society, to know and recognize their cultural heritage so that, based on this knowledge, they can define what they will do: whether they will organize in cooperatives to produce fabric painting with Afro-Brazilian esthetics, if they are Afro-Brazilian, or to produce CDs and indigenous handicraft, or, on the contrary, they will fight these tendencies, asserting aspects of equality with people of other skin colors, or feel proud of their ancestors, or seek another trajectory in their future. In sum, to understand how they situate themselves in the world, how they find their way around the apparent social disorganization in the outskirts.

The so-called "right-wing" sociology got its inspiration particularly from Émile Durkheim. Unlike Marx, Durkheim wanted to understand "the abnormalities" caused by the social division of labor in modern society. Differently from Marx, who saw man as naturally good and rational, requiring a fair society to develop his essence, Durkheim saw man as a bundle of desires that needed to be regulated, tamed, repressed and directed for the good of social order. To Durkheim, the social division of labor, albeit positive in itself, carries centrifugal tendencies which disaggregate the social body beyond the point where spontaneous solidarity could emerge. Individuals therefore cease to feel that there's a common work being shared by those beside them, and don't see in them members of the same community. The destruction of this communion spirit dissolves the influence of groups on individuals, creating a false feeling of independence which makes them disrespect the social order and the values and norms of the group. The correction of social order could be produced by a communion of beliefs and feelings capable of neutralizing the pressures caused by the social system's inequalities. In this case, cultural actions would be an attempt to discipline the social body and inculcate values capable of making peace and harmony prevail in face of the inequalities – which Durkheim considered natural – of the social division of labor.

A public culture policy under this model would be a terrible form of indoctrination and political violence, one that is hardly defensible based on ethical principles. Therefore, the right has preferred to be silent in this respect.

Anomy and Alienation

Both the concept of anomy in Durkheim and the concept of alienation in Marx are psycho-social concepts that contain specific hypotheses about the relationship between social conditions and individual psychological states. Common to both is also an underlying theory about human cognition. Building on Hegel, Marx tries to change the central role that the latter confers on consciousness in the formation of identity for the role of concrete human activity as the fundamental reality of human development. According with Marx, human consciousness is formed from the concrete relations of production (which define who is a worker, a bourgeois, etc.).

The thoughts of Marx and Durkheim are incompatible. The core of this incompatibility resides in the fact that, to Marx, the individual's self-surrender to society, his acceptance of its norms, values and beliefs, which is fundamental for the solidarity proposed by Durkheim to exist, is seen in a negative way. After all, if we understand society from a political-economic perspective, the individual's participation in this organized set of a society of classes is a synonym for submission to, and acceptance of exploitation.

Curiously enough, if we investigate what is stolen from the individual in the phenomenon of anomy, which Durkheim points to as the source of social disaggregation in capitalism, it is precisely a set of values, principles and feelings of social integration.

This dichotomy between right-wing and left-wing sociological thoughts has created a subliminal agenda to approach culture which we need to unveil. To the right-wing thought, fighting anomy has come to be seen as a synonym for producing social order, and the idea of instilling adequate values and beliefs resulted in efforts to create, in school curriculums, disciplines such as "moral and civic education". Values have become a synonym for the drilling of thought to produce social order. To the left, any action in this direction expanded the alienating tendency of the capitalist society, and culture thus comes to be approached as art and heritage. The individual's autonomous reflection about his identity should wait until the left-wing elite produced the material conditions so that freedom of thought could occur without bourgeois ideology. In the meantime, a certain critical education comes to inhabit proposals for education, in the core of which are

revolutionary values and worldviews. Curiously, this form of education ends up creating the same indoctrination tendencies as the right wing, and it is also a form of symbolic violence which denies the value of what people know and identify with, to replace that for values of another group.

Culture and Liberal Thinking

Liberalism, in turn, doesn't create the bases for thinking about this question. Produced in a cultural context where the human being is conceived as isolated, as formed only by its psychic and moral realities, it is unable understand the role of culture in the constitution of the individual. About this question, Geertz notes: the Western (and here, perhaps we might correct it for European) conception of person as a clearly delimitated, unique entity, with its integrated motivational and cognitive worlds, a dynamic center of consciousness, emotion, judgment and action organized in a coherent whole which relates with other similar wholes and with its social and natural environment in a way that reinforces contrasts and differences is a very peculiar and characteristic idea among the possibilities of cultures around the world.[xxix]

This conception of man as a being isolated from society, rational and utility maximizer is incompatible with the notion of culture in its essence. How can this individual be at once free, autonomous and rational, and formed by something exterior to him in the construction of his identity and worldview? In this view, culture ends up being treated like other consumption goods: a matter of choice and a rational decision based on the individual function of utility, utility being, in this sense, a black box where psychological factors and others of different natures are mixed together. As a consumption good, it makes no sense to treat it as the object of public policy, since the market is significantly more efficient in matters of this type. The whole formative aspect of culture is, thus, abandoned to the action of the invisible hand of the market. Therefore, its transformative potential isn't realized, since the market is not capable of producing the necessary coordination of actions to manage such a complex phenomenon. In fact, the functioning of the market tends to eliminate traditional cultures, as well as immaterial, historical and architectural heritage. These goods, which are of a public, rather than private nature, require protection and

regulation mechanisms. The private interests of the entertainment industry and real estate speculation, if disordered, can create a process of destruction of this heritage.

Culture, Material and Immaterial Heritage as Public Goods

The public nature of these goods doesn't seem obvious, but even in economic terms, it's possible to defend it. We just have to think, for example, of the benefits for the tourism industry that preserving the architectural and artistic settings of Paris or Venice can generate. Obviously, the great economic value of these high touristic turnover areas is directly related with the capacity of these societies to preserve the architectural and artistic settings that arouse worldwide interest. However, to an individual investor, it would be extremely profitable to be able to demolish some of those buildings to build a shopping mall right in the middle of the large touristic flow. We know that if this is allowed, in less than one generation, the whole setting will be destroyed, and the malls will no longer have anybody to sell to, since the destruction of the heritage kills the goose that laid the golden eggs of tourism in the region. If the architectural settings are preserved, business will be good for all in the mid and long terms. Therefore, from the perspective of individual interest, it would be interesting to be able to destroy part of this heritage, yet forbidding others to do the same. If one exception is allowed, this logic expands and we'll have various individuals trying to corrupt the government to have that exclusive right, believing that only in their case the losses will be counterbalanced by a better service to tourists, while wanting the rest of the setting to be preserved.

History, as well as material and immaterial heritage, form the set of intangible assets of a society or a city. They can generate attraction for a series of businesses and become the theme of a series of products which, because of their specific characteristics, can add value to their brand. A handicraft from Marajó Island is different from one made in the Pampas, which, in turn, is different from those of Parati, and so on. The possibility to develop creative industries based on local traditions is huge. Embroideries from the state of Ceará are known across Brazil, and they are export products, generating a large amount of jobs in the regions where they are made. Clay handicrafts from Jequitinhonha Valley, with their original esthetics, produce resources for one of the poorest regions in the state of Minas

Gerais, and are now being sold across the country. These traditions are the source of competitive differentials for innumerous micro- and nano-businesses spread over the country and around the world. Each of these traditions has its masters and its own production and reproduction dynamics, which, if not well looked after in their own terms, can be turned into something of lesser value. For example, the great attractiveness of hand-made laceworks made by embroiderers can encourage the emergence of small manufacturers which make similar, lesser-value, machine-made products. These products of lesser quality and inferior artistic value can predatorily compete with embroiderers in the local market, serving lower-income tourists or those who want to buy larger quantities at a lower price. Over time, the embroiderers' business can be rendered inviable, and the disappearance of traditional embroidery techniques can eliminate the status and value of the industrialized product itself, which, in the absence of the higher-value product on which it built its sales as a similar good, will also lose its market.

Creating mechanisms of regulation for product quality, fidelity to traditional techniques, and certification of origin can ensure fidelity to tradition and its possibility of perpetuation. Organizing the masters of these techniques is fundamental for exerting pressure on local governments through collective actions to ensure these regulations. The support of local companies for these groups can develop locales, ensuring a creation of jobs that capital-intensive companies cannot generate. Generating jobs in this way can ensure local sustainable development without necessarily polluting the environment, balancing industrial production with other forms of production. Economic diversification ends up being a factor of environmental sustainability, since diversification avoids the concentration of emissions of the same types of pollutants in the environment, giving nature a greater possibility to absorb the emissions it receives.

If we think in terms of local regulation, it's possible to create a "cultural market" similar to the ecological market, which has been seeking to foster environmentally correct actions through the buying and selling of carbon credits. Encouraging local culture has similar effects, generating jobs and wealth in non-polluting forms, while contributing to local sustainable development. Within their responsibility programs, companies can use tax incentive laws for culture in this direction and become leaders in their industrial hubs by promoting these changes. That would be of their interest, as it promotes ecologically-

oriented and social responsibility actions as well as an improvement in local politics, with generalized gains for their whole task environment.

Culture and Development

The questions relating with the promotion of economic development are many and of a huge complexity. Most of them are studied in economics, which seeks, through rational and instrumental approaches, to understand the logic and the dynamics of this process. Traditionally, development questions tend to be treated almost exclusively from a perspective that deals with the nature of resources and incentives.

In more recent times, questions of other natures, such as culture and institutions have taken a prominent place in these debates. However, we still have to isolate relevant aspects of these two sociological factors and relate them in a consistent way with questions related with economic development.[xxx]

In fact, the existence of an interrelation between the nature of institutions, culture and the capacity to generate wealth in a society is no news. Adam Smith already acknowledged the interaction between the enrichment process and the process of political and social change. David Ricardo pointed to the importance of developing in workers a taste for comfort and luxury as a way of encouraging them to work, and Malthus believed that pay raises and quality public education would lead to a decrease in natality rates, thus reducing the pressures for food production.

In these authors, we can see already an interrelation between political and civil freedom and the strengthening of the market. But freedom is a value, and as such it is deeply related with cultural perceptions. It's not difficult for us to see that, while in some cultures, both individual freedom and economic enrichment are goals shared by the majority of the population, this is not equally true in other societies. There are societies and cultures where economic enrichment is not an ideal to be pursued (or, still, it's an ideal to be rejected in the name of religious ideals or the virtue of poverty), and others where economic enrichment is a value, but individual freedom, such as it is conceived in some European countries and in the US is not. There are also societies where both enrichment

and freedom are valued, but there are relational and traditional chains that prevent individuals from dedicating themselves to pursuing them.

One's understanding of what freedom is is deeply related to one's cultural perceptions. To Americans, the essence of the question of freedom is freedom of choice, which reinforces the dynamic of the market and an individualist, hedonist consumerism. This conception is precisely the opposite of the Buddhist concept of freedom, which refers to freedom from choice (or from the necessity to choose) as a form of development of the mind. In ancient Greece, Socrates and Plato warned about the risk of excessive fondness of the sensible world, of the world of choice, and fondness of beauty, which made us slaves of our most mundane passions, our senses and immediate pleasures, and drove us away from the cultivation of the spirit and ethics. They viewed ethics as the contrary of hedonism and the freedom of choice on which the former is based, since the essence of the question of ethics lies precisely in the capacity of renouncing. There is no ethical behavior if conscious subjects don't impose limits on themselves and don't hierarchize their needs and desires in relation to nobler values. By way of example, we can see how this dichotomy works in practice: freedom of choice, based on the principle of pleasure, can easily lead to consumerism and environment-destructive wasting, which is contrary to an ethics that values nature.[xxxi] Nietzsche criticizes this separation between good (the object of ethics) and beauty (the object of aesthetics) proposed by Socrates and Plato. He sees in this separation a source of castration of transformative will. Nietzsche shows, therefore, that this question isn't solved even in European thought.

One complication may be added to this subject if we note that, like the concept of *trabalho* in Portuguese can be loosely translated as both work and labor in English, with very different meanings, the same occurs with the concept of *liberdade*, which can be translated as freedom and liberty – again, terms which are not synonyms in English. Freedom is more connected with real, concrete, action-related freedom. It's about being free from imprisonment and/or oppression by another human being. Freedom doesn't mean being free to do whatever one wishes, but being out of relationships that can restrict freedom of moving and acting. Liberty, on the other hand, refers to broader, more philosophical forms of freedom. Liberty is a concept of political philosophy that refers to an individual's capacity to act according with his will. Freedom is a state of protection

against tyranny. Stuart Mill defines freedom negatively, i.e., as the absence of coercion, and liberty positively, i.e., as freedom of action. In political terms, freedom is something that the society can politically organize to ensure. Liberty is something that the autonomous individual must seek by himself, and which he has conditions to achieve when freedom is ensured.

At a first reading, we are left with the feeling that diffusing and instilling prosperity values should be goals in the promotion of development, but this is certainly not the case. This would generate the type of process that Durkheim envisioned, as seen earlier, with totally undesirable consequences in terms of human rights. In the appendix at the end of this book, we included the Agenda 21 for Culture, which gives us a measure of how this approach would drive us away from UN's goals for the promotion of cultural diversity, sustainability and participatory democracy. The very definition of what economic development is must be discussed, among other reasons, because of the question of environmental sustainability, as well as the possible consequences of each definition, by various authors of various schools of thought, regarding the features that this ideal should have. Another complex question is what values these would be, and who would be entitled to define them.

Based on a few preliminary studies, the question that seems to us the main obstacle to conducting these debates is the close relationship which developed between the notion of economic development and the notion of freedom, or the type of freedom that some authors assume more developed societies to actually possess and which must be the parameter with which freedom should be thought about in other cultures. It's precisely this relationship that we must investigate in order to provide the foundations for the debate on the relationship between development, culture and institutions.

Another pertinent question we must consider is what type of enrichment we want to generate, as well as the consequences it will have in environmental terms. Western enrichment was built on two mutually dependent processes: production and consumption. Studies of sociology of consumption[xxxii] demonstrate the relationship between individualism, individual freedom, equality and the dynamics of contemporary consumption. Various questions, from social construction of identity, to narrative strategies

of the I, to the construction of sociability ties and social competition strategies are pervaded by the dynamics of consumption. However, the use we have been making of material culture as the raw-material of identitary and social processes is environmentally inviable in the long term. There seems to be a Siamese relationship between individual freedom and the dynamics of contemporary consumption which needs to be reconsidered. The concept of freedom cannot be restricted to the notion of freedom of choice.[xxxiii] If we conceive economic development for the whole planet in the same terms as it has been built until now by the richest countries, ecologic disaster will be inevitable. Therefore, the promotion of individual freedom in the way the modern West has conceived it, and the goal of bringing it as a development standard to other countries, must be debated, since the fraying[xxxiv] of the social fabric it promotes has been leading to the consumerist, environmentally unsustainable desire of building niches of belonging in the social space which rely heavily on material culture.

Therefore, to us, freedom could be thought of as the right to decide one's own destiny based on organized participation in collective decision-making processes. Without this organization, we are all victims of chaos, rather than masters of our own destinies.

At first, however, refusing this notion of freedom of Americans sounds like a defense of authoritarianism and the most dreadful forms of power, which must obviously be repulsed. Moreover, by refusing the notion of freedom as defined by liberals, we might be equally refusing the notion of development, in view of the necessity relationship that seems to exist between both. However, the point here is that this relationship is one that is sensed, and empirical proof, if any, of its existence lies only in the historical knowledge that development has taken place in the West under these conditions. When we affirm that refusing them is not possible, we do so based on the historical knowledge that development has not occurred detached from individual freedom in any case we know of. Japan is certainly a historical example that allows us to deny this direct, necessary relationship. The problem is that the Japanese model, albeit not built on the economic development-individual freedom relationship, is not an alternative of environmentally correct development, i.e., no better than the Western model. In other words, we don't have one development-freedom relationship, but at least two: for if individual freedom is not a value in Japan in the same way as in the West, freedom of enterprise and the dynamics of market

competition have been ensured, demonstrating that there are various possible combinations of 'freedoms'.

This puts us in a position of having to think, today, not only about economic development, but environmentally sustainable economic development. That is, the logic that rules economic interactions can't be centered on the conspicuous consumption of durable or non-durable goods with a planned obsolescence, and even less on waste-generating wasteful consumption. This can only be achieved through the development of new sociability forms, which, again, points us to the question of freedom, for who has the right to define what these sociability forms should be?

Part of these questions, we believe, can be approached by building on developments of Amartya Sen's theory, which, in our view, is currently the theory on economic development that best admits different cultural logics and different conceptions of freedom than that of traditional liberal models. Sen's theory allows us to think of culturally specific forms of freedom which don't have to be necessarily built on the notion of individual that is typical of some cultures, and it's the one that allows orderly investigation on possible contributions from anthropology and sociology to questions regarding development. Something we can't do with the concept of freedom proposed by Hayek (1959), for example, which is culturally specific and built on a notion of individual that is also cultural.

We thought it might also help if we put in question innocent, utopic visions about multiculturalism, which tend to view cultures as harmonic, balanced wholes. Many of these visions advocate that contacts of Western capitalism or democracy with traditional cultures are necessarily disastrous in that they destabilize alternative and equally legitimate forms of sociability.

The excessive relativism in the multicultural vision tends to ignore that, within these cultures, there are centuries-old domination and power relationships which allow the reproduction of terrible forms of oppression and human suffering. In this sense, Sen's comprehension of freedom as the power to exercise options and choices seems to us pertinent, and more in line with the observable reality of power when we consider the human being in society. We will develop this idea further below. One of the most interesting elements in Sen's theory is how it approaches development without falling in the trap of the debate on basic needs and its consequent association between economic

development and the dynamics of goods production and consumption. By understanding human development as empowerment, rather than freedom in the traditional liberal sense, Sen opens innumerous possibilities for thinking about development in various ways.

Sen seems to recognize that the human being exists immersed in webs of non-contractual social relationships, and although he doesn't approach this subject in this direction, he seems to understand people as socially built by different cultural logics and tied to circumstances from which they don't necessarily wish to free themselves, but over which they need to be able to positively exert an influence, and this relationally negotiated freedom is the one he wishes to see expanded. In this perspective, to have power is to have access to material and political resources (Giddens, 2001) that allow a subject to constantly renegotiate his forms of social integration and the limits of restriction to his rights that collective life can impose on him. Education is the privileged means to have access to these resources, as we will see below. But the fact is that the access to these resources is not always open, often for reasons that we can only understand by looking into the dynamic interaction between culture, economics and politics.

However, in acknowledging this idea, we need to understand the link that relates these questions. When we talk about empowerment, we are talking about empowerment in relation to what? If we are talking about empowering people to allow them a more balanced inclusion into the same institutions through which that society has historically reproduced domination relationships, we should ask ourselves why and how access to education will effectively change these relationships. Empowering in the sense of giving alternatives could mean building new institutions the subject can resort to, breaking with the economic, social and political need to belong to the ones he has always belonged to, like family, clan, caste, etc., thus providing alternatives for him, in so doing, to be able to add to the capacity of these organizations to support his living, through the production of goods, but, perhaps, fundamentally services, for which a certain demand, albeit disorganized, exists in a latent way. Economics can solve this question through the institution of private property. This solution was actually fundamental to conceive economic development during the industrial age. Economic freedom allowed the proliferation of businesses, which in turn increased the offer of jobs, and, as a result, nobody would have to to submit to the will of another to survive, as occurred in societies

where there was slavery or servitude, like the Brazilian society in the colonial period or the European society in the feudal period. However, for countries with extreme poverty, this solution prevents conceiving economic development in another way than by attracting capital to leverage industrialization. Historically, therefore, the construction of alternative forms to traditional ones was conducted by the market's advance, being intrinsically tied to the freedom-property relationship. This solution is environmentally inviable today, we know this. Besides, without property, as is the case of many of our poor who possess traditional, folk knowledge, how can we approach this question?

In Brazil, however, the question doesn't seem to be this one of having to increase freedom domains by developing alternative institutions to traditional ones as a means of promoting development. In the business environment, excessive regulation can actually reduce entrepreneurial capacity and economic freedom, and we know this reality well enough in Brazil, but this diagnosis doesn't necessarily apply to the removal of poverty. If we think about removing poverty in terms of traditional employability, no doubt reducing taxes and removing barriers to productive activity would help due to the incentive these measures would provide to the generation of new enterprises. But if we look at the reality of the Brazilian poor, we will see that what afflicts them isn't the lack of freedom in relation to traditional institutions, like families, clans, or similar others. It's precisely the opposite. In the absence of institutions to belong to, there is no possible domain for freedom, since freedom stems from civilization and it doesn't exist in the state of nature. The isolated individual, with no safety nets or institutions to belong to, is an extremely fragile atom in urban poverty. The reversal of this situation can lie in strategies of organization or reorganization of the people scattered in urban masses in poor countries' megalopolises. In Brazil, poverty and social disorganization pose Sen's question in a reverse way. Our society is apparently contract-based: people can freely decide who to work for, and they are free to change their lives and options. Therefore, they should make the most rational choices and get ahead. In Brazil, the family is not an element of rigid control over social behavior and there is a high degree of permissiveness regarding children and their options. Besides being poor, why don't these individuals seem to us free to change their lives?

In the absence of property and capital to invest, and in social isolation, many of these individuals who possess knowledge and techniques can't find the means to act. Because the use of traditional knowledge as a touristic attraction depends on a broader coordination of activities that require investments, this organization has no means to take place spontaneously.

A few initiatives to make the organization of these individuals viable in order to promote economic development are already being conducted in the country. For example, there is the case of the "Estrada Real" program, which aims to promote cultural and ecological tourism along the old routes of gold. With an effective coordination by the Instituto Estrada Real, as well as cooperation of the state government of Minas Gerais and support from FIEMG, the Instituto sees to the mapping of routes, the divulging of the idea, the creation of a brand, the organization of walking tours, among others, and innumerous small business become viable as a result. Cultural activities are boosted and the cities begin to understand the importance of their historical heritage and to preserve it.

In Rio de Janeiro, the SEBRAE has been actively supporting microentrepreneurs. Programs like "Juntos Somos Fortes", which promotes associativism and cooperativism, has been attracting the interest of and motivating artisans, seamstresses, folk artists and various others to organize and overcome the barrier of lack of capital. The difficulty, however, is that these initiatives, if isolated, have few chances of getting the demand they need for businesses to take off. But these initiatives, if associated with the promotion of historical, archeological and cultural heritage, begin to create a synergy that is capable of attracting tourists. Given these groups' absolute lack of capital to invest, the capacity of survival of their businesses is small if there isn't a way of generating positive cashflow, often daily. It's the case of the handicrafts market in Duque de Caxias. Very often, the artisans will use up what they have earned in the market to cover the costs of participating in it (transportation and food) and to buy raw material for the next day. In these markets, artisans often sell and make goods at the same time, using the interval between one client and the next to accelerate the production. Few can take a chance and accept orders, since if the buyer walks away from the deal, the time invested in making the good won't have been used to generate cash to produce the items that sell most for the next market day.

The organization of these groups can generate innumerous externalities for communities in these cities. In the case of female artisans, for example, a very common problem could be solved with more adequate organization strategies which their organization-building training could generate. Many have small children. There are no public day care centers available. To go to the market, these women leave their children with neighbors or friends, paying a certain amount that's not enough for a private day care center in town. Many of them are afraid about the quality of care their children are getting. Organizing women in cooperatives to look after the children of other women can increase scale gains and solve the distrust problem, since children will be with a group of women rather than with just one, who might abuse them. But because demand for this type of service is sporadic due to the instable income of these working mothers, the service ends up not being organized. The same holds for elderly, who could be served in a "community elderly day care center", so the economically active could be free to go to work. It would be Adam Smith's old principle of the social division of labor, only instead of being applied to industries and coordinated by a hierarchy, it would be applied to services provided by a community and coordinated through networks.

But traditional cultures can prevent people from realizing the importance and opportunities these new forms can provide. Hence the centrality of an educational process for development.

If we revisit the bibliography about organizations and their business management, we are forced to agree with Peter Drucker when he affirms that wealth production in contemporary society takes place through companies and organizations. Within them, knowledge produces economically more than property per se, since we can clearly see the difficulty of today's large companies to survive when they can't add knowledge and innovation to products and processes. Given the dimensions and complexity of contemporary society, the pursuit of solutions for problems relating with the market necessarily implies the capacity to bring together individual contributions and efforts in organizations that can turn them into results. Therefore, one of the main difficulties of the poorest layers of the population in countries like Brazil is precisely their inclusion in organizations capable of empowering them.

Cultural responsibility actions can produce job and income solutions through different mechanisms than those of economic development under the models we know, but we are so strongly attached to the job paradigm and traditional capitalist institutions, that we suffer from a crisis of creativity in relation to alternative strategies. We have no doubt that the most serious problem about underdevelopment is exclusion, i.e., being sentenced to live in institutions or conditions in which traditional forms of exploitation and subjugation take place. However, it seems to us that the empowerment of subjects can occur when they are offered viable alternatives of belonging, but belonging doesn't necessarily mean a job (Castel, 1998), perhaps nor property in the classic sense of the term. Property of knowledge, of traditional skills and techniques, can be another path.

Therefore, the creation of alternative forms of social organization by encouraging the development of alternative activities to the existing formal ones, as in the example of the artisans' efforts, or in solidary economy groups, can actually strengthen society's democratic and participatory structures, managing the social inclusion and safety nets that cannot be conceived if we take the abstract individual which liberal doctrines theorize about as the starting point.

New forms of social organization can, in fact, counteract individualistic hedonism with more cooperation-oriented values, and achieve the effect of leveraging sales of local goods, as well as locally produced handicrafts, art, music and theater. The expansion of art consumption feeds the cycle of critical reflection and esthetic appreciation, and it can boost a cycle of reflection and action that is capable of producing institutional mechanisms of cooperation to reduce poverty and exclusion. As long as "culture consumption" is not a synonym for entertainment only, but also for expanding vision and consciousness.

Culture and Education

The new tendencies in social organization of labor require new competences from citizens. During most of the existence of industrial societies, vocational education, which could train docile workers to perform in hierarchies and to be employable by companies where they executed relatively simple tasks, was the goal. Education trained workers.

Today, the question of employability, the trends in social organization of labor, and the tendency for formal employment as we know it to disappear, are posing as a major challenge for schools, families and societies to develop new competencies, particularly the necessary subjective dispositions for entrepreneurial action. The end of formal jobs poses new dilemmas, particularly in societies such as the Brazilian, with significant parts of its population out of formal employment. Unlike traditional education, which was oriented to producing passive workers, the challenge for contemporary education lies in educating people who can actively conduct themselves in the world, find their place, and be able to build it. Building these competences requires a greater pedagogical transformation that it might seem at first. An empowering, critical and transformative education must be within everyone's reach if we want to think in terms of a fairer society.

What is the role of culture in this process? Ethnic culture and culture as systems of articulate values are what allows valuing education and creating forms of appropriating its contents. It is also ethnic culture which, in different ways, have created, in countries that are now developed, the necessary motivation for action that led to development.

In Brazil, we must admit we've been having a few difficulties with this process.

One of the first necessary steps is to allow youths to exercise the theory-practice relationship. It's fundamental to allow students to internalize contents as a form of intervention in reality. It's fundamental to create a desire for learning as a privileged form of action. It's fundamental to respect the ecology of the mind as being able to provide the bases for cultivating analytical structures of complex questions. We believe these are better learned, under the models of course we have, through a practical process of investigation of causes and relationships between concrete phenomena, a process where the ludic, reflexive and investigative aspects can be ensured. The main goal of this type of program would be to produce the critical reflection about practice that Paulo Freire (1996) so clearly associates with the progress not only of theoretical knowledge, but, fundamentally, of practical knowledge, for the informed exercise of any profession. This conclusion is strongly reinforced by the thoughts of Piaget (1932, 1973, 1970) and Vygotsky (2001) that there is a necessary interaction between thought, language and action which is fundamental for the learning process and the sophistication of the student's intellectual capacity.

It is this element that we'll be exploring from this point onwards, discussing how the question of motivation can be revisited by an anthropologic perspective, in the pursuit of understanding the relationship between motivation and the meaning of action.[xxxv]

A question that is raised if we believe in the importance of "active learning" as an integral element of knowledge professionals, is that the traditional model of education implies a student like a blank page, passively receiving knowledge from teachers; in this process, only the teacher deals with the complexity and uncertainty that are characteristic and natural of knowledge, while hiding it from the student in an effort to "simplify" the content, which, in fact, keeps the former in the position of the one who knows more and has certainties versus the one who knows less and must listen. The student receives a content as an answer to questions he didn't have the chance to formulate, and is forced to accept this apparently useless piece of knowledge in an enthusiastic manner. But, well, can one be enthusiastic in the absence of sense?

Expanding opportunities for students to build knowledge, for making them understand the importance of academic discipline to validate the knowledge they acquire, reintroducing the ludic and the political in learning processes, with methodologies in which the student can see how "knowing is power" – i.e., how science knowledge can increase his ability to read the world and act on it – all this is fundamental for educating this citizen of the future. Interactive museums, digital games, places where experiments can be conducted in front of children, testimonies of scientists at research centers in companies, recorded in DVDs, are examples of best ways of producing situations where students can effectively develop the cognitive abilities that will make them managers of the society of knowledge.

The new medias and new technologies can help us reintegrate culture and education at quite low costs. Even youths involved in cultural projects in schools or in their cities can, with a digital camera in their hands, record interviews, testimonies, and make documentaries with the various "griôs" in our society, thereby learning and teaching, as the films they will make can, at the cost of a few DVD recordable discs, be distributed to all other schools or be made available at websites to whoever is interested.

According with the Ministry of Culture's "Cultura Viva" program:

"Griô is the 'Brazilianization' of the French word griot, used by African youths who went to French universities. Moved by their concern for preserving their storytellers,

who carry with them the oral tradition ('the death of a griot represents a fire in a library', they used to say), they consolidated a concept and an activity which are centuries-old among their people, and are also expressed by the word dielis. These are persons who, for various reasons, circumstances and skills, accumulated knowledge which belongs to their communities and which we can understand as "immaterial cultural heritage". This includes practices, representations, expressions and techniques – along with instruments, objects, artifacts and places associated with them – which communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as an integral part of their cultural heritage. This cultural immaterial heritage is transmitted from generation to generation.

Like UNESCO's Living Human Treasures *program, the* Griô – Mestres dos Saberes *action aims to preserve these goods, encouraging the transmission of these accumulated knowledge, skills and know-how. As a way of boosting these actions already in progress, the program will seek partnerships with the Ministries of Labor, Social Security and Education to provide financial and material support for these Masters of Knowledge so they can continue, with less difficulties, to preserve and reinvent our culture.*

(http://www.cultura.gov.br/programas_e_acoes/programa_cultura_viva/grios/index.php)".

The didactic-pedagogical goal of this type of program, where culture and education intermingle, is to provoke a permanent change in behavior and in the way of perceiving reality through experience and reflection that can serve as a basis to informed action on the world, creating adequacy between students' education and the requirements of work in the unpredictability of the society of knowledge. This change in behavior, which is observable in the school in the form of an active, autonomous behavior of seeking solutions for problems should consequently generate a proactive, entrepreneurial behavior in the workplace, since it should become a position, or a subjective disposition, of healthy confrontation of the world's difficulties. We recognize, in line with Demo (2002), that the analysis of the complexity of post-modern context can't be suitably addressed through "disciplinarization", which is a pointless, monotonous, official restriction of one's view of observable phenomena, nor through the passive position this disciplinarization tends to cause in students, as disciplinarization tends, in many ways, to present a theory or model as

the perspective of analysis or management for a phenomenon or process in a didactic, linear way, rather than *one among the* possible perspectives of apprehension of a multiple and complex reality.

In our view, moreover, disciplinarization tends to reinforce an authoritarian teacher-student relationship model where the teacher appears as the one who "knows" or who has "the answer" which the student must passively learn and/or reproduce. This instruction format, which is adequate to train a workforce that is passive and readily adjustable to a bureaucratic model of company, is, in our view, inadequate to the situation of contemporary work. The difficulty lies in finding the form, or the forms, of separating ourselves from this authoritarian, traditional model, while ensuring quality transmission of constituted knowledge. Today, there are innumerous attempts to move in this direction, but most of them lack support and resources.

This effort to avoid excessive disciplinarization (which, as Demo (2002) stressed, is not a synonym for abandoning specialization) necessarily includes the cultivation of the adequate subjective dispositions[xxxvi] to tackle complexity through active efforts to seek possible causes and relationships between phenomena. This also necessarily includes the study of theories as a way of illuminating aspects of the investigated reality, rather than as a ready solution for problems.

The "griôs" of industries, those people with truly ingenious minds who have learned over the years to make the most of technique, the engineers who are fascinated about science, the factory workers who are real masters in their crafts can, by acting as the "sage of this great urban tribe of ours", break the distance that poor youths experience in relation to science and arts at home, and integrate them into this wonderful world of amazement about science, technique, art and knowledge. This esthetic element we discover when we find ourselves involved in an absolutely fantastic project, with a brilliant technical solution, with a theory that illuminates totally new aspects of the world to us, needs to be shared with these children and youths. Amazement about science and technique has an element of esthetic fascination to it that few people in our society have had access to. One must know a lot and study hard about a subject to be able to produce this synthesis of beauty that exists in every human creative activity. Our great masters of engineering and arts have travelled this path and often don't realize how this synthesis and knowledge are fundamental to

promote a similar amazement in youths. Knowing, learning and teaching are absolutely fascinating activities when we reach the level where these activities can produce a spark in the eye. We have an experience of man's transcendence when we can, even for just a few moments, glimpse this kind of beauty.

This type of "cultural project" is also a way of acknowledging and rewarding our great men of industry who have never been acknowledged for their capacity to make the most of science and technique.

In this process, the teacher's role is transformed: from one who simply transmits information to one who teaches students to learn, i.e., he guides activities, integrates extracurricular contents with the contents that must be conveyed in a systematized way in classroom, helps students organize information, teaches the theories that explain what was observed, and builds our assessment systems, where the student is called upon to demonstrate what he has learned.

The main difficulty found in this type of program is the low qualification of teachers to act in an empowering way, and the difficulty to build students' perception about the importance of participating. Games, museums and dynamics are useful in removing these obstacles and achieving these goals, and their continuing use can help develop teachers' capacity to act in line with these purposes. In our universities, there is no shortage of specialists capable of developing these projects. Researchers of all areas, from computer science to digital museology to constructionist pedagogy, suffer from a lack of resources to conduct their works, create and innovate with these goals in mind.

We are losing opportunities. Opportunities for supporting our researchers and teachers to save generations. In general, the authoritarian education doesn't generate among students the perception of the relationship between innovation and research, between discipline and personal growth, between effort and creativity, among others. Nor the perception of the importance of theories for expanding the horizons of reality comprehension. There is no active participation process without a "will" being formed in the student, which, we believe, is directly related with the perception of the **meaning** that knowledge can have in his process of formation and professional competence. It's certainly not by lecturing that we will catch children's and youths' attention to work in building this will.

Based on the Nietzschean perception of will to power as being at once formed by a will to create and a will to power, we can see the importance of summoning students to the challenge of learning understood as the acquisition of a capacity of self-transformation into more ludic, creative professionals. Instead of starting the process of capturing students' will by lecturing about the importance of study, it's possible to rescue the history of the feudal origin of universities and education institutions, of their anarchic character, of the formation of brotherhoods which saw forms of power in knowledge, in order to summon students to a liberation against the organizational structure of the school system. The creative possibilities are innumerous. It's possible to invite them to a school life that goes beyond the comforts of bureaucratic order and students' passive role, bringing ludic and political features into activities: empowering students for the process of building their role in society. It's possible to invite them to discuss the school in innumerous ways. In societies with a smaller power distance, where this type of exercise is more common, teachers are surprised by youths' conservatism and strictness in the creation of rules, showing that, contrary to what we imagine, this process doesn't tend to end up in anarchy.

Even here in Rio de Janeiro, a few schools have been surprised by the results of non-conventional programs. A game held annually among a few private schools in Rio, where children and youths simulate being at the UN, shows how these actions take place: each youth receives the role of a diplomat from a given country and a serious problem in this country for him to study and defend before other students, who will represent other countries. They prepare for weeks and then meet at the host school for the final confrontation. Parents and teachers watch these youths sitting at the computer for weeks, doing research to defend their country well. In a ludic, interactive way, they learn about political economy, geography, diplomacy, history, among other themes, without a teacher teaching them the whole content. The teacher acts as a research facilitator and a coach to the teams, who struggle to stand out in the confrontations. This is an effort to raise them from the position of students "to be convinced" to that of "agents of change".

It's important to understand that, over the evolution of modern educational process, as order and bureaucracy tried to offer a quality education for everybody, they turned what had been the subject's autonomous pursuit of self-development into an organized, authoritarian process of transmitting constituted knowledge, where the subject is no longer

the author of his own trajectory of formation, but a receiver of knowledge transmitted by the teacher. In this process of massification of access to education, contemporary education has lost contact with the active process of learning by the student, and has shifted towards the "teaching and transmission of knowledge" by the teacher, who finds himself in the position of having to persuade the student to learn those contents because, one day, they will be important.

The idea is to rescue the importance of this knowledge now, not through persuasion, but rather through the autonomous pursuit of it. Students can be summoned to rescue the participatory and autonomous character of learning, and cultural activities are the most adequate means to this. In this non-school education, it's possible to invite them to elaborate their group's participation and discipline rules, and to effectively form brotherhoods with the role of ensuring the necessary survival of a free, creative, inquisitive spirit for improving the subject and his ability to contribute for development. Seeking, since the beginning, to act not by a monological logic (in the Habermasian sense) where only one is allowed to speak, which builds on the teacher's instituted role and authority, with the superiority of his power to define the truth, but rather by a logic that is dialogical, democratic, participatory, empowering and driven towards understanding, in line with Tenório (2000) in that there is a relationship between dialogicity and a break with instrumental reason (and its application to the process of education and preparation to the labor market), which, according with Nietzsche, destroys the will to power. It's also important to encourage the functioning of these programs through a dialogic logic, and to contribute to develop a flexible model of management of the very cultural programs students participate in.

The project of this type of program can start from the idea that, instead of studying and learning in an scholastic way (whose institutionalized form is school order – Bourdieu, 2001), which is fundamentally characterized by the suspension of students from practical reality, or by the separation between the world of learning and the concrete ways of existence (economically and politically situated), we can point them directly to this world so as to have them realize that knowledge is a form, or perhaps, today, **the** form par excellence of producing economic value and political participation, and it's one of the fundamental tools of power, since knowledge aims not only to decipher reality to

understand it, but also dominate it (Portocarrero, 1994 em Demo 2001). Exercises, programs and games of work, as well as research projects, point them directly to unsolved doubts and problems in their reality and to the necessary effort to find out how to solve them with all the uncertainty of a non-simulated work which hasn't been previously executed. As they ludically participate in projects, games and in each step of real, concrete research, from designing the research problem to collecting data, with all its unusualness, to the difficulties treating and interpreting data, students are constantly being surprised by aspects not previously considered, by their (and also teachers') ignorance about unforeseen possibilities for a given behavior to occur, and by all the risks of error and resource waste that concrete action poses. They are also led to reflect about the economic conditions of knowledge production, about the cost of our research, and the value of knowledge generated in this collective effort.

This more autonomous process of apprehending reality is a strategy, or, at least, an attempt, to fight what Demo (2002) calls instructionism, a logic that pervades formal education and works under a linear ritualization, still based on the misconception of "knowledge transmission", a typical bank clerk movement, as Demo (2002) affirms, quoting Paulo Freire. We have often noted that the desire to understand a theory or learn a content is greater and deeper when it comes in answer to a doubt or as a possibility to organize chaotic information formed in the effort to find solutions for problems. The teacher can present theories after the doubt is formed and when students are already looking with curiosity for a possible answer. But even in these cases, the theory is presented as one of the possibilities of analyzing and comprehending the phenomenon, and, whenever possible, contrasted with another, equally possible one, so that, in an interpretive effort, students can, with all the uncertainty that is typical of a pursuit of knowledge, decide which way to follow. Museums, galleries, and science exhibitions have the potential to be a concrete reality on which students can expand their capacity of reflection.

Programs such as historical routes, which unveil the past of a community, also have a fascinating impact on children and youths. Knowing where we come from, knowing the struggles, challenges and problems of our ancestors, can fight the passivity and lack of meaning that many of our youths feel today. Programs like "Estrada Real" and "Caminhos Singulares", including the "caminhos do Ouro", "caminhos da fé", and "caminhos do

imperador" ["routes of gold", "routes of faith" and "routes of the emperor", respectively] not only articulate material and immaterial heritage in the production of touristic attractions, but they also create affective bonds with the territory of the city, a feeling of the importance of looking after it, and a feeling of community that we've allowed to be lost in our recent history. Here too the work of masters and griôs can be incorporated to small digital museums and to everyday school works by youths from the cities. These small museums, which have no similarities with old, static museums, are living centers of production and diffusion of memory, which, with digital technology and active teachers, are places for finding and enjoying culture. These are places where the community's history and stories can be stored in digital videos, where photographs and maps can be explained, where children and youths can be trained to operate as local touristic guides. Where "playing" with the past and "discovering" the future can take place through extracurricular pedagogical programs.

Although still rare in Brazil, there are already museums in other countries where youths can learn techniques from a past age, where they learn and interact with techniques and knowledge, and play all the time with the objects on display. The Museum of Discovery, in Paris, is one of them. Edomura, or Edo Village, in Japan, is another. It's a re-creation of an old medieval village where children and tourists can enter the houses, watch theatrical performances about daily life in that period, among other activities.

About the Nature of the Necessary Motivation to Participate in this Type of Program: A Critique of Traditional Theories on Motivation

In our effort to understand how to motivate students to build active learning and knowledge collectively, we resort to the motivation theories that are most commonly used in the field of business management, only to discover that, in many ways, these theories, which claim to be general theories of motivation, are far too deep-rooted in bureaucratic companies' empirical reality to tackle contemporary needs and, particularly, our needs. Maslow's (2003) hierarchy of needs theory, for example, contradicts recent anthropological research (Slater, 1997) which presents abundant evidence that human motivation is culturally constituted and deeply pervaded by social meanings. Of course, anthropology is

not denying the most obvious fact that human being needs food and protection from bad weather, as well as to provide for his basic needs, but rather affirming that, even at the most materially rudimentary levels of life, human being provides for these needs in a culturally informed way. By affirming that necessities are social, anthropology is not simply saying that the individual suffers influence or pressure by the group, or that, in the socialization process, society "shapes" the individual. The central point is another one: when somebody says: "I need something", he is making a statement that is deeply social in its essence: it means that this subject needs that "something" so he can live a certain type of life in which he has certain forms of relationships with other people, in which he produces his existence or achieves his goals in certain ways. The idea here is that we need to create this sense of need of the type of competence produced by knowledge as a form of generating the conditions for building motivation in our children and youths so they can occupy their places in the world.

The question of sociological aspects of motivation and perception of necessity is partially eclipsed when we treat them as natural or purely subjective. Slater (1997) complements this discussion as he affirms that there is still a second question to be understood when we talk about the social characteristics of needs. When somebody says he needs something, he is making a social and political claim in two ways: first, because he is making a statement that reveals that this subject considers he is entitled to claim access to certain material, social or symbolic resources; and second, because this claim can only be made through the understanding this individual has of his position in a social organization and/or institution.

If we take into account these questions, we can therefore approach the question of motivation for studying at contemporary education institutions as depending on the ability to create the perception that mastering this knowledge is necessary as one of the integral competences of professional capacity, as only thus will students engage in this undertaking with an open mind to the learning it proposes. Therefore, this necessity needs to be "sensed" as such, not only from the viewpoint of individual psychology, but as a necessary condition for facing the necessities of labor market and of professional practice itself. It's important to produce in students the perception or notion of how research and its underlying logic of thought can empower them to read reality and, therefore, empower

them in their capacity to act on it, so as to claim the right to participate in programs of this nature in the same way as they claim other rights at school. This demand is a signal of active learning.

Therefore, cultural responsibility is, in this sense, a new form of solidarity. It's a mechanism that can help us share the most important resource in post-industrial society, i.e., knowledge. With the new technologies and a little creativity, companies of every size can exercise this with considerable impact on youths and children in their task environment. Partnerships with the third sector and universities can significantly expand the quality and range of these actions.

When we look at the nature of this challenge, we realize how little we can rely on the motivation theories normally used to understand human behavior in organizations. In this perspective, Maslow's (Maslow, 1970) motivation theory, for example, can be perceived as based on the observation of a specific historical and sociological situation, i.e., that of companies in the mass production age, where it was empirically observable that the primary motivation for someone to accept a hard, monotonous assembly line job was because he needed food and a place to live. That, after securing this, he wants to make sure he will have the conditions to do it the next day (need for safety); next, he will seek social integration; after getting it, he will try to build a reputation in that group; and only later will he seek a work that gives him pleasure. Now, this theory only makes sense in a society where formal employment in a bureaucratic organization, in which the individual enters isolated and can be fire at any time, is the only form of making a living and being socially integrated. It doesn't make any sense, for example, in a tribal society where the subject doesn't choose the activity he will perform, nor can he be fired, and where there is no logic of economic shortage or capitalist productivity.

In a society without formal employment, as it seems to be the case, according with the emerging tendencies, a subject who can't find pleasure in some activity and, therefore, can't be good at it, will not be able to build a reputation, nor have the necessary social integration to economic activity, and will not be able to support himself. Not least because, in a society without formal employment, there won't be that subject in a position of power and authority, as it's common in the industrial society, i.e., in a position of making sure that necessities at the bottom of the pyramid be met so that workers can progress towards nobler

motivations. There are questions of power and authority that are implicit in Maslow's pyramid which, in a way, cause his theory to be in a position of convincing managers about the importance of humanizing work as a way of obtaining gains of motivation. The motivation that is expected from knowledge workers can be graphically represented by a reversed Maslow pyramid. Therefore, the set of dispositions for work that traditional education creates is not capable of tackling needs in the new context. Below, we will see why.

The same occurs with Herzberg's[xxxvii] theory, which opposes hygienic factors to work-intrinsic factors. This theory directs us to the classic division between execution and conception that is typical of bureaucratic companies, as well as to the meaninglessness and hardness of work in their plant floor. In addition, the theories of Maslow, Herzberg, McGregor (X and Y theory) and Clayton Alderfer (existence, relatedness and growth needs) have in common the fact that they exclude the question of work's symbolic and sociological meaning from their analyses (although these questions appear in a peripheral or indirect way in all of them, but never as a central question), and that they are based on empirical observations about a form of social division of work that shows clear signs of erosion. Therefore, in order to approach the question of students' motivation to participate in special programs, besides avoiding these traditional theories, we must also intentionally avoid motivation theories that are focused on understanding individual psychology, as we believe that the epistemological analysis they build on wouldn't give us bases for approaching the motivation of the collective of children and youths to participate in our programs.

In fact, through anthropology and philosophy, one can see that the same cultural logic that informs the thoughts of the authors above is also behind the logic that opposes needs to desires in marketing theories, which, in the same way as the former, hinders the understanding of desire formation by anything that isn't absolutely indispensable for life maintenance. Not for no reason, much of consumption ends up being viewed, in this perspective, as irrational. The problem lies in conceiving motivation and/or desire through a logic that opposes or hierarchizes desires and needs, or still, that starts from the presupposition that there are such things as general, abstract needs that can be abstractly understood and must be morally satisfied, and desires and futilities, which can be satisfied

under specific conditions and are partially susceptible to moral criticism under the label of "consumerism" or hedonism. Therefore, by this logic, there are practical, rational behaviors which every moral subject should pursue, in opposition to hedonic and futile ones, which must be socially repressed or permitted under certain conditions, but only to the extent that consumption feeds the market and absorbs production. Likewise, in school logic, there is a rational, practical learning behavior that can be combined with the ludic only as a facilitator of studies. Understanding the origin and the nature of this logic seemed to us a pertinent project to conceive the best form of involving youths in our programs, as the idea of study as duty and ludic as leisure are opposed in the same way. Scholastic knowledge, or study as a moral discipline, values the idea of good behavior, of a good student as the one who can rationally adequate his efforts to maximize his chances in the job market, accepting the teacher's authority and reproducing in tests the content learned. We will explore this idea by building on the Nietzsche's critique of Socrates and Plato, and on Marcuse's (1997) critique of the idealist philosophy, trying to demonstrate how, by opposing reason to emotion and by raising the rational individual to the condition of the ideal subject, these thinkers have promoted a break with the very possibility of viewing technical and practical learning as pleasure, and built the logical bases on which we founded our schools' instructionist, content-guided education. Understanding the nature of this break is fundamental to proceed with the discovery of a motivation theory that allows cultivating the necessary subjective structures[xxxviii] for the knowledge professional. These structures can start to be conceived through the development of new ways of promoting the student's relationship with learning and school order.

Nietzsche can help us understand the formation of this logic through his critique of the opposition that Socrates and Plato established between the Apollonian principle (Apollo is the god of clearness, harmony and order) and the Dionysian principle (Dionysus is the god of music, exuberance and disorder), which are mutually complementary and were separated by the Greek civilization in the same way as manual and intellectual work, the politician and the citizen, the poet and the philosopher, Eros and Logos. And also through another critique of how the Socratic and Platonic thoughts put good and truth in the world of ideas, thus creating the ideal of pursuit of true knowledge, instead of recognizing that man is destined to multiplicity, where knowledge can only be obtained through

interpretation. According with Nietzsche (1983), as Socrates established the distinction between these two worlds through the opposition between essential and apparent, true and false, intelligible and sensible, he made life that which must be judged, measured, evaluated and limited in the name of superior values such as the Divine, the Beautiful, and the True, starting the age of reason and of the theoretical man. Socrates interpreted tragic art as irrational, and condemned the irrational and the emotional as something that must be ignored by good men.

Contemporary science and education, influenced by the fusion between Socratic logic and Christianism, become a way of fighting mystic ignorance and educating "the good man" through reason. This education includes the taming of desire and its harnessing towards "useful" activities. Nietzsche rescues the original meaning of the Latin word for good, i.e., bonus, which also means warrior, in order to rescue the idea of will to power which he believes that Socratic moral has annihilated. Will to power can, if tamed by this Socratic moral, turn into a "will to nothingness" devoid of creation and drive, turning life into weakness and mutilation. This is the notion of nihilism, where desire no longer seeks creation, but becomes oriented towards domination, which is necessary to produce docile beings. Much of the discipline and drilling of bodies for work takes place through this model of education, which Foucault[xxxix] rightly perceives as fundamental and necessary for producing men and women capable of dedicating their lives to productivity under traditional capitalist standards. We can see now, however, that, given capitalism's own necessity to produce a new form of placing itself in the world, this form being denominated entrepreneurship, it's necessary to rescue this desire for action and to deconstruct the discipline of docile submission to power. The entrepreneur is the warrior, the one who throws himself into action, possessing not only the ability of being proactive (in the sense this term normally takes on, i.e., doing what there is to be done), but in the sense of throwing himself into battle and dispute. The subjective dispositions for entrepreneurship which schools have been trying hard to form are fundamentally distinct from that of the conscientious, hard-working employee.

The cognitive competences responsible for this capacity are those of analysis, critic, interpretation, assessment and synthesis, fundamentally, and the subjective ones are desire for action and pleasure to create. Therefore, more than making youths aware of a given

content, it's fundamental to make them aware of the nature of the intellectual effort that adequate appropriation of that content implies, as well as the power it generates. In other words, it's important to situate the youth in the process of pursuit of strategies for interpreting reality and solving problems and concrete cases based on theoretical structures, literature, theater and arts, which can serve as analytical basis for his thought, while mobilizing his desire. These competences are fundamental for building autonomy of thought and action. This only reinforces the inadequacy of traditional motivation theories in the new context. Traditional theories' "motivation" places the hierarchic subordinate in the submissive position of having to be motivated by the one in power or the leader, but nowhere does it explain why these subjects have fallen in the situation of requiring someone to motivate them for action. This is not a question that today's leaders can exempt themselves from answering, since if these people need to be constantly called upon to act, there is something inadequate in their education that calls them into submission and paralysis, which is grave, particularly if we agree that management in the age of knowledge tends to have smaller and smaller hierarchies.

Contrary to commonplace in bureaucratic companies, where the new employee would receive a job description and work routines to be fulfilled, in new organizations, the employee is confronted with new problems for which he is expected to contribute by finding the most adequate solutions. Opportunities will come according with the type of solution he can provide. In fact, much of people management literature points to the importance of this autonomy and relates this capacity with the formation of subjective dispositions.[xl] It's important to explore these questions also in the context of the education of these people.

And, in this perspective, we must remember Paulo Freire's (1996) affirmation that there is no teaching without learning, i.e., it's necessary to think about teacher education in parallel with a reflection on the educational-progressive practice aimed at students' autonomy. In this movement, it's necessary to acknowledge human being's inconclusiveness and start seeking to integrate students to a movement of pursuit which teachers, leaders and griôs must transform from a naive curiosity into a critical and, later, epistemological curiosity. Therefore, more than teaching a content, we must teach children

and youths to learn – to seek, in an autonomous, informed way, solutions for questions they are faced with.

The progress of youth's and children's thought in this direction depends on critical reflection about practice, since educating is not transferring knowledge, but creating the possibility for its production or construction by the student. In this perspective, the content-oriented strategy we tend to use in classroom can hardly achieve its goals, unless students can situate the theoretical knowledge they learn in relation to some practical or concrete experience they have. Normally, those who manage to perform this feat are those who were born to families where parents are professionals who can help them reach that conclusion. Studies of learning tend to confirm that, in the classroom, the student learns about half (although this is hard to quantify) of his total learning. The rest is learned out of the classroom (in campi, in extracurricular activities) or at home, in the student's exposition to a family with a science and arts culture. In terms of the study of any profession, this implies a new balance between professionalizing and educating per se. And the younger the students, the more necessary this awareness on the part of teachers and griôs, since the former still haven't experienced work and can hardly see in the theories they learn possibilities of solution for problems.

Motivation: An Anthropological Approach

If we start from the understanding of this historical origin of the separation between reason and emotion as analyzed by Nietzsche and Marcuse, we'll be better prepared to see the extent to which traditional motivation theories normally used in management are marked by a double paradigm: an epistemological one and a moral one; and, therefore, the extent to which they have to be relativized so we can tackle the deepest needs of change in educators' way of working to produce the creative professional. The first of these paradigms, i.e., the epistemological one, situates these theories in the pursuit of the "truth", a pursuit that is in the basis of positivism and its ideal of science as a neutral, universal knowledge. To that end, it ignores human being as a historical, social and cultural being, and seeks a universal and general knowledge about him which claims to be able to explain him universally, regardless of circumstances. Therefore, it ignores the very bases on which

it is built, as well as its limits of application. These theories tend to view human being as a being formed by two realities: a psychic one and a moral one, regardless of his social contexts of existence, or only "influenced" by them.[xli] Through this choice (which we don't know the extent to which it is actually a choice, in that we don't know the extent to which there is clear consciousness of the paradigm (Kuhn, 1997) that informs it), they isolate the whole question of meaning formation in human being's understanding, as a prerequisite to be able to universally conceive it. As for the moral paradigm, these theories are based on the notion of "tyrannical reason", which Nietzsche points to as being aimed at the domination of contradictory instincts. According with these theories, there is a natural and logic course of life to be pursued, one that, in its origin, opposed science to art and the ant to the grasshopper, giving moral superiority to the former to the detriment of the latter. By these theories, the primary motivation should be for economic maintenance of life and society, and only when these have been suitably provided for, motivation would logically and morally progress towards meeting the needs of the spirit. Likewise, students should first learn their contents, quiet in the classroom, and only after this duty has been fulfilled can they leave to seek leisure, thus reinforcing the work-leisure dichotomy that is also typical of the cultural distinctions through which we perceive culture, distinctions which are not truer nor necessarily more valid than other culturally valid ways of perceiving the world and human activity on it. Thus, the perception that the pursuit of knowledge is ludic and can in itself lead to its own forms of leisure, a perception typical of Greek pre-Socratic philosophy, becomes forgotten as Socrates' moral position consolidates in the constitution of our society's ethical foundations.

Another distinction created in Greek thought and which influences the way we perceive knowledge in Western culture was elaborated by Aristotle, who, according with Marcuse (1997), despite affirming that every human knowledge referred to a praxis, and that every known truth should guide praxis, whether in daily life or in arts and sciences, organized knowledge in a hierarchy, the bottom of which was occupied by knowledge guided to the purposes of what is necessary to daily existence, and at the top of which was philosophical knowledge, which exists for no purpose external to itself, but only for its own sake and its ability to provide maximum happiness to men (p. 89). In so doing, he establishes an order in which there is a fundamental distinction between the necessary and

useful on the one hand, and the beautiful and creative on the other, thus opposing work on the one hand, to leisure on the other. Pleasure and happiness would be found in leisure and in the type of activity exercised in it, a type of activity that, by principle, would be an end in itself and not subordinated to the hard necessities of life and existence. Marcuse rightly notes that this separation between useful and necessary on the one hand, and beauty and enjoyment on the other, forms the beginning of a development that, on the one hand, opens the perspective for the materialism of bourgeois praxis, and, on the other, for situating happiness and the spirit in a separate dimension, i.e., the dimension of "culture" (p.90).

Therefore, what Bourdieu (2001) calls scholastic order translates into this separation between the concrete world and its necessities and the abstract cultivation of the spirit, as, in many ways, this appears as ethical and ideal under the principles of Greek philosophy that inform our worldview. As Marcuse affirms (1997), the fundamental cause of this distinction lies in the way this path is presented as the pursuit of human freedom and happiness. The world of material goods is seen as not necessarily being the result of human wisdom and laboriousness in the Aristotelic thought. This world is a product of chance. The individual who places his supreme goal in those goods becomes a slave of men and of things that steal his power. Living to produce material wealth is a form of renouncing freedom. Likewise, the human soul is articulated in an inferior dimension, which is that of sensibility, and a superior dimension, which is that of reason and the soul. The dimension of sensibility is devalued for the same reason as material goods are, i.e., because it's the dimension of inconstancy, anarchy and non-freedom. The dimension of sensibility, or "inferior sectors of the soul", ties man to greed and possession. To Plato, the love of the sensible world is a form of love of money, as this type of desire is preferably satisfied by means of money. Attachment to the sensible world, to the world of emotion, is therefore also a form of slavery to matter and an absence of freedom. Little wonder, then, that the ideal of education has, in a way, withdrawn the student from life's concreteness and educated him in an abstract way. It has done so because it was believed that students were being educated for freedom, when, in fact, the very concept of freedom here wasn't being discussed, but unconsciously and a priori accepted based on specific values that come to us in this way through culture.

Therefore, an anthropological understanding of motivation to learn should be capable of understanding how these principles have turned into paradigms (Kuhn, 1997) that influenced education and the models of course we created, which are strongly founded on symbolical logics of perception of the world that structure contemporary culture, in order to allow us to think about the pursuit to overcome it. By understanding this logic, which is behind the way we organize school discipline and every form of knowledge transmission in our schools, we'll be better prepared to figure how to work towards the production of truly motivating conditions, i.e., rescuing the ludic element as an integral part of learning activities. This necessarily implies the pursuit of discovering how knowledge can be transmitted without resorting to traditional authoritarian structures. This is a huge challenge for contemporary societies. Of course, we are not advocating here the end of classes and discipline in the school, but rather the integration of students' active role to it, even in building the very discipline required for learning. Discipline can be a source of individual freedom when the individual cultivates it as a method of self-enhancement. Brazilian culture's authoritarian tradition tends to pose us a certain difficulty with this notion: because the law was imposed by those in power, discipline can only be viewed as a synonym for domination.

Students participation in building the discipline required for active learning can, for example, be constructed through the formation of study brotherhoods, film societies, student unions for the support of folklore, among others, where member affiliation is decided by students themselves.

Therefore, to think about cultural responsibility is to integrate that which should never have been broken, and to understand that we are all responsible for the future of our youths. It's to understand that values-based leaderships are, fundamentally, leaderships that exercise their influence by means of the diffusion of values. This is only possible if we stop delegating education entirely to school, and understand we need to be an "educating society". Like in tribes, in old communities: it's the adults who educate youths. It's the leaders who transform hearts and souls. School is only a mechanism, an organization of a functional-utilitarian nature that aims to organize and transmit instituted knowledge. It is not, nor can it be, the only educating institution in a society. To delegate the entire education to school is to give up a fundamental role in social transformation.

Finally, we note that the didactical-pedagogical goal starts to be achieved not by transmitting a certain content and assessing its understanding, but by building inquisitiveness about how to solve a problem. Thus, the student starts to realize how theories are, as Guerreiro Ramos (1983) puts it, epistemological rules to interpret reality in practical terms, as well as their limits of applicability. And he starts to realize, also in practice, the historical and sociological conditioning of knowledge – i.e., that a certain set of knowledge types isn't related with an "absolute truth", but, rather, that it forms knowledge that is constructed to build specific problems, of a specific society, and in a specific historical moment, and how, by acknowledging this specificity, we can use such knowledge in solving new problems in a conscious manner. In other words, by understanding its possibilities and limits.

Studying becomes an award, rather than a duty.

Culture, Power and Emotion

Business owners, executives and managers know well how power can motivate. They have experienced how responsibility and a clear understanding of their mission and goal can stimulate their senses and imagination, accelerate their learning process, and expand their curiosity for solutions and possible answers for a single problem. They also know how the lack of it can affect their actions. If they don't have power over a problem, the necessary knowledge to solve it is felt like a useless waste of time.

The sense of mission and the vision of what one wants to achieve are given by a culture which establishes the values that will allow us to hierarchize our priorities and give our actions a focus.

Obviously, not every human being is motivated to do the same things. Diversity and difference are part of human richness. But motivating oneself to do something the meaning of which is not internalized as a value, or for which there is no access to the necessary resources to achieve results is rather a symptom of lack of connection with reality, it's a form of madness. Giddens[xlii] defines power as access to the material and political resources to make a difference at the level of human concrete activity. In the lack of values that

establish a personal mission or a vision of how to fulfill it, is it possible to view education as a resource? In other words, when the individual isn't conscious of who he is or how far he can go, is it possible to opt, in a rational, conscious, motivated way, for a path to take him there?

Culture, Power and Ethics:

In philosophy, there is a general tendency to agree that ethics is the general theory, that it seeks to found or justify a given form of moral behavior. Ethics deals with defining what is generically good.[xliii]   The problem of what to do in each situation is a practical-moral problem. Not a theoretical-ethical one. But the question of defining how to act, how to hierarchize questions, involves the filter of culture.

We talk about citizenship. We talk about the importance of promoting citizenship. But we leave that role to the state. Isn't there an inversion in this logic? Doesn't the state exist to serve the citizen? How and why, then, is the state responsible for creating citizenship?

Citizenship is the set of rights that the citizen recognizes he possesses and exercises. The citizen is the subject who knows himself and is aware of his rights, who can enter, through these rights, a given society that clearly shows, through its institutional, legal and moral systems, each citizen's capacity to claim and exercise them in public life. [xliv] We will only be an actual democracy when people understand themselves in terms of this role.

If we agree with Nietzsche and so many other thinkers about the notion that there is no truth for human being, only interpretations and viewpoints, the importance of dialogue emerges as the only possibility of ethical interaction. In fact, Habermas already affirms this as he says that exercising dialogue is in itself ethical. But dialogue doesn't mean indoctrination, it doesn't mean persuasion, it means mediation, since ethics is necessarily conflict, as pure good or evil doesn't correspond to the human. Conflict mediates the health of relationships, as it allows each person to express himself, to be who he is, or better put, to build himself in a healthy relationship with the other and grow as a being. It's in this perspective that ethics is related with autonomy. If we search the etymology of the word, autonomy means to give oneself norms. For this to be possible, the subject needs four

fundamental conditions: consciousness, will, freedom and responsibility. In this perspective, consciousness is the acknowledgement that I am an ethical subject, and so is the other. Will is the result of the subject's effort to build his I based on self-control and self-limit, acknowledging that the more an individual is capable of controlling himself and knowing himself, the greater his control over his life, and the more choices he has in it, therefore, the greater his freedom. The norm imposed from outside, imposed by the other, is heteronomy, which is a form of violence, where the other determines what I can do. Heteronomy tends to generate passivity or resistance.

Ethics is always associated with promoting autonomy and the fight against passivity, which presuppose acknowledging and respecting difference, while knowing the position one speaks from. To promote dialogue is, therefore, to promote empowerment based on autonomy, while understanding that freedom (including freedom of speech) without norms is barbarism. Norms, rules and principles are given by culture, but they should and can be changed by autonomous, conscious subjects.

One of multiculturalists' mistakes in defending culture as an entity to be respected in its integrity was refusing to acknowledge that culture is not an entity, it's not a being, it's a human product. It can't be greater than human being, it can't suffocate him, restrain him, repress him or sentence him to live in a way he wouldn't if he had choices. Every culture produces strong ideological tendencies that legitimate a social order and the unequal relationships within it. These power relationships can hardly stem from consensus, and, therefore, within the same culture, there are those who would like to live differently. Defending a "culture" as something that must be respected in itself is, in many ways, defending that a human production should be greater than man in his capacity to choose his own paths.

In our case, culture, as a lens that forms our worldview, has been making us live in a vicious cycle we would like to find ourselves free from but reproduce without having chosen to.

In general, an empowering, critical, consciousness-building education should work within an expanded communicative logic which embrace the student's complex and integrated needs. Human communication has various roles: an integrating role, which seeks

to reach a certain amount of consensus about a system of values; an informative role, which seeks to organize cognition about certain matters; a political role, which seeks to create partnerships, alliances, to solve or produce conflicts or disputes, or to diffuse a vision of reality (ideology); and an organizing role, which seeks to obtain consensus about how to act in a coordinated way. The denial of the other in the communication forms that are characteristic of Brazilian education takes place by privileging the informative role above all others, always establishing that the teacher must inform, and the student must listen. This form of action is unethical in that it doesn't promote autonomy or the fight against passivity, quite the opposite: it privileges heteronomy and the taming of the other. It hinders the formation of the subordinate's or student's identity and the construction of his point of view, while expecting him to act regardless of values of his own. In this perspective, the political role is exercised without awareness of it, as a result of the (unconscious) denial of the other.

In order to see how, in the West in general, and, more specifically, in Brazil, with its characteristic tendencies, communication is thought of, a valid exercise of reflection is to make a comparison with the Japanese way of thinking about the same phenomenon. If we look at our traditional communication schemes, which are a reflex of how we think, we will see that the process starts with a vector departing from the one who sends a message – i.e., the sender – then crossing a medium (where it may suffer noise interference or not) and reaching a receiver – who theoretically responds, thus feeding the cycle again. The focus is always on action, as if nothing could take place in its absence. Our way of speaking and our grammar reflect this point of view. When we speak, we do so by affirming that a subject executes an action. E.g., The boy walks in the room. When we look at how Japanese speak, we see another focus: in the situation where a room exists, a boy entered (*heia ni kodomo ga hairu*). There is an organized situation, a room, which is interrupted or disturbed by an action. The action doesn't take place in nothingness, but where something already exists. In terms of a communication system, the Japanese colloquially say it's important to establish a "harabanashi" or a dialogue between bellies, to ensure communication efficiency. Of course, the Japanese don't speak with their bellies literally, but they believe that harmony between them is fundamental. What this means is that bellies, which are viewed as human being's energetic center, must be in tune for the subsequent action of communicating to be

successful. In other words, communication success lies in managing or building its context. An authoritarian speech ignores this subject and this set of emotions that preexists speech. And it's often uncappable of perceiving that resentment towards power or the person is the main interfering noise, particularly in face-to-face interaction situations. We all have experienced trying to communicate in relationships that went wrong: regardless of what is said or how, speech is met with opposition. Likewise, when we are in situations where we wish to connect, half a word unveils a world of possibilities of dialogue and understanding.

This process is no different from the way children and youths interact with the teacher's speech in school. If the teacher is nice (democratic, attentive), there is a very big predisposition to listening to him. On the contrary, when the teacher is distant and authoritarian, a predisposition to contradict and confront him builds. But perhaps due to our authoritarian past and our struggles against authoritarianism and repression, being nice is being equal, it's not imposing a difference. It is, in many ways, to indulge students. The opposite of that is being authoritarian. We can't see alternatives, such as being nice while disciplining and orienting in a democratic, responsible manner, or seducing students towards the world of knowledge while imposing limits of ethical and democratic coexistence. Demanding respect as an exercise of autonomy, rather than domination.

We have a historical difficulty understanding the importance of the power that says yes, as Michel Foucault analyzes. The power that empowers. We forget that freedom is a social production, it doesn't exist in nature and it needs social order to form. Freedom depends on the law, otherwise we have barbarism and anarchy. In barbarism, the power of the strongest prevails, and freedom gives way to fear. Our restrictions to the phenomenon of power, which we can only see negatively, blind us to the importance of the discipline that singularizes, values, builds perfection, the discipline that is internal, characteristic of the conscious subject, who achieves his best by managing himself. But our experience with legalism, bureaucracy and abuses of power help us forget this, as too often it brings to our memory the negative aspects of power. We talk about ethics in our society, but we have difficulty thinking about it in its foundations, as we are afraid of speaking of law and sounding authoritarian, conservative and outdated. We speak of ethics in the void and in abstracto. We are unable to speak of the concrete relationships and consequences it must necessarily have as a result of our actions on the world.

In a society that we subjectively read as hedonist, we are afraid of talking about capacity of renouncement as a foundation of ethics. There is no ethics without an ethical subject. There is no ethical subject if people don't freely and consciously renounce doing evil, if they don't renounce prioritizing their own pleasure for the good of the other, or if they don't renounce satisfying their own immediate desires or seeking easy gains to the detriment of efforts to build a fairer, more harmonic society. There's no ethical society where everything is relativized. Our system's impunity has deeper causes than the action of this or that politician or judge. It's founded on our fear of power, our fear of equality or fear of ethics, for what it makes us confront: ourselves. Culture can be a powerful element of informal coordination. We know that social life depends on coordination and cooperation. But in the lack of a historical dialogue, in an authoritarian coexistence, we haven't been able to build a minimum degree of consensus regarding productive values. In Brazil, social coordination has historically taken place by means of hierarchies, where subordinates don't get to speak. In this perspective, social controls were instituted by means of force and oppression, particularly against the other, against the poor. With democratization, we have progressively sought to break with this perverse tradition, but we haven't found effective coordination mechanisms in its absence. We live with a chaos and a disorganization that test the limits of our endurance. To complete our passage to democracy, we need to help build a system of ethical values that serves as basis to it. Our institutions have much to learn so we can know how to create order through dialogue and the inclusion of the other's point of view.

We have created a country where the elite, i.e., cultural, business, and educational leaders, among others, hide for fear of assuming the responsibility that comes from being a leader. Cultural responsibility presupposes, in a way, that we look at this foggy mirror through which we can see the culture we created so we can act responsibly to improve the image it reflects.

Culture and Consumption

Another field where the question of cultural responsibility needs to be thought about is that of consumption. Today, there is a vast academic production about consumption as a cultural process, but this subject is still far from being public domain, and further still from being included in a systematic discussion about culture.

Again, when we take a closer look at the public policies arena, the discussion becomes unduly marked by ideological positions. The left, deeply marked by Marx's thought, tends to see the consumption process as the opposite of sociability, as contrary to solidarity and as the result of the alienation process, this time described as commodity fetishism. The right tends to view consumption as a buying and selling process, as an action of free, isolated individuals who, based on their utility functions, can freely exchange in the market. In positions that articulate between both extremes, we can see a whole wide range of approaches about mass communication, publicity, advertising and marketing which produce other myths and other answers about the role of consumption and publicity in global society. Obviously, it's not our purpose here to repeat or summarize this entire complexity, but rather to propose another perspective on the matter.

When anthropologists talk about consumption as a cultural process, what they are actually saying is that human beings organize, communicate with one another, hierarchize themselves, create their rituals, their identities and their disputes not only through communicative, political and economic processes, but also material ones, in a symbolical sense.

For example, we organize our activities in time and space through various communicative processes, clothing being one of them. We have clothes for sleeping, clothes for staying home, clothes for leisure, clothes for work, clothes for religious ceremonies, clothes for rituals, among others. Some indigenous tribes make some of these distinctions through body painting. Although clothes are a cultural production, this doesn't mean they don't have a weight of reality over our actions. We can't go to work in our pajamas. We can't attend our boss' wedding at 8:00 p.m. wearing jeans. Through our clothes, we communicate our agreement with a system of norms, with some types of discipline, with the desire to celebrate, among others.[xlv]

Our clothes indicate our position in social hierarchy, our status, our role, our functions, how much power we have in a certain group or how excluded we are. When we

choose a type of clothing instead of another, in reality, we are making various statements about who we are and who we want to be. If I choose hippie-looking clothes, I'm making a series of political statements about the way I view contemporary society. I'm saying what kind of people I have affinities with, and what kind I don't. The same holds for more formal clothes, international brand clothes, or a refusal to wear those brands.

A country's integration to global dynamics can, if not properly managed, aggravate a series of historical inequalities and magnify the process of social disorganization. Our poor boy dreams about a pair of Nike trainers. He associates this brand with glamour and a capacity to make him accepted and respected in his community. He figures that if he can consume like a middle-class boy, most of his problems will be solved. He will no longer be followed by security guards in shops and shopping malls, he will no longer be treated as a poor excluded boy when he asks well-dressed gentlemen downtown the time, he won't be looked at like someone to be feared and to steer away from. He dreams that the brand will mediate new forms of sociability. Without means of access to these consumption goods, he becomes vulnerable to the lure of drug dealing as an alternative to this exclusion, which is at once material and symbolical. How is it possible for youths like him to build resistance against the power of brands and the appeal of global marketing? How to prevent millions of poor children and youths from outskirts of big cities in countries like ours from becoming victims of the perverse effect that consumption dynamics has over them?

The valuing of local cultures, the valuing of a production (of handicrafts, organized in cooperatives) attached to these local cultures, can work as an antidote against these pressures, while reconstructing the sense of belonging to these communities, and reorganizing social life. But small handicraft cooperatives obviously don't have economic power to invest in building an imagery about their products. There is no way of attaching an image of glamour, sophistication and success to these products, since building brand image and value requires bulky investments.

A perverse cycle is thus created in the heart of these communities. Mothers strive to sell their handicrafts and sewn products, while their sons seek drug dealing to get the resources to buy themselves designer trainers. The devaluing of local products takes place in a direct relationship with the valuing of products promoted by publicity and advertising,

which offer the symbolical code, the logic of social imagination, that one appropriates through these products.

Pride in using local products and the valuing of local production are directly related with a capacity to produce adequate social values and identities in relation to them. This process is connected to the capacity of producing a symbolical logic that allows building an identity as a member of that group, a supporter of its causes and values. If in the capitalist age, the resistance of peripheral countries took place in the form of a state-stimulated industrialization which allowed investment leveraging, in the post-capitalist age, this dispute is symbolic: it's in the perspective of struggles and local articulations between global and local that this integration must be thought about.[xlvi]

We all know that one of the strategies that large brands have created to secure businesses with greater added value is to secure the noblest activities in their headquarter countries, i.e., design, image, publicity, while outsourcing production to peripheral countries with lower labor costs. The value of products is not in their manufacturing, pure and simple, as it used to be in the mass production age, but in the ability of product image managers to attach a set of intangible and symbolical elements to products. Investing in forms of resistance that are also symbolical and intangible is a fundamental condition to avoid all the negative externalities that this brand production process creates in poor communities, and to seek to create some strategic balance in this totally unequal dispute. The dispute is for hearts and minds – and it's in this battlefield that strategies of cultural responsibility must be operating to avoid the aggravation of exclusion and injustice. If we fail in this struggle, our youths, without opposition discourses or a values-based education, have no way of resisting the appeal of brands. The cost of fighting violence increases and we all foot the bill, while the large profit goes to large brands.

Allowing the poor to appropriate their local culture, their folklore, their traditions and their traditional esthetics can help subjects to symbolically build their position as subjects who speak, who have a point of view, who have the capacity to resist and set their own strategies of life, like autonomous and capable subjects. This capacity is at the core of the possibility to look at a designer product and say: this instance of beauty is foreigner – it's not ours, it doesn't speak about us, it's not the measure of our cultural expression. I can even choose to consume it, but I have other equally valid alternatives which are not

necessarily gaudier, tackier, poorer or inferior by any criterion whatsoever. An instance of beauty from New York doesn't override mine, it doesn't act against me. It's only another possibility of human creation among innumerous possible others. It's only a form of esthetic expression, and not the one that makes me act against my own interest. Developing the consciousness that the subject can resist with dignity is fundamental. But, as sociologist Pierre Bourdieu used to enjoy saying, resistance to any type of power depends on producing a discourse that reveals how this power operates and how it's possible to act in relation to it. It takes a considerably educated mind to grasp the whole articulation that global economy conducts with local consumption and the ways in which it affects people's self-esteem, self-image and dignity. One cannot expect the poor, who are excluded, among other things, from a critical education process, to be capable of articulating this discourse. But investing in the valuing of local culture in combination with this political debate with communities can generate this movement.

In terms of public policies for culture, what we can do is to expand incentives for projects that have this purpose at once cultural and educative (education understood here not as academic content, but rather as ways of reading the world).

If we agree that the industry will employ less in the future, given its irrevocable tendency towards automation processes, and that formal employment as the privileged form of social integration tends to decline, it's necessary and urgent to empower the poor so they can benefit from what they already possess: their knowledge, their techniques, their art and their esthetics, so that local markets can absorb and value their products.

In reality, we tend to agree with Amartya Sen [xlvii] when he says that, although we are living in a time of unprecedented opulence, we live with poverty persistence, chronic hunger and the violation of elementary political and economic freedoms. Gross domestic product growth can be seen as one of the means of valuing human being and his growth, but it can't be confused with the solution or the final goal of the whole developmentalist effort. The goal of development is to produce quality of life for people. Innumerous means can be employed to that end. If we think about development as Sen proposes, i.e., as freedom, we can find again the link between forms of local empowerment and social development. According with him, what people can effectively realize is influenced by economic opportunities, political freedoms, social powers and habilitating conditions such

as good health, basic education and encouragement and enhancement of initiatives. The institutional dispositions that provide these opportunities are also influenced by people's exercise of their freedoms by means of freedom to participate in the social choices and public decision-making that boost the progress of these opportunities. These forms of support for local economic action reinforce these goals and the scope of people's freedom, if we understand freedom as man's capacity to decide and choose in society. There is no choice in the state of nature, nor in poverty and exclusion.

Extracted from: *Oficinas do Sistema Nacional de Cultura*. **A Publication of the Ministry of Culture, Brasília, July 2006.**

Agenda 21 for Culture

An undertaking by cities and local governments for cultural development

We, cities and local governments of the world, committed to human rights, cultural diversity, sustainability, participatory democracy and the creation of the conditions for peace, assembled in Barcelona on 7 and 8 May 2004, at the IV Porto Alegre Forum of Local Authorities for Social Inclusion, in the framework of the Universal Forum of Cultures – Barcelona 2004, agree on this Agenda 21 for Culture as a guiding document for our public cultural policies and as a contribution to the cultural development of humanity.

I. Principles

1. Cultural diversity is the main heritage of humanity. It is the product of thousands of years of history, the fruit of the collective contribution of all peoples through their languages, imaginations, technologies, practices and creations. Culture takes on different forms, responding to dynamic models of relationship between societies and territories. Cultural diversity is "a means to achieve a more satisfactory intellectual, emotional, moral and spiritual existence" (UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, article 3), and is one of the essential elements in the transformation of urban and social reality.

2. Clear political analogies exist between cultural and ecological questions, as both culture and the environment are common assets of all humanity. The current economic development models, which prey excessively on natural resources and common goods of humanity, are the cause of increasing concern for the environment. Rio de Janeiro 1992, Aalborg 1994, and Johannesburg 2002, have been the milestones in a process of answering one of the most important challenges facing humanity: environmental sustainability. The current situation also provides sufficient evidence that cultural diversity in the world is in danger due to a globalization that standardizes and excludes. UNESCO says: "A source of exchange, innovation and creativity, cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature" (UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, article 1).

3. Local governments recognize that cultural rights are an integral part of human rights, taking as their reference the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966) and the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (2001). They recognize that the cultural freedom of individuals and communities is an essential condition for democracy. No one may invoke cultural diversity to infringe upon the human rights guaranteed by international law, nor to limit their scope.

4. Local governments are worldwide agents of prime importance as defenders and promoters of the advance of human rights. They also represent the citizens of the world and speak out in favor of

international democratic systems and institutions. Local governments work together in networks, exchanging practices and experiences and coordinating their actions.

5. Cultural development relies on a host of social agents. The main principles of good governance include transparency of information and public participation in the conception of cultural policies, decision- making processes and the assessment of programs and projects.

6. The indispensable need to create the conditions for peace must go hand in hand with cultural development strategies. War, terrorism, oppression and discrimination are expressions of intolerance which must be condemned and eradicated.

7. Cities and local spaces are a privileged setting for cultural invention which is in constant evolution, and provide the environment for creative diversity, where encounters amongst everything that is different and distinct (origins, visions, ages, genders, ethnic groups and social classes) are what makes full human development possible. Dialogue between identity and diversity, individual and group, is a vital tool for guaranteeing both a planetary cultural citizenship as well as the survival of linguistic diversity and the development of cultures.

8. Coexistence in cities is a joint responsibility of citizens, civil society and local governments. Laws are fundamental, but cannot be the only way of regulating coexistence in cities. As the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (article 29) states: "Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his …(/her) … personality is possible".

9. Cultural heritage, tangible and intangible, testifies to human creativity and forms the bedrock underlying the identity of peoples. Cultural life contains both the wealth of being able to appreciate and treasure traditions of all peoples and an opportunity to enable the creation and innovation of endogenous cultural forms. These qualities preclude any imposition of rigid cultural m o d e l s .

10. The affirmation of cultures, and the policies which support their recognition and viability, are an essential factor in the sustainable development of cities and territories and its human, economic, political and social dimension. The central nature of public cultural policies is a demand of societies in the contemporary world. The quality of local development depends on the interweaving of cultural and other public policies – social, economic, educational, environmental and urban p l a n n i n g .

11. Cultural policies must strike a balance between public and private interest, public functions and the institutionalization of culture. Excessive institutionalization or the excessive prevalence of the market as the sole distributor of cultural resources involves risks and hampers the dynamic development of cultural systems. The autonomous initiative of the citizens, individually or in social entities and movements, is the basis of cultural freedom.

12. Proper economic assessment of the creation and distribution of cultural goods – amateur or professional, craft or industrial, individual or collective – becomes, in the contemporary world, a decisive factor in emancipation, a guarantee of diversity and, therefore, an attainment of the democratic right of peoples to affirm their identities in the relations between cultures. Cultural goods and services, as stated in the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (article 8), "as vectors of identity, values and meaning, must not be treated as mere commodities or consumer goods". It is necessary to emphasize the importance of culture as a factor in the creation of wealth and economic development.

13. Access to the cultural and symbolic universe at all stages of life, from childhood to old age, is a fundamental

element in the shaping of sensitivity, expressiveness and coexistence and the construction of citizenship. The cultural identity of each individual is dynamic.

14. The appropriation of information and its transformation into knowledge by the citizens is a cultural act. Therefore, access without discrimination to expressive, technological and communication resources and the constitution of horizontal networks strengthens and nourishes the collective heritage of a knowledge-based society.

15. Work is one of the principal spheres of human creativity. Its cultural dimension must be recognized and developed. The organization of work and the involvement of businesses in the city or territory must respect this dimension as one of the basic elements in human dignity and sustainable development.

16. Public spaces are collective goods that belong to all citizens. No individual or group can be deprived of free use of them, providing they respect the rules adopted by each city.

II. <u>Undertakings</u>

17. To establish policies that foster cultural diversity in order to guarantee a broad supply and to promote the presence of all cultures especially minority or unprotected cultures, in the media and to support co-productions and exchanges avoiding hegemonic positions.

18. To support and promote, through different means and instruments, the maintenance and expansion of cultural goods and services, ensuring universal access to them, increasing the creative capacity of all citizens, the wealth represented by linguistic diversity, promoting artistic quality, searching new forms of expression and the experimentation with new art languages, as well as the reformulation and the interaction between traditions, and the implementation of mechanisms of cultural management which detect new cultural movements and new artistic talent and encourage them to reach fulfillment. Local governments state their commitment to creating and increasing cultural audiences and encouraging cultural participation as a vital element of citizenship.

19. To implement the appropriate instruments to guarantee the democratic participation of citizens in the formulation, exercise and evaluation of public cultural policies.

20. To guarantee the public funding of culture by means of the necessary instruments. Notable among these are the direct funding of public programs and services, support for private enterprise activities through subsidies, and newer models such as micro-credits, risk-capital funds, etc. It is also possible to consider establishing legal systems to facilitate tax incentives for companies investing in culture, providing these respect the public interest.

21. To open up spaces for dialogue between different spiritual and religious choices living side by side in the local area, and between these groups and the public authorities to ensure the right to free speech and harmonious coexistence.

22. To promote expression as a basic dimension of human dignity and social inclusion without prejudice by gender, age, ethnic origin, disability, poverty or any other kind of discrimination which hinders the full exercise of freedoms. The struggle against exclusion is a struggle for the dignity of all people.

23. To promote the continuity and the development of indigenous local cultures, which are bearers of a historic and interactive relation with the territory.

24. To guarantee the cultural expression and participation of people with cultures from immigration or originally rooted in other areas. At the same time, local governments undertake to provide the means for immigrants to have access to and participate in the culture of the host community. That reciprocal commitment is the foundation of coexistence and intercultural processes, which in fact, without that name, have contributed to creating the identity of each city.

25. To promote the implementation of forms of "cultural impact assessment" as a mandatory consideration of the public or private initiatives that involve significant changes in the cultural life of cities.

26. To consider cultural parameters in all urban and regional planning, establishing the laws, rules and regulations required to ensure protection of local cultural heritage and the legacy of previous generations.

27. To promote the existence of the public spaces of the city and foster their use as cultural places for interaction and coexistence. To foster concern for the aesthetics of public spaces and collective amenities.

28. To implement measures to decentralize cultural policies and resources, legitimating the creative originality of the so-called peripheries, favoring the vulnerable sectors of society and defending the principle of the right of all citizens to culture and knowledge without discrimination. That determination does not mean avoiding central responsibilities and, in particular, responsibility for funding any decentralization project.

29. To particularly promote coordination between the cultural policies of local governments that share a territory, creating a dialogue that values the identity of each authority, their contribution to the whole and the efficiency of the services for citizens.

30. To boost the strategic role of the cultural industries and the local media for their contribution to local identity, creative continuity and job creation.

31. To promote the socialization of and access to the digital dimension of projects and the local or global cultural heritage. The information and communication technologies should be used as tools for bringing cultural knowledge within the reach of all citizens.

32. To implement policies whose aim is the promote access to local public media and to develop these media in accordance with the interests of the community, following the principles of plurality, transparency and responsibility.

33. To generate the mechanisms, instruments and resources for guaranteeing freedom of speech.

34. To respect and guarantee the moral rights of authors and artists and ensure their fair remuneration.

35. To invite creators and artists to commit themselves to the city and the territory by identifying the problems and conflicts of our society, improving coexistence and quality of life, increasing the creative and critical capacity of all citizens and, especially, cooperating to contribute to the resolution of the challenges faced by the cities.

36. To establish policies and investments to encourage reading and the diffusion of books, as well as full access for all citizens to global and local literary production.

37. To foster the public and collective character of culture, promoting the contact of all sectors of the city with all forms of expression that favor conviviality: live shows, films, festivals, etc.

38. To generate coordination between cultural and education policies, encouraging the promotion of creativity and sensitivity and the relations between cultural expressions of the territory and the education system.

39. To guarantee that people with disabilities can enjoy cultural goods and services, facilitating their access to cultural services and activities.

40. To promote relations between the cultural facilities and other entities working with knowledge, such as universities, research centers and research companies.

41. To promote programs aimed at popularizing scientific and technical culture among all citizens, especially considering that the ethical, social, economic and political issues raised by possible applications of new scientific knowledge are of public interest.

42. To establish legal instruments and implement actions to protect the cultural heritage by means of inventories, registers, catalogues and to promote and popularize heritage appreciation through activities such as exhibitions, museums or itineraries.

43. To protect, valorize and popularize the local documentary heritage generated in the public local/regional sphere, on their own initiative or in association with public and private entities, providing incentives for the creation of municipal and regional systems for that purpose.

44. To encourage the free exploration of cultural heritage by all citizens in all parts of the world. To promote, in relation with the professionals in the sector, forms of tourism that respect the cultures and customs of the localities and territories visited.

45. To develop and implement policies that deepen multilateral processes based on the principle of reciprocity. International cultural cooperation is an indispensable tool for the constitution of a supportive human community which promotes the free circulation of artists and cultural operators, especially across the north-south frontier, as an essential contribution to dialogue between peoples to overcome the imbalances brought about by colonialism and for interregional integration.

III. Recommendations

TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

46. All local governments are invited to submit this document for the approval of their legislative bodies and to carry out a wider debate with local society.

47. Ensure the central place of culture in local policies and promote the drafting of an Agenda 21 for culture in each city or territory, in close coordination with processes of public participation and strategic planning.

48. Make proposals for agreeing the mechanisms for cultural management with other institutional levels, always respecting the principle of subsidiarity.

49. Fulfill, before 2006, a proposal for a system of cultural indicators that support the deployment of this Agenda 21 for culture, including methods to facilitate monitoring and comparability.

TO STATE AND NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS

50. Establish instruments for public intervention in the cultural field, bearing in mind the increase in citizens' cultural needs, current deficiencies of cultural programs and resources and the importance of devolving budgetary allocations. Moreover, it is necessary to work to allocate a minimum of 1% of the national budget for culture.

51. Establish mechanisms for consultation and agreement with local governments, directly or through their networks and federations, to make new legislation, rules and systems for funding in the

cultural field.

52. Avoid trade agreements that constrain the free development of culture and the exchange of cultural goods and services on equal terms.

53. Approve legal provisions to avoid the concentration of cultural and communication industries and to promote cooperation, particularly in the field of production, with local and regional representatives and agents.

54. Guarantee appropriate mention of the origin of cultural goods exhibited in our territories and adopt measures to prevent illegal trafficking of goods belonging to the historic heritage of other peoples.

55. Implement at state or national level international agreements on cultural diversity, especially the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, approved at the 31st General Conference, in November 2001, and the Plan of Action on Cultural Policies for Development agreed at the Intergovernmental Conference in Stockholm (1998).

TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

ORGANIZATIONS OF CITIES

56. To United Cities and Local Governments: adopt this Agenda 21 for Culture as a reference document for their cultural programs and also assume their role as coordinators of the process after their adoption.

57. To continental networks of cities and local governments (especially the ones that promoted this Agenda 21 such as Interlocal, Eurocities, Sigma or Mercociudades): consider this document within their technical action and policy programs.

UNITED NATIONS PROGRAMS AND AGENCIES

59. To UNESCO: recognize this Agenda 21 for Culture as a reference document in its work preparing the international legal instrument or Convention on Cultural Diversity planned for 2005.

59. To UNESCO: recognize cities as the territories where the principles of cultural diversity are applied, especially those aspects related to coexistence, democracy and participation; and to establish the means for local governments to participate in its programs.

60. To the United Nations Development Program (UNDP): deepen its analysis of culture and development and incorporate cultural indicators into the calculation of the human development index (HDI).

61. To the Department of Economic and Social Affairs – Sustainable Development Section, which is responsible for the monitoring of Agenda 21: develop the cultural dimension of sustainability following the principles and commitments of this Agenda 21 for C u l t u r e .

62. To United Nations – HABITAT: consider this document as a basis for the establishing the importance of the cultural dimension of urban policies.

63. To the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: include the urban dimension in its analysis of the relations between cultural rights and other human rights.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND SUPRANATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

64. To the World Trade Organizations: exclude cultural goods and services from their negotiation rounds. The bases for exchanges of cultural goods and services must be established in a new international

legal instrument such as the Convention on Cultural Diversity planned for 2005.

65. To the continental organizations (European Union, Mercosur, African Union, Association of Southeast Asian Nations): incorporate culture as a pillar of their construction. Respecting the national competences and subsidiarity, there is a need for a continental cultural policy based on the principles of the legitimacy of public intervention in culture, diversity, participation, democracy and networking.

66. To the multilateral bodies established on principles of cultural affinity (for example, the Council of Europe, the League of Arab States, the Organization of Iberoamerican States, the International Francophone Organization, the Commonwealth, the Community of Portuguese Language Countries, the Latin Union): promote dialogue and joint projects which lead to a greater understanding between civilizations and the generation of mutual knowledge and trust, the basis of peace.

67. To the International Network for Cultural Policies (states and ministers of culture) and the International Network for Cultural Diversity (artists' associations): consider the cities as fundamental territories of cultural diversity, to establish the mechanisms for the participation of local governments in their work and to include the principles set out in this Agenda 21 for culture in their plans of action.

Barcelona, May 8th, 2004

---

[i] See: http://www.sustainability-indexes.com/

[ii] For more details about the relationship between consumption and citizenship, see: CANCLINI, Néstor, *Consumidores e cidadãos: conflitos multiculturais da globalização.* Rio de Janeiro, Editora da UFRJ, 2001.

[iii] Suchanek, A. and Waldkirch, R**.** (2002). *The Task of Business Ethics*. Universität Eichstätt, Ingolstadt.

[iv] See, particularly: Buarque de Hollanda, Sérgio. *Raízes do Brasil*; Prado Júnior, Caio, *Formação do Brasil Contemporâneo*; Gilberto Freire, *Casa Grande e Senzala* & *Sobrados e Mucambos*, all of which in the collections: Santiago, Silviano (coord.) *Intérpretes do Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro, Editora Nova Aguilar, 2002, and Faoro, Raymundo. *Os Donos do Poder*. São Paulo: Globo; Publifolha, 2000, *Grandes Nomes do Pensamento Brasileiro* collection.

[v] The index for measuring hierarchic distance is proposed by Hofstede, Geert. *Culture's Consequences. Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi, 2001, in one of the greatest and more systematic efforts to create quantitative methods for comparing cultures. The hierarchic distance index aims to measure and define the degree to which those with less power in a country's institutions and organizations accept an unequal division of power. Starting from the assumption that any society must hierarchize people and deal with inequality, Hofstede proposes a tool for comparing the forms in which this is done in relation to other cultures. He creates a tool to assess tendencies to build relationships of dependence, independence and counter-dependence (i.e., dependence with negative connotations) in a country. According with this study, Brazil appears in the quadrant of countries with greatest hierarchic distance for this index.

[vi] Geddes, Bárbara. *Politician's Dilemma. Building State Capacity in Latin América*. Berkley, Los Angeles and London. University of California Press, 1994.

vii For more details about this trajectory of Swiss democracy, see: Fleiner-Gerster, Thomas. *Teoria Geral do Estado*. São Paulo, Martins Fontes, 2006.

viii The term poor was chosen here because it conceptually points to the essence of the question we wish to address. Poverty is a measure of exclusion in various aspects. Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood (1979) note that, in anthropological terms, a rich person is not the one who has much, materially speaking. It's the one who is well integrated to a community that perceives itself as prosperous. To be poor is to be excluded. Poor is also the term that has been used by the World Bank in its studies on fighting poverty and exclusion, meaning the lack of access to a series of goods and services necessary to a full human life, from drinking water to quality education.

ix The Ministry of Culture, along with the Commission on Education and Culture (CEC), held preparatory sectoral seminars for the 1st National Conference on Culture, and they have been working on the creation of the National Culture Plan and on reviewing the National Education Plan. But there is still a long, uncertain way to go. Source: *Oficinas do Sistema Nacional de Cultura*. Ministry of Culture, Brasília, July 2006.

x In anthropological terms, meaning is a necessity – it's a precondition for reading the world and surviving in it. Ultimately, meaning makes survival possible, as it organizes the world cognitively so the human being can act on it. To psychoanalysis, as Sônia Diegues and Ricardo Carvalho pointed out to me when they read the manuscript of this book, this question must be understood through the concept of desire, which forms the motivation for the action that solves the incongruences one feels.

xi Meira & Grazzinelli, *Oficinas do Sistema Nacional de Cultura*, 2006.

xii Idem.

xiii In terms of philosophy of science, this cut is called epistemological cut. For more details on how to understand this process, see Japiassu, 1992.

xiv Text partially extracted from the article: Migueles, C. *Trabalho, poder e subjetividade na gestão empreendedora*. *Revista Portuguesa e Brasileira de Gestão*. V. 2, n. 2, Apr/Jun 2003.

xv Eco, 1997 and 2000, Peirce, 2000

xvi For a deeper analysis of this question, see Barbosa, 1999.

xvii Sahlins, Marshall. Stone Age Economics. New York: Aldine De Gruyter. 1972.

xviii To understand a little more about this difference, we recommend reading: Doi, Takeo. *The Anatomy of Dependence*. Tokyo, New York & San Francisco. Kodansha International, 1973 and De Vos, George. *Socialization for Achievement. Essays on the Cultural Psychology of the Japanese*. Berkley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press, 1973.

xix Interviews in the petrochemical sector allow us to see some of the peculiarities of this process in Brazil. Before outsourcing took place, every worker in these industries belonged to the same union because they were employees in the same sector. Therefore, they benefited from the gains obtained by the petrochemical workers' category as a whole. With outsourcing, this system was broken, allowing considerable labor cost reductions. Because the wage difference between cleaning professionals in the petrochemical sector and out of it was not as great in other countries as in Brazil, these cost reductions were far greater here.

xx We understand subjective here in the same way as Max Weber, i.e., defining it as meaning, which plays a fundamental role in the Weberian work. This perception of subjective meaning in Weber follows a strictly non-psychological sense of the term, but, rather, meaning associated to action. See Weber, Max. *Economia e Sociedade*. Brasília: Editora da Universidade de Brasília, 2000. v.1, p.xiv.

xxi in: Harrison & Huntington 2002

xxii Sérgio Buarque de Hollanda. *Raízes do Brasil*. *Coleção Intérpretes do Brasil*. Volume III, p. 903. Rio de Janeiro, Editora Nova Aguilar, 2002.

xxiii Bourdieu, Pierre. *Homo academicus*. Paris: Ed. de Minuit, 1984 & Bourdieu, P. & Jean-Claude Passeron. Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. Sage Publications. London, Newbury Park & New Deli. 1977.

xxiv A survey by the MEC, published in the O Globo newspaper, 2nd issue, Thursday, January 11, 2007, titled *MEC: 66% dos docentes sem formação adequada* [*MEC: 66% of Teachers without Adequate Education*], confirms a situation of inadequate teacher education for a good part of teachers in the country. The main difficulty is in the areas of physics and chemistry, according with the survey. In physics, up to 90% of teachers have no specific education. According with the secretary for educational affairs at the National Confederation of Education Workers (CNTE), Heleno Araújo, who is quoted in the piece, it's common to see public admission tests for the positions of chemistry, physics and biology teacher where sales representatives, engineers, lawyers, among others, compete for the positions to complement their income. Education has

become an odd job, Araújo Says. The estimate confirms his affirmation. The estimate was made by Inep's Integrated Educational Information System coordinator Carlos Eduardo Moreno, as well as by statistical analysis coordinator Liliana Aranha Oliveira and consultant Vanessa Néspoli. Without teacher preparation courses in these areas, professionals work without adequate qualification in pedagogical techniques and methods, and without knowledge of psychology, pedagogy and other sciences involved in learning. Therefore, they tend to focus on transmitting knowledge, thus reproducing the problems analyzed in this text.

[xxv] Poole, Fitz John Porter. *Socialization, enculturation and the development of personal identity*. In: Inglod, Tim (ed.) *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology. Humanity, Culture and Social Life*. New York & London, Routledge, 1994.

[xxvi] Klein, Melanie, *Envy and Gratitude and Other Works. 1946-1963*. London, Hogarth Press, 1975, in: Douglas, 1998.

[xxvii] Dumont, Louis. Homo Hierarchicus. *O Sistema de Castas e suas Implicações*. São Paulo, Edusp, 1992.

[xxviii] In classic studies, the ideal, unalienated state is clearly described in relation to a metaphysical understanding of human nature. Much of the conclusions of these authors involve an a priori concept of man or human nature in comparison with a utopic ideal. The central questions around which the thoughts of these authors are built are: is man a narcissist being or a being who achieves a deeper level of satisfaction through his relationships with the other? Can man know himself and others through his apprehension of the material world? If not, how does life in society affect the subjective construction of the subject? Are man's needs socially defined, as Durkheim proposes, or antisocial by nature, as proposed by Freud? Does man have an inner need for transcendence and artistic creation, as proposed by Nietzsche, or are we satisfied to reproduce pre-established roles and functions? For quite different reasons and through quite different routes, the discussion of alienation in Marx and anomy in Durkheim seeks to answer questions of this nature by confronting the social man with his opposite or with an ideal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARGYRIS, C. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York, Wiley, 1964

APPADURAI, Arjun. The Social Life of Things. New York, Cambridge University Press, 1986.

_____ (1996) Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

BANCO MUNDIAL. Relatório sobre o Desenvolvimento Mundial 1997. Oxford University Press, 1997.

BANCO MUNDIAL. 1998 Annual Review of Development Effectiveness. Robert Buckley (coord.). Washington, The World Bank, 1999.

BARBOSA, Lívia. O Jeitinho Brasileiro. Rio de Janeiro, Campus, 1992.

_____ Igualdade e Meritocracia. Rio de Janeiro, FGV editora, 1999.

BEFU, Harumi. Power in Exchange. Strategy of Control and Patterns of Compliance in Japan. Asian Profile. Vol. 2, n. 6, December 1974, 601-621.

_____ Gift-giving and Social Reciprocity in Japan. An Explanatory Statement. France-Asie, v.21, n. 2, 1966-67.

BLAU, Peter. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New Jersey, Transaction Books, 1986.

BLAUNER, R. Alienation and Freedom. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964.

BOFF, Leonardo. A ética e a formação de valores na sociedade. Reflexão. Ano 4, n. 11. Ano 2003. Instituto Ethos, São Paulo.
http://www.ethos.org.br/_Uniethos/Documents/reflexao_11.pdf

BOURDIEU. Pierre. Outline of a Theory of Practice. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1977.

_____ A Economia das Trocas Simbólicas. São Paulo. Perspectiva, 1987.

_____ O Poder Simbólico. Rio de Janeiro. Editora Bertrand Brasil, 1989.

_____ Meditações Pascalinas. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2001.

_____ Homo academicus. Paris: Ed. de Minuit, 1984.

Bourdieu, P. & Jean-Claude Passeron. Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. Sage Publications. London, Newbury Park & New Deli. 1977.

BOURDIEU, Pierre et all. A Profissão de Sociólogo. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1999.

BOUVIER, Pierre. Le Travail. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1991.

BRAVERMAN, Harry. Labor and Monopoly Capital. New York, Monthly Review Press, 1974.

CALHOUN, Craig. (org). Social Theory and the Politics of Identity. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.

CAMARGO, Aspásia, J.P.R. Capobianco & J. A. P. De Oliveira. Meio Ambiente Brasil. Avanços de obstáculos pós-Rio-92. São Paulo: Estação Liberdade:Instituto Socioambiental; Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 2002.

CASEY, Catherina. Work, Self and Society after Industrialism. New York, Routledge, 1995.

CASTELLS, Manuel. A Era da Informação: Economia, Sociedade e Cultura. Vol II: O Poder da Identidade. São Paulo, Paz e Terra, 1996.

CANCLINI. Nestor Garcia. Culturas Híbridas. São Paulo: Edusp, 2003.

_____ Consumidores e Cidadãos. Conflitos Multiculturais da Globalização. Rio de Janeiro, Editora UFRJ, 2001.

CARMO, Maria Scarlet, J. A. Puppim de Oliveira & Carmen Migueles. A Semântica do Lixo, o estímulo à reciclagem e o trabalho dos catadores do RJ. Integração. Ano VII, n. 34, Janeiro 2004.

CASEY, Catherine. Work, Self and Society After Industrialism. London & New York: Routledge, 1995.

CASTEL, Robert. As Metamorfoses da Questão Social. Uma Crônica do Salário. Petrópolis, Vozes, 1998.

CARVALHO, Vanderlei. Câmbio Verde – Curitiba: um programa social de coleta de lixo. In: Spink & Clemente (orgs) 20 Experiências de gestão pública e cidadania. Rio de Janeiro, FGV editora, 1999.

CHAUI, Marilena. Convite à Filosofia. Ed. Ática, São Paulo, 2000.

CHEAL, David. The Gift Economy. London, Routledge, 1988.

CHIE, Nakane. Japanese Society. Middlesex, Penguin Books, 1973.

CLAMMER, John. Contemporary Urban Japan. A Sociology of Consumption, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 1997.

Da MATTA. Roberto. Carnavais, Malandros e Heróis. Para uma Sociologia do Dilema Brasileiro. Rio de Janeiro, Editora Rocco, 1997.

DAVEL, Eduardo & Vergara, Sylvia, orgs. Gestão com Pessoas e Subjetividade. São Paulo: Altas, 2001.

DAVEL, Eduardo & Vasconcelos, João, orgs. "Recursos" Humanos e Subjetividade. Petrópolis, Vozes, 2000.

DEMO, Pedro. Metodologia Científica em Ciências Sociais. São Paulo: Atlas, 1995.

_____ Complexidade e Aprendizagem. São Paulo: Altas, 2002.

DE MASI, Domenico. A Sociedade Pós-Industrial. São Paulo: editora Senac, 1999.

De VOS, George. Socialization for Achievement. Essays on the Cultural Psychology of the Japanese. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1973.

DOI, Takeo. The Anatomy of Dependence. Tokyo, Kodansha International, 1973.

DOUGLAS, Mary. Como as Instituições Pensam. São Paulo, Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 1998.

_____ Pureza e Perigo. Lisboa, Edições 70, s/d.

_____ & Baron Isherwood. The World of Goods. Basic Books, 1979.

DRUCKER, Peter. A Nova Sociedade. Anatomia do Sistema Industrial. Rio de Janeiro & Lisboa, 1962 (3ª ed.)

_____ Uma Era de Descontinuidade. Orientações para uma Sociedade em Mudança. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar editores, 1970.

_____ Sociedade Pós-Capitalista. São Paulo: Livraria Editora Pioneira, 1994.

DUMONT, Louis. Ensaios sobre o individualismo. Rio de Janeiro, Rocco, 1975.

DUMONT, Louis. Homo Hierarchicus. O Sistema de Castas e suas Implicações. São Paulo, Edusp, 1997.

ECO, Umberto. A Estrutura ausente. São Paulo, Editora Perspectiva, Coleção Estudos, 1997.

_____ Tratado Geral de Semiótica. São Paulo, Editora Perspectiva, 2000.

DURKHEIM, Émile. Da Divisão do Trabalho Social. São Paulo, Martins Fontes, 1999.

FARAH, Marta Ferreira S. & H. B. Barbosa (orgs). Novas Experiências de Gestão Pública e Cidadania. Rio de Janeiro: Fundação Getúlio Vargas Editora, 2000.

FISCHER, Ernest. A Necessidade da Arte. Rio de Janeiro. Editora Guanabara Koogan, 1987.

FLEINER-GESTER, Thomas. Teoria Geral do Estado. São Paulo, Martins Fontes, 2006.

FLEURY, Sonia (org). Democracia, Descentralização e Desenvolvimento: Brasil & Espanha. Rio de Janeiro, FGV Editora, 2006.

FOUCAULT, Michel. Estética: Literatura e Pintura, Música e Cinema. Org. Manoel de Barros Motta.Rio de Janeiro, Editora Forense Universitária, 2006.

_____ Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other Writings. Edited by Colin Gordon. New York, Pantheon Books, 1980.

FREIRE, Paulo. Pedagogia da Autonomia: Saberes Necessários à Prática Educativa. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2000.

_____ Pedagogia da Esperança. Um Reencontro com a Pedagogia do Oprimido. Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra, 1992.

_____ Pedagogia do Oprimido. Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra, 2005.

GREGORY, C. A. Exchange and Reciprocity. . In: Inglod, Tim. Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology. London, Routledge, 1994.

GEERTZ, Clifford. A Interpretação das Culturas. Rio de Janeiro: LTC Livros Técnicos e Científicos Editora S.A. 1989.

_____ Suq: the bazaar economy in Sefrou. In: C. Geertz, H. Geertz and L. Rosen. Meaning and Order in Maroccan Society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

GIDDENS, Anthony. O Estado-Nação e a Violência. São Paulo, Edusp, 2001.

GIDDENS, Anthony. The Consequences of Modernity. Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1990.

_____ Central Problems in Social Theory. Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis. London: The Macmillan Press, 1979.

GIDDENS, A. Ulrich Beck & Scott Lash. Modernização Reflexiva. Política, Tradição e Estética na Ordem Social Moderna. São Paulo, Fundação Editora da UNESP (FEU), 1995.

GREGORY, C. A. Exchange and Reciprocity. In: Tim Ingold, ed. Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology, London, Routledge, 1994.

_____ Gifts and Commodities. London, Academic Press, 1982.

GOFFMAN, Erving. Frame Analysis. New York: Harper, 1974.

GOULDNER, Alvin. The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement. American Sociological Review, April 1960, v. 25, n. 2 161-179.

HAAS, David & Forrest Deseran. Trust and Symbolic Exchange. Social Psychology Quaterly, 1981, v. 44, n.1.

HAARISON, Lawrence &Samuel Harrison. A Cultura Importa. Valores que definem o progresso humano. São Paulo, Record, 2002.

HELLER, Agnes & Ferenc Ferér. A Condição Política Pós-Moderna. Rio de Janeiro, Civilização Brasileira, 1998.

HOFSTEDE, Geert. Culture´s Consequences. London & New Delhi. Sage Publications, 2001.

INGOLD, Tim. The Appropriation of Nature: Essays on Human Ecology and Social Relations. Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1986.

ISMAIL, Serageldin. Praticando o Desenvolvimento Sustentável. Finanças e Desenvolvimento. Fundo Monetário Internacional & Banco Mundial, Dezembro 1993, v.13, n. 4.

JAPIASSU, Hilton. Introdução ao Pensamento Epistemológico. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, 1992.

KONDO, Dorinne K. Crafting Selves: Power, Gender and Discourse in a Japanese Workplace. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. 1990.

KUHN, Thomas. A Estrutura das Revoluções Científicas. São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva, 1997.

LANGER, Susanne K. Sentimento e Forma. Uma Teoria da Arte Desenvolvida a Partir de Filosofia em Nova Chave. São Paulo, Editora Perspectiva, 1980.

LEBRA T. & W. Lebra. Japanese Culture and Behavior. Selected Readings. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 1986.

LEBRA, Takie S. An Alternative Approach to Reciprocity. American Anthropologist. March 1975, v. 77, n.1.

LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude. The Elementary Structures of Kinship. London, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1969.

LUKES, Steven ed. Power. Readings in Social and Political Theory. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1986.

MACKENZIE, Norman, et all. A Arte de Ensinar e a Arte de Aprender. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da Fundação Getúlio Vargas, 1985.

MARCUSE, Herbert. Cultura e Sociedade. São Paulo, Editora Paz e Terra, 1997.

MASLOW, Abraham. O Diário de Negócios de Maslow. Deborah Stephens org. Rio de Janeiro: Qualitymark, 2003.

MAZZOTTI, Tarso & R. Oliveira. Ciência(s) da Educação. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2000.

MAUSS, Marcel. Ensaios sobre a dádiva. Lisboa, Edições 70, 1988.

MIGUELES, Carmen. O exercício do poder pelos administradores e a motivação dos empregados. Algumas considerações teóricas sobre esta relação. RAP, Rio de Janeiro, 33 (3), maio/jun, 1999a.

_____ Alienação, motivação e implicações políticas da crise de identidade nas ciências humanas. Estudos de Sociologia. FCL – UNESP – Araraquara. Ano 4, n. 7 2º semestre de 1999b.

_____ O estudo da cultura organizacional: as dificuldades estão no objeto ou nas formas de defini-lo? Cadernos EBAPE.BR. vol. 1, n. 2, dez. 2003a.

_____ Trabalho, poder e subjetividade na gestão empreendedora. Revista Portuguesa e Brasileira de Gestão. V. 2, n. 2, abril/jun 2003b.

_____ Pesquisa na Graduação: Revendo o Paradigma das Teorias sobre a Motivação para Educar Empreendedores – Estudo de Caso sobre um Projeto Experimental (EPA1060). ENAMPAD 2003c.

NAKANE, Chie. Japanese Society. Middlesex, Penguin Books, 1973.

NIETZSCHE, Friedrich. Obras Incompletas. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1983.

NORTH, Douglas. Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

_____ La Nueva Economia Institucional Y el Desarrollo. FUNDES, Serie Diálogo N. 6, Bogotá, 1994.

_____ Institutions, Economic Growth and Freedom: An Historical Introduction. In: Michael Walker (ed.) Freedom, Democracy and Economic Welfare. Vancouver, The Fraser Institute, 1988.

ORTIZ, Sutti. Work, the division of labor and cooperation. In: Inglod, Tim. Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology. London, Routledge, 1994.

PANDOLFI, Dulce et all (orgs). Cidadania, Justiça e Violência. Rio de Janeiro, Fundação Getúlio Vargas Editora, 1999.

Peirce, Charles. Semiótica. São Paulo, Perspectiva, 2000.

PAREKH, Bhikhu (2000). Rethinking Multiculturalism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

PETRUCCI, Vera & Letícia Schwarz (orgs) Administração Pública Gerencial. Ensaios sobre a reforma administrativa brasileira no limiar do século XXI. Brasília: Editora Universidade de Brasília: ENAP, 1999.

PIAGET, Jean. The Origins of Intelligence in Children. New York: International University Press, 1932.

_____ Psicologia e Epistemologia. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Forense, 1973.

_____ A Situação das Ciências do Homem no Sistema das Ciências. Lisboa: Bertrand, 1970.

POOLE, Fitz. Socialization, enculturation, and the development of personal identity. In: Inglod, Tim. Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology. P. 831-861. London, Routledge, 1994.

PRATES, Marco Aurélio & Betânia T. de Barros. O estilo brasileiro de administrar: sumário de um modelo de ação cultural brasileiro com base na ação empresarial. Em: Motta, F. & M. Caldas. Cultura Organizacional e Cultura Brasileira. São Paulo, Atlas, 1997.

PUTNAM, Robert. Comunidade e Democracia. A Experiência da Itália Moderna. Rio de Janeiro, Fundação Getúlio Vargas Editora, 1996.

RAVI, Kanbur. Pobreza e Desenvolvimento: Human Development Report e World Development Report., 1990. Revista Brasileira de Economia. 45(3):397-415, Rio de Janeiro, jul./set.1991.

RAMOS, Guerreiro. Administração e Contexto Brasileiro. Rio de Janeiro: FGV editora, 1983.

RIBEIRO, Darcy. A Universidade Necessária. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1969.

SAHLINS, Marshall. Culture and Practical Reason. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.

_____ Stone Age Economics. New York, Aldine de Gruyter, 1972.

SALMEN, Lawrence. Ouvir os Pobres. Finanças e Desenvolvimento. FMI & Banco Mundial, Dezembro 1994, v. 14, n.4.

SEMPRINI. Andréa. Multiculturalismo. Bauru: Edusc, 1999.

SEN, Amartya. Desenvolvimento como Liberdade. São Paulo, Companhia das Letras. 1999.

SCHILLER, Friedrich. A Educação Estética do Homem. São Paulo. Editora Iluminuras. 2002.

SCHNEEWIND, J.B. A Invenção da Autonomia. São Leopoldo, Editora Unisinos, 2005.

SCHNEIDER, Hartmut. Participatory Goververnance: The Missing Link for Poverty Reduction. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Policy Brief n. 17, Paris, 1999.

Serva. Maurício. A importação de metodologias administrativas no Brasil: uma análise semiológica. Revista de Administração Pública. Rio de Janeiro, FGV, 26(4), out./dez. 1992.

SILVA, José Carlos Gomes. A Identidade Roubada. Ensaios de Antropologia Social. Lisboa, Gradiva, 1994.

SINGELMANN, Peter. Exchange as Symbolic Interaction: Convergence Between Two Theoretical Perspectives. American Sociological Review, August 1971, v. 37, 414-424.

SODRÉ, Muniz. A Verdade Seduzida. Por um Conceito de Cultura no Brasil. Rio de Janeiro, DP&A, 2005.

TENÓRIO, Fernando G. (coord) Gestão Social, Metodologia e Casos. Rio de Janeiro, Fundação Getúlio Vargas Editora, 1998.

THOMPSON, Michael, Richard Ellis & Aaron Wildavsky. Cultural Theory. San Francisco, Westview Press, 1990.

TORCAL, Mariano & J. R. Montero. Facets of Social Capital in New Democracies. The Formation and Consequences of Social Capital in Spain. Kellogg Institute. Working Paper #259 University of Notre Dame October 1998.

TURNER, Jonathan H. A Theory of Social Interaction. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.

TURNER, Victor. On the Edge of the Bush. Anthropology as Experience. Tucson, The University of Arizona Press, 1985.

SUCHANEK, A. AND WALDKIRCH, R. The Task of Business Ethics. Universität Eichstätt, Ingolstadt, 2002.

VELHO, Gilberto. Individualismo e Cultura. Notas para uma antropologia da sociedade contemporânea. Rio de Janeiro, Jorge Sahar Editor. 1987.

VIGOTSKY. Lev Semenovich. <u>A construção do Pensamento e da Linguagem.</u> São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2001.

VROOM, Victor. <u>Work and Motivation</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc, 1995.

WEBER, Max. <u>The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism</u>. New York, Charles Scribnerson, 1958.

WILLIAMSON, Oliver, E. <u>The Mechanisms of Governance</u>. New York & Oxford. Oxford University Press, 1996.

[xxix] Guertz , Clifford. *From the native´s point of view*. In: R.A. Shweder and R.A. Levine (eds) <u>*Culture Theory.*</u> Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984 in Poole, 1994.

[xxx] Classic authors of new institutional economics, which is the line of thought that brings the question of culture and institutions into economics, recognize that there is a relationship between culture and development, but they see culture as a "black box", as well said by Williamson, 1996.

[xxxi] An excellent work in this respect is: Sahlins, Marshall,1972. <u>*Stone Age Economics*</u>. New York: Aldine De Gruyter. p. xi to 39.

[xxxii] Slater 1997, McCracken 1990, Slater & Tonkiss 2001, Lipovetsky1987, Miller et all., 1998

[xxxiii] The concept of freedom is of great complexity for humanities and social sciences. Since Adam Smith, economics has created a vision of freedom that is related with the creation of economic possibilities for an individual to escape oppression by others. This vision is extremely related with the question of freedom to start an enterprise and acquire private property and with the European historical and institutional development in the modern period. Historically, what Adam Smith realizes is that the end of feudalism and of suzerainty and vassalage relationships, as well as freedom of enterprise, expand the possibilities of generating economic wealth, which in turn expands the limits of freedom. In the capitalist system, a work contract can be broken, and the worker can seek new opportunities. In a slave-based or a feudal system, this possibility doesn't exist.

In turn, the creation of economic wealth that freedom of enterprise provides expands the social division of labor and generates new opportunities of choice. In societies with an extremely low productivity, such as Brazilian indigenous ones, the only division of labor that the tribal economy possesses is sexual: men hunt and fish, and women collect. In order for classes of artists, scientists, among others, to exist, it's fundamental that the economy produce enough surplus to support them. In the absence of a logic of productivity and accumulation, the very notion of productivity of knowledge and its accumulation mechanisms make no sense.

But the understanding of what freedom is varies greatly. In Buddhism, freedom means being free from choosing, through the suppression of the desire to possess things, which is achieved through spiritual exercise (see Parekh, 2000). To the Greek, like Socrates and Plato, freedom of choice, particularly of material goods, is a synonym for man's slavery to his lowest instincts, as in order to consume, man needs to dedicate his life to production in order to pay for things which feed his hedonism, abandoning a life of contemplation and intellectual development (Marcuse, Herbert, <u>*Cultura e Sociedade*</u>. São Paulo: Paz e Terra editora, 1997). In England and the USA, there are the notions of liberty and freedom, which are not synonyms and express the existence of different values than those of Brazilians with regard to the theme. *Liberty* is freedom in its broadest sense, i.e., that of the free, equal man's freedom to live according with the principles that rule his autonomy. *Freedom* is freedom from prison, from slavery, from direct oppression by another man. Being *free* doesn't necessarily mean to enjoy *liberty*. These cultural differences are not irrelevant, as, in this perspective, the notion of freedom as conceived by the Indigenous Australians studied by Sahlins (1972), i.e., as freedom to "migrate and travel light", is opposed to that of liberal economists, in its capacity to generate economic accumulation. In Brazilian society in general, people conceive the notion of freedom in a way that is close to "being able to do what one wants" – in a notion that is close to politics, but far from economy, where fighting oppression doesn't necessarily mean to accumulate property to support individual autonomy. Freedom as conceived in Brazil is power. This view creates questions that are very characteristic of Brazilian society when we think about economic development.

In contemporary society, left-wing authors since Marx have denounced "bourgeois freedom" as freedom for the bourgeois, as factory workers and those who are excluded remain separated from the

advantages of this system. Contemporarily, the root of this conception is related with the idea that an individual's ability to politically influence, or economically benefit from de advantages of, capitalist enrichment is linked to his belonging to organizations. It's only by participating in organizations, whether public or private, or in fields, in the sense conceived by Bourdieu (of arts, of intellectuals), that we participate in contemporary society. Social exclusion is the return to the state of nature. Therefore, individual freedom can only be socially built and enjoyed.

About this discussion in economics, see: HAYEK, F.A. von. *The Constitution of Liberty.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959. SEN, Amartya. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999. PIPES, Richard. *Property and Freedom*. New York, Vintage Books, 2000, HAQ, Mahbub ul. *Reflections on Human Development*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999. LAL, Deepak. *The Transformation of Development Economies: From Plan to Market*. In James A. DORN, Steve H. HANKE and Alan A. WALTERS, eds, *The Revolution in Development Economies*. Washington, D.C.: Cato Institute, 1988: 55-74.

[xxxiv] When we talk about the fraying of the social fabric, we are thinking about the transformation analyzed by Tonnies (Toennies, Ferdinand. [1887] 1963. *Community and Society* (*Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*). Translated and edited by Charles P. Looomis. New York: Harper & Row), as well as his analysis of the development of capitalism and its effect on the dissolution of traditional community and solidarity bonds. This question is widely analyzed in sociology, in classic works like those of Durkheim (1999) and Dumont (1997). Obviously, we are not proposing here a romantic return to the past, nor are we affirming the superiority of communities over contemporary forms of sociability, not least because we refuse the naive perspective of cultural relativism and its tendency to ignore that many forms of violence and oppression remain in many communities because there, like in any other human society, historical power struggles have put certain groups in a position to impose their interpretations of reality and ideologies on the rest of the group without the checks and balances for this power, like the ones we have in liberal democratic societies, to allow people to escape this oppression. However, by examining the role of individualism and hedonism in consumerism (as done by Lipovetsky, 1989, Slater & Tonkiss, 2001 e Canclini, 1999), we can see that they are woven in complex, mutually reinforcing institutional mechanisms. Fighting consumerism cannot, therefore, be thought about unless new forms of sociability can be engendered. Consumerism mediates relationships between individuals in mass societies in a much more complex way than it might seem at first.

[xxxv] This question is approached in its relationship with the work and management world in: Migueles, Carmen. *O exercício do poder pelos administradores e a motivação dos empregados: algumas considerações teóricas sobre esta relação. Revista de Administração Pública.* Rio de Janeiro 33(3):113-138, May/Jun 1999.

[xxxvi] We understand dispositions here like Bourdieu, in the sense of habitus, i.e., like schemes of thought and action inscribed in the body through the process of acquiring the general principles of the practices that regulate conditions of action on the world. See: Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1977.

[xxxvii] Herzberg, F. , Mausner, B. Snyderman, B. *The Motivation to Work*. New York: Wiley, 1959.

[xxxviii] We understand subjective here like Max Weber, i.e., we define it as meaning, which plays a fundamental role in the Weberian work. This perception of subjective meaning in Weber follows a strictly non-psychological sense of the term, but, rather, meaning associated to action. See Weber, Max. *Economia e Sociedade*. Brasília: Editora da Universidade de Brasília, 2000. v.1, p.xiv.

[xxxix] See Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1978.

[xl] Vasconcelos & Davel orgs. 1995; Davel & Vergara orgs.,2001

[xli] To see how this vision is limited to North American culture, see Parekh, Bhikhu. *Rethinking Multiculturalism. Cultural Diversity and Political Theory.* Cambridge & Massachusetts. Harvard University Press, 2000.

[xlii] Giddens, 2001.

[xliii] See: Chauí, 2000 and Boff 2003.

xliv Porto, Marta. *Construindo o público a partir da cultura – Gestão Municipal e participação social. Oficinas do Sistema Nacional de Cultura*. Ministério da Cultura, Brasília, July 2006.
xlv For deeper analyses on the question of consumption, see: [PEQUENA BIBLIOGRAFIA]

xlvi To understand how local logics can mediate the globalization process, see: Martin-Barbero, Jesús. *Dos Meios às Mediações. Comunicação, Cultura e Hegemonia*. Rio de Janeiro, Editora UFRJ, 2003.

xlvii Sen, Amartya. 1999.