

# ECAS 2013

5<sup>th</sup> European Conference on African Studies (Lisbon)

June  
27-29



African Dynamics in a Multipolar World

ISCTE - Lisbon University Institute

## **ECAS 2013**

5<sup>th</sup> European Conference on African Studies

*African Dynamics in a Multipolar World*

©2014 Centro de Estudos Internacionais do Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)

ISBN: 978-989-732-364-5

## **THE POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTION OF THE BRAZILIAN SOCIAL THOUGHT TO THE ANALYSIS ABOUT THE COOPERATION/COMPETITION BETWEEN NATIONAL ECONOMIES: THEORETICAL CHALLENGES**

**Adelia Miglievich-Ribeiro**

Department of Social Sciences - Espirito Santo Federal University – Ufes/ Brazil

[miglievich@gmail.com](mailto:miglievich@gmail.com)

## Abstract

*We analyze the history behind the concept “Latin America”, which goes back, from one point of view, to the French expansionism; from another, to the Hispanic and Portuguese colonization in the continent; and finally, to the antagonism toward the Anglo-Saxon matrix, until the point in time in which the Latin-American utopia. Our intention is to recognize the integration as effort and not as data that prescribe, among others, which integration, cooperation, and development is desired. Thus, with hope, I retrieve Elísio Macamo’s question about “what links us” in reference to Brazil and the countries in Africa, highlighting the importance of mutual knowledge and open debate that goes, as Gustavo Lins Ribeiro also says, to a post-imperialist era in the dialogue South-South.*

**Keywords:** Brasil, portuguese colonization, América Latina, integration, decolonial thought, postimperialism

**The possible contribution of the Brazilian social thought to the analysis about the cooperation/competition between national economies: theoretical challenges<sup>1</sup>**

I am retaking here a dialogue that started about a year ago at the event called “Africanidades e Brasilidades” (Africanisms and Brazilianisms), which took place at the Espírito Santo Federal University, in the capital of Espírito Santo State, Vitória. At that time I received from Elisio Macamo the paper that was sent to our desk where he makes an elegant and straightforward criticism toward the continuity of a certain “lusofonia” (“*lusofonism*”) every time when, in the meetings on Brazil and Africa, it is taken as natural the idea that the countries in the African continent, uncomfortably shielded under the so called “Portuguese Africa”, which seems to ignore that each one of them, in its specificity, keeps unarguable bonds with Brazil when the history of the Negro slavery in the Brazilian land is retaken. Macamo calls attention to the fact that such attitude tends to explain how little we know each other and how far we still are from having solved our differences currently. His alert does not mean any demotivation toward the search for the dialogue between Brazil and the African countries, in our case, Portuguese speakers, but it recognizes this as a project that requires care, as any other intention that is in its first start, such as defining the kind of dialogue to be built upon.

Although considering the colonial past times and the intersection points that exist, the 21st century proposes new matters to be exhaustively debated. Supposing the integration as natural, in this sense, contributes very little to how much we still should build on what is called “cooperation for the development”, this time, under a “post-imperialism” perspective.

---

<sup>1</sup> I am thankful to Elisio Macamo and to Linda van de Kamp to accept a reflection that, at this moment, does not articulate thoroughly with Africa, but intends to do it, as it brings the Latin-American experience to discuss *what* and *how* our nations will be bonded in a perspective that we could call post-imperialist. The concept of “post-imperialism” is brought up under the inspiration of Gustavo Lins Ribeiro (UnB) who, during an agreeable and provoking **inaugural lecture** taught in our university, offered me the.

I agree with Elisio Macamo on the fact that the Brazilian academy, under honourable exceptions, knows very little about Africa, that is, the Africas. The opposite, when we think about Latin America in its pluralism, would not be utterly untrue. With this in mind, I am bringing to a Conference on African Studies a little of the accumulation of the Latin-American critical thought, in its decolonial power. My assumption is that, if a regional integration, either past or future, associates with the project of continuity of the colonial domination system, accessory with the predatory capitalist world-economy, the denomination of “cooperation” is much more illusory and the reference to the forms of “imperialism” is much more true.

My strategy consists in revisiting the thought of the Brazilian Darcy Ribeiro (1922-1997) and, before him, of Manoel Bomfim (1868-1932). I will try to show how the South of America wanted a counter-hegemonic integration, anti-Pan-Americanism. I will go back to the Venezuelan rescuer Simon Bolivar and, also, to the Cuban poet and writer José Martí (1853-1895) in order to talk about the “Patria Grande” (“Great Nation”) or “Nuestra América” (“Our America”), explaining where Brazil stands in the Latin-American imagination of yesterday and today. Therefore, this paper is about the continuities and discontinuities and about which South-South integration we expect to see.

## **1. The history of a concept: Latin America**

The Brazilian academy of Social Sciences certainly lists names with exceptional work on Africa studies and the number of Africanists is growing. Mentioning some and not all of them would be unfair. What I am trying to say, however, is that the school curricula – in what refers to legal and university instruments, and also in our post graduations in Social Sciences, contemporary Africa still is, in Brazil, much less known than it is necessary.

Hannah Arendt (2006) proposes the difference between “commercial colonialism” and “imperialism”, observing that only in the second one there is the item of territorial occupation and the building of a local administration aimed at the exercise of violence for the subjugation of the native peoples. I am using, however, the term “forms of imperialism”, in the plural, in order to observe that their perseverance today happen in different degrees; even so it is important, to my point of view, not to forget the expression, as those forms that suppose intervention for which the expression “commercial colonialism” would not be sufficient have not extinguished.

Ever since the release, in 1968, of the influent essay by John Leddy Phelan called “Pan-Latinism, French Intervention in Mexico” (1861 apud. BETHEL, 2009, p. 289), there has been a relative agreement that the concept of “Latin America” came from a French origin. The term “Amérique Latine” was used by its scholars to justify then the French imperialism in Mexico, under Napoleon II. The French argued that there was a cultural and linguistic connection among the “Latin” peoples and that France would be their inspiration and natural leader just as the North-American threat with the Angle-Saxon matrix.

Phelan mentions the relevance of the French economist Michel Chevalier (1806-1879), one of the main ideologists of the “panlatinism”, the widening of the French empire in the Meridional America. The essay by Phelan would be, twelve years later, severely criticized by Arturo Ardao, in “Gênesis de la idea y El nombre de América Latina” which, in the place of Chevalier, it highlighted, some time before, the use of the term “la raza latina” by writers and Spanish scholars like José María Torres Caicedo, Colombian poet and critic, born in 1830 in Bogota and deceased in 1889 in Paris; Francisco Bilbao, Chilean socialist scholar (1823-1865), and Justo Arosemena, Colombian Panamanian law-writer, politician, sociologist and diplomat [1817-1896] (Farret & Pinto, 2011; Bethel, 2009).

The quarrel for the position of who would have baptized the wide American lands to the South of the United States continues, but what matters to us is that, when the 10 (ten) Spanish American republics became independent, and later enlarging to 16 (sixteen) republics, a significant intellectual idea, inspired in Simon Bolivar, started using the term, in order to refer to a Spanish-American conscience that was superior to the existing “nationalisms”.

Simon Bolivar, a Venezuelan military and political leader, was the key figure in the independence war of the Spanish empire. He led Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Panama, Peru and Venezuela to the decolonization in the beginning of the XIX century, and launched the democratic ideological bases in most of the new republics. During his short life span, he was considered a hero, a visionary, a revolutionary and a savior. He took part in the foundation of the first union of the independent nations in Latin America, named Grã-Colômbia, and presided over it from 1819 to 1830. He was probably the first articulator of the continental Latin-American union, as we can see in his classic *Carta da Jamaica* dated from 1815, in which he urges the former Spanish colonies to get together to defend themselves from their common foe: the European settler. He became the president of Colombia, supreme leader of Peru and president of Bolivia, and all of this made him believe that the dream of a Latin-American union was not too far away. In Panama, in 1826, he intended a congress to promote that so called “Pátria Grande”. Bolivar’s plan was seeing that each nation participant of the confederation would give away part of its sovereignty to the greater good that would be the union of the Spanish-American nations, pursuing their internal autonomy, which would be ruled by the administration of each State-Nation. In its turn, in the ideal of the “Pátria Grande” was stated the understanding among the regional characteristics of each people, not being overruled by the local culture. But things are not that simple and the American federation Bolivian utopia failed. In 1828, Simon Bolivar is

forced to resign from his lifetime presidential office in Peru. Bolivia, in 1829, and shortly after, Venezuela, left the Great Colombia, which ceased in 1830.

It should be registered as adversaries to the Bolivian utopia not only the protagonism that was conquering the United States in the continent, but the omission of Brazil. Bolívar vetoed Brazil, since the very start, from any participation in the imagined confederation. Despite the common Iberian and Catholic heritage, the enormous *lusofonous* neighbour that took half of South America was, for the mentor of the “Pátria Grande”, incompatible with the language, history and culture to the project in generation. Moreover, the Brazilian economy was based on slavery – which had been abolished in most of the Spanish-American republics – and so it was to be refused. Apart from that, Brazil’s Independence happened peacefully and continued with the Portuguese monarchic system, which made of Brazil an ally to the European imperialism.<sup>2</sup>.

*To those who were born in one of the republics that became independent from the Spanish monarchy between 1810 and 1820, it is almost inconceivable that Brazil became independent almost at the same time, keeping the monarchy as a form of government and founding an empire [...]. Such fact marks the difference between Brazil and almost all the rest of the Spanish America, where the debates over republic, centralism, federalism, monarchy, country and nation were very early, opposite to what occurred in Brazil. (ENRÍQUEZ, 2010, p. 61-94)*

Besides the rejection of the Spanish America toward Brazil in their antirepublican and conservative demonstrations, the Brazilian intellectual minds never missed the chance to describe the nations under the name Grã-Colômbia as violent, unstable and “barbarian” (Bethel, 2009, p. 293). Along the II Reign, Brazil confirmed its belief of pertaining to the Atlantic world, keeping political and economic bonds with Great Britain and cultural bonds with France, and, in a lesser degree, with Portugal. With the Proclamation of the Republic, in 1889, the proximity

---

<sup>2</sup> An example of this was the Brazilian ambitions in Rio da Prata. The relationships between Brazil and its Spanish-American neighbours were then very limited with the great exception: Rio da Prata. It’s necessary to refer the Paraguay War, when Brazil allied to Uruguay and Argentina, to combat the Paraguayan leader Solano López, in the years 1864 to 1870.

with the Spanish America does not happen, as Brazil approached the United States, becoming a strong defender of the so called Pan-Americanism, which was considered, to the South of the continent, as a mere tool used to confirm the United States' political and economic hegemony, and assure the future exploration of the region, through long - term or punctual interventions which, in fact, occurred.

The pragmatism of the Brazilian international politics placed Brazil once again more distant from the Spanish America. Worried about making the United States its principal commercial partner, replacing Great Britain in the importation of our coffee, and providing us with manufactured goods, the country had been having the cooperation of the Monroe doctrine.<sup>3</sup> Even so, not everyone gave up the place that belonged to Brazil, in a future Latin-American project. The Mexican José Vasconcelos (1882-1959) defended, in his essay “El problema del Brasil”, published for the first time in 1921, the Brazilian integration in Latin America. Soon after leading a Mexican mission in Brazil, in celebration to our centennial Independence, he applied himself to writing “La raza cosmica” (1925), a reference to the new “Iberia – American people”, with its unpublished ethnic matrix.

The intellectual Latin –American criticism became denser. The new concept of “IndoAmerica” was beginning to be known, and even stronger than that of Latin America, as it gave visibility to the expressive indigenous contingents, negroes and *mestiços* and, excluded in the first idea of Latin America, it was brought about to reflection from the writing production of

---

<sup>3</sup> The so called Monroe Doctrine was announced in 1823 by the American president James Monroe. The summary of the doctrine is: "America for the Americans" against the European colonialism. The United States could interfere in the destiny of the nations to the South of the continent, under the firm conviction that it was about a “civilizing mission”.



the Peruan Victor Raúl Haya de la Torre (1895-1979), when also another Peruan, José Carlos Mariátegui (1895-1930), inspired by José Martí, became known <sup>4</sup>.

Being the Brazilians in greater number, such as Eduardo Prado, Manuel de Oliveira Lima, Joaquim Nabuco, Euclides da Cunha, they were concerned about the building of *Brazility*, keeping apart from the Latin-American critical thought. A discordant voice was Manoel Bomfim's who, in "America Latina: males de origem", first published in 1905, emphasized to combat the Pan-Americanism, foreseeing the power that was given in to the United States, in leading the Latin-American subjects, at the same time that the aim was promoting the supportive bonds between Brazil and the Spanish America.

The Vargas times (1930-45), however, followed next, and reinforced the intellectual effort for the establishment of a national identity, which became even stronger, as it gathered, among others, Carlos Drummond de Andrade, Mário de Andrade, Heitor Villa-Lobos, Rodrigo Melo Franco de Andrade, while Latin America was known as "the other America."

It is not strange, therefore, that the Mexican academic Leopoldo Zea (1912-2004), who wrote so much about Latin America, in no moment of his extensive bibliography approached Brazil in an adequate way (BETHEL, 2009, p. 311-2). It was necessary that the middle of the XX century came, in order to identify, finally, the continuity of the pioneer effort of Manoel Bandeira's, through his "Literatura hispano-americana", published for the first time in 1949.

It was to be, however, the inglorious net of exiled intellectuals by the successive State Coup that spread through the south of the continent that was going to forever unite the Brazilian intellectuals to the other Latin people, especially between the years 1960 and 80. It is to be

---

<sup>4</sup> With Farret and Pinto (2011), my emphasis is not so much on what the Latin American utopia did not see, especially in the Andes and in Mexico, with its majority of indigenous. But it is nice to know that, today, the intellectual current of the *modernity-coloniality* does not sustain any idea of State- Nation or regional integration that does not attend to the ethnic differences, in gender, among others.

highlighted Darcy Ribeiro's <sup>5</sup> path who, in his visits to Uruguay, Chile, Venezuela, Mexico, Peru, says he discovered himself as a Brazilian and Latin-American citizen, and then he started to apply to studies that would take him to the re-elaboration not only of the Latin-America building but also of the *utopia* within it, with emphasis on their potentialities, in order to oppose to what he called "reflexed modernity", which maintained the delay, and also to propose the "evolutive acceleration", based on the technological-scientific innovation, automatically generated by each society, to assure, then, its autonomy and emancipation <sup>6</sup>.

As Darcy Ribeiro hosts the Julian Steward e Leslie White's multilinear evolution" concept, he questions the unilinear civilization standard to the whole mankind. He points that the real sociocultural formations shows a temporal and synchronic characteristic, so that since the evolution break of the primitive state, the features of the human societies have become uncountable and unforeseeable.

*This ideal construction (homogeneous diagnostic which refers to adapted associative and ideological systems that go through all the backgrounds presenting in each of them certain significant alterations) is very distant from the possible, due to the range of dispersion of the variations of the content of each culture (RIBEIRO, 2001, p. 47-8)*

According to Darcy's thoughts, the changes happen, as it has been mentioned, as "reflexed modernization", or "evolutive acceleration". Only the second term allows us to break

---

<sup>5</sup> In 1962, Darcy Ribeiro took office in the Ministry of Education and Culture of João Goulart's government. In 1963, as Brazil retook the presidential regime, after a short term of parliamentary experience, Darcy Ribeiro left the Ministry, and was summoned by President "Jango" to take over the Civil House. With the Military Coup, he was forced to evade, like many others and the president himself, who was impeached, and he was exiled in Uruguay. Cf. MIGLIEVICH-RIBEIRO, 2012.

<sup>6</sup> In his exile, Darcy Ribeiro wrote "The civilization process. Steps for the socio-cultural evolution". From then on, he started a series of 6 (six) books called "Studies on the Anthropology of Civilization", in which are "The Americas and the Civilization", "The Brazilians – theory of Brazil", followed by "The Indians and the civilization"; "The dilemma of Latin America"; "The Brazilians – theory of Brazil", and then finishing his 30 years of reflection, as he published "The Brazilian People".

with the dependence on the other more powerful economic systems, and to conquer, with the development, the auto determination, once the dependence is the delay and also the absence of freedom (RIBEIRO, 2001, p. 36).

## **2. Darcy Ribeiro and the Latin – American imagination**

Manoel Bomfim was one of the sources where Darcy Ribeiro enthusiastically inspired, opposing to “all the former and modern scholars who support the groups that hold interest in keeping Brazil behind” and he passed on to Darcy Ribeiro what the latter defined as an “extraordinary capacity of indignation and hope [...] his assurance that this country is viable” (Ribeiro, 1993, p. 17).

Combating the pseudo-scientific of the beginning for the XX century racism, and appointing the so called “social Darwinism” and explaining the “social parasitism” of the settlers, that is, their utter inability to work on the settlers’ side - not exactly the settled people, who were long submitted to hard work with which they provided for the goods and work of the colonial societies and their metropolis – Bomfim unfolded the mythology of the “inferior races”, and, therefore, also of those *mestiços* born in the continent. He cleared made people see that the super exploration of the work, which could bring to death from exhaustion and poor treatment, could only bring objection to that activity which day by day deprived them of their *humanity*. Unless some day the labour activity would be experienced as reinvigorating and raising the human being and then rejected, only so the locals could be given the stigma of lazy or incompetent. Such doing, however, referring to the slaved mass or to the freed ones still submitted to the semi slaved work would be, in the least, the most unfair judgment:

“In the colony, only the captive worked; everyone exploited and oppressed; the production depended, only, on the number of slaves and on the cruelty of the

whippings; the progress was condemned as useless, the intelligence was persecuted as dangerous. The settler over the captive, the revenue over the settler, absolutism and the religious archaism over all of them, would sink, more and more, these societies into the misery, shame and obscurantism. The metropolis rolled, yelped with joy, and performed its idea, the social parasitism.” (Bomfim, 1993, p. 324).

Darcy Ribeiro followed Bomfim’s steps, and also his betting on education and culture as the only path toward the change that could not be based on the only material wealth linked to instruction and the conscience of the decolonized peoples. In this case, it anticipated the argument that today is widely known that little or nothing would be reverted to the submitted populations, but the so called political independence would only concentrate revenue for the national elites that would keep the underdevelopment of the societies at the exact growth of their private revenues.

Darcy Ribeiro took part in a generation of intellectuals that only started to approach the Brazilian social thought to certain critic sociology. In 1948 started the CEPAL (Economic Commission for Latin America), which allied the Chilean Raul Prebich and the Brazilian Celso Furtado. In 1958, FLACSO was implemented (Social Sciences Latin-American College), whose first principal was José Medina Echavarría. In 1957, in Rio de Janeiro, it was founded, also attached to the UNESCO, the CLAPCS (Latin-American Social Researches Center). The dependence theorists Ruy Mauro Marini (1932-1997) and Theotonio dos Santos (1936-) also got visibility, and their thought inspired several published works on Latin America .

Fernando Henrique Cardoso also participated in the debate during the decade of 1970 on the possibilities for the capitalist development of the Latin-American countries and, especially, on Brazil. According to Theotônio dos Santos (2012), an intellectual and ideological swing would separate Cardoso and his group at the University of São Paulo and at the Cebrap from the

critic project that came from the Theory of Dependency and would relate to his joining the MDB, at the final years of the military dictatorship in Brazil. Basically, according to Santos, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, from 1974, proposes the argument of permanence on dependence and, yet on those circumstances, one could speak about economic growth and democracy. Ruy Mauro Marini, on the other hand, argues him and visualizes opportunities to overcome the subordination to the world capitalism. To Wagner (2005), the debate between Cardoso and Marini reflects exactly the impacts and the tensions that were placed on the reopening of the politics in Brazil and the change of tone of the author of “Dialética da Dependência” would suggest, maybe, the conservative fear face the more radicalized sectors of the social movements or of the remaining of the party organizations that got organized in the clandestineness during the dictatorship.

If the second half of the XX century was marked by the effervescence of the critic Latin-American thought, it happened due to the affronting to the dictatorships in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay e Uruguay. As it is known, in Paraguay a general became president in 1958 with a State Coup, being re-elected for eight consecutive offices, and so enjoying, for 35 years, the longest military government ever seen in Latin America. In Brazil, on March 31st 1964, the military impeached the President of the Republic João Goulart and they took over the government of the country until March 15 1985. In Chile, on September 11 1973, a Military Coup also placed a general in the presidency, who stayed until 1990. Uruguay which, between 1942 and 1973, lived an important democratic period, retaking the political debate of the three first decades of the XX century, interrupted during the dictatorial governments between 1933 and 1942, experienced the rising of the movements in favour of democracy and the diversification of the cultural and intellectual spaces, particularly between 1945 and 1955, but it also saw the

dictatorship strength being retaken, when its civil president applied a Coup of State in his own government, on June 27 1973, supported by the military who remained in office until 1985. On March 24 1976, the Argentinian Armed Forces took the Executive, deposing the then president and installing military governments until 1983. Therefore, if Chile, Argentina and Uruguay, between the decades of 1960 and 1980 were exiles to many of those who were persecuted by the dictatorships in their countries of origin, that fact did not last (Miglievich-Ribeiro, 2011, p. 161).

Paradoxically, the social Latin – American imagination, as it experienced suffering, it gained new firmness. Darcy Ribeiro, in his essay “A América Latina existe?” (2010), contrasts “what there exists” (the emphatic) to “what can exist” (the counter emphatic). Ironically, Thomas Morus and others before him started to write on the utopia, when they heard the first narratives of Colombos’s or Américo Vespúcio’s:

*It was a vision of our pure Indians, dressed in the innocence of their feathered nudity, dancing in an idyllic Garden, which [...] lit the utopic heat that blooms in successive waves of generous or perverse fantasies, rethinking the world like a project. Inventing beautiful and ugly communisms and bad savages, dreaming of possible lives, but better to be lived ones (Ribeiro, 2010, p. 45).*

He tells that, after the ecstasy, the white men needed to purge their sins from such paradisiac vision on earth. Not too long after, the Christian utopia also transformed as many souls as it was useful into mild bodies for the work in captivation to generate the wealth in silver, gold, diamonds, and also, into agricultural products from the tropical lands in a time when the sugar cane could value as much as oil today. Indians and slaved Negroes for centuries in the Americas were placed in the most inferior positions in the society, feeding a racism that would try to neutralize its own inferiority.

*A singular characteristic of Latin American is its condition of being a group of peoples intentionally made up by acts and wishes other than theirs [...] The people have always been, in this world of ours, a mere work strength, a means of production, being first slaves; then, being waged, always abused [...] We are*

*the result of exogenic economic enterprises, which aim at sacking wealth, exploring mines or promoting the production of exportable goods, always aiming at generating revenue and profits. If from such deeds there appeared new human communities, which was an occasional result, and even envied* (Ribeiro, 2010, p. 59-60).

Miraculously survived, the great Latin-American population would be reborn, however, as “new people”, spread all over the continent as populations created in biological amalgams, and in the raising of controversial ethnics under the slaved and farming framing and the plantation system.

*[...] attached to the tropical plantations, for the exploration of forest products or mines and precious metals that gave way to an entirely new ethnic creature, deeply different in his/ her three matrixes and who still searches for his/her identity. They are peoples who, not having a past to be proud of, are only good enough for the future.* (Ribeiro, 2010, p. 66).

The anthropologist elaborates his “ethnic – national typology of the extra European peoples in the modern world: a) testimonial – peoples; b) new peoples; c) transplanted peoples; d) emergent peoples. The first are survivors from ancient autonomous civilizations which the European expansion dropped over, that is, the Mexican, Mesoamerican and Andes populations, survivors from the old Aztec, Maya and Incaic civilizations. The new peoples result from the ethnic friction of the indigenous, Negro and European matrixes. The third group is formed by those who, although they were born in the continent, have the language, culture and ethnic profile identical to those of the settlers. The emergent peoples are the new nations in Africa and Asia.

The Latin-American that really exists is formed by the integrated contingents in each Neo – American population, highlighting the numerous African people who were shaped in each

national ethny, under the oppression and suffering marks, but exerting in these influences of several natures which translate the undeniable resistance of the negro slaves to the white domination. Not less the undifferentiated agricultural villages of the *Tupi-Guarani* on the Atlantic coast of South America, of the *Aruak*, in the Amazon jungle, of the *Karib*, in Caribe, of the Araucanes in the modern Chile, of the *Chibcha*, in Venezuela, Colombia and Central America, also the *Timote* and the *Fincenu*, *Pancenu e Cenufaná confederations*, besides the *Jicague* (Nicaragua), the *Cuna* (Panama), among so many other Indians and citizens of their State- Nation subjects, who are, at the same time, Latin – American people (Ribeiro, 2007, p. 187).

And now we can speak of many more than five hundred million Latin – Americans who “speak two modern variables of a Neolatin language, Portuguese and Spanish, mutually intelligible.” (Ribeiro, 1993, p. 9), besides, on the Indian part, their mother- tongues. Even so, it is possible to agree with Darcy Ribeiro that:

*We, Latin – American, as a ponderable part of the humane gender, are already shaped in our basic form. We are a late Romanity, washed in Indian and Negro blood. We are a Latin – America – Nation matrix in search of its destiny, which will be shaped in the next millennium [he referred to the current 3<sup>rd</sup>. Millennium.] (RIBEIRO, 1993, p. 11. The brackets are mine).*

The search for the destiny is deeply related to the challenges for the overcoming of the delay and of the underdevelopment that still bonds the Latin – American people under the stigma of “reflex modernization”, described by Darcy Ribeiro as a subordinated way of insertion of the Latin – American societies into those technologically superior systems, paying the price, in the limit, of its auto destruction as an ethnic entity and environmental death. It should be entitled, on the contrary, to the Latin – American peoples to determine for themselves another



modernization, called “evolutive accelerations”, capable to start a new civilizational, non – imperialist process.

Speaking of integration or cooperation for the development<sup>7</sup>, without talking about decoloniality – as Quijano (2000) says, - of the power, of the being and the knowledge, it is, also, for Darcy, improper. Walter Mignolo (2003), one of the most outstanding representatives of the *coloniality – modernity* chain of the so called post-colonial Latin – American, highlighted the conscience of Darcy Ribeiro about his submissive enrolment as an anthropologist in the geopolitics of the knowledge. For Mignolo, the award of Darcy’s should be for his clearness about the *place* of his talk: An intellectual Latin – American, who speaks of the Third World, not as a bizarre or inferior place, but as a powerful locus of enunciation. There is no doubt that for the “anthropologist”, as he chose to call himself, in contrast to the anthropologist who only observes, refusing to be inserted as a member of the studied population, the “Latinamericanity” was something as essential as breathing (Nepomuceno, 2010, p. 19). Thinking of Brazil required from him, then, thinking the context of regional integration, understanding it, living it, explaining it. Aiming at the debate here presented, we can think that the ideals of Darcy Ribeiro’s generation would not accept any integration when we also thought of the Global South.

### **Some final thoughts: on integration and cooperation for the development**

As Brazil has not overcome its abysmal social inequalities, and thus renewing the marks of its colonization, it is necessary, though, to ask how the country inserts itself in the new world geopolitics. We can ask about the so called South-South axis, especially with respect to the Latin

---

<sup>7</sup> The commonest types of cooperation for the capitalist development, according to most of the literature on the theme, are: the Financial Cooperation (FC) the Technical Cooperation (TC) and the Humane Assistance (HA). Besides those, there also is the Food Assistance and the Technological and Scientific Cooperation, which are considered less frequent cooperations for the development. Cf. ZORZAL & SILVA, 2013.

America and Africa countries, concerned about knowing how they cooperate among themselves for the development (which one?) of the named non-developed and the emergent countries in the current context of the global capitalism.

As Zorzal e Silva (2013) put it, in the range of the emergent countries, the group made up of Brazil, Russia, China, India and South Africa (BRICS) appeared in the international scenario as allied protagonists in search for changes in the international cold post-war, proposing collisions between Latin – Americans, Asians and Africans. Such countries are getting firm as technological producers, in different levels which become direct investments for the less developed economies, especially in Africa.

The direct foreign investments are not even deliberated by the local politics and their character of benefit to the population is very questionable. That is why it is urgent to know the analysis such as by ZORZAL e SILVA (2013) about how to guarantee the social responsibility and accountability of such investments, which means the promotion of a wide debate on the normative aspects of governing and include the transparency of the decisions and of the mechanisms to get to them.

We can, then, take for granted Gustavo Lins Ribeiro's <sup>8</sup> challenge and then we can question how the “ex sleeping giant” can avoid the attractive exercise of the “sub-imperialism” about which, for decades, Ruy Mauro Marini (1932-1997) had alerted us. The imperialist Brazil has never been a fiction in the Latin – American history, as we have seen. The building of the solidarity between Brazil and Spanish America is an effort that, like Darcy Ribeiro, has many hot defenders, but it is not auto evident.

---

<sup>8</sup> During the inaugural lecture under the title “Por que o poscolonialismo e a decolonialidade do poder não são suficientes: uma perspectiva pós-imperialista”, at the Espírito Santo Federal University (Ufes), as a guest for the Social Sciences Post-Graduation Program, on June 14, 2013.

If the idea of Latin America did not gain strength in the identification of the common antagonist, the United States, we know that the attempts for the dislegitimation of the Latin – American unity are many, and also for any effort in regional blocks that do not question national sovereignties. In the several modalities, Brazil has the possibility of surprising or reproducing the uneven distribution of power and wealth that keep so far the international relationships. The XXI century, considering the trend to multilateralism in the global economic relationships and the proliferation of the free commerce agreements, has not yet witnessed something very different from the known last century's imperialism. Specialists assure that it will see. They do not say, however, if it will have to do with the alternance of actors, but of principles, therefore, of praxis in the matters related to regionalism and to the regional and global integration.

It seems important that the Brazilian government keeps its autonomy and capacity to oppose the North-American policies as it has demonstrated in recent occasions in the Far East, in the South of Africa and, more specifically, in that named Portuguese Africa. Its autonomy at the BRICS is still fundamental so that they do not question the symmetric and wide ranged dialogue in their own continent.

To Elísio Macamo's (2012) question, mentioned in the beginning of this article, about *what bonds us*, the answer still lies in the wish and the hope areas. We wish / hope that it be a south – south more qualified cooperation, read it, which promotes a more even distribution of benefits to the involved ones. They also think of an integration that does not happen only in the commercial area, but that reaches the productive and infrastructure integration. (Menezes & Lima, 2012, p. 163). Still, in which can participate, besides politicians and Chiefs of State, entrepreneurs and those in finances, who knows, different civil societies, social movements and, why not, the intellectual and academics boards of the countries that search to cooperate?

In that sense, this work intended to bring Darcy Ribeiro's intellectual production as an expression of the Brazilian social thought on the critic current in the expectation that his reflection, which belongs to his generation and to some pioneers, may help us in the current debates on the cooperation for the South – South axis development, so that we can effectively transcend the “reflexed modernization” of the societies that cooperate and plan the “evolutive acceleration” among the peoples, according to Darcy Ribeiro's words, “structured by themselves”, bearers of “their own project for the autonomous and self – sustained development”, against any “recolonizing” imposition (Ribeiro, 1982, p. 21-2).

In such terms, I think, the invitation for the dialogue is irrecusable.

## References

- Arendt, H. (2006) *Origens do totalitarismo. Antissemitismo, imperialismo, autoritarismo*. São Paulo: Cia das Letras.
- Bethell, L. (2009, July/Dec) O Brasil e a ideia de ‘América Latina’ em perspectiva histórica. *Estudos Históricos*, Rio de Janeiro, vol. 22, n. 44, p. 289-321.
- Farret, R. L. & Pinto, S. R. (2001, July/Dec). América Latina: da construção do nome à consolidação da ideia. *Topoi*, vol. 12, n. 23, p. 30-42.
- Macamo, E. (2012, Jan/June) A moral da história: adiar conversa como intervenção epistemológica. *Realis. Revista de Estudos AntiUtilitaristas e PosColoniais, UFPE*, v. 2, n. 1, p. 8-15.
- Henríquez, L. (2010). Da monarquia à república: o Chile na América (primeira metade do século XIX). In: Pamplona, M. A. & Stiven, M. (Eds.). *Estado e nação no Brasil e no Chile ao longo do século XIX*. (pp. 61-94). Rio de Janeiro: Garamond.
- Menezes, A. & Lima, M. C. (2012) *Cooperação, regionalismo e desenvolvimento econômico: Brasil, Índia e Coreia do Sul comparados*. In: Lima, M. C. (Ed.). *Política internacional comparada. O Brasil e a Índia nas novas relações Sul-Sul*. (pp. 151-178). São Paulo: Alameda.
- Miglievich-Ribeiro, A. (2011). *Intelectuais no exílio: onde é a minha casa?*. *Dimensões. Revista de História. UFES. Vitória (ES)*, vol. 26, p. 152-176.

- Miglievich-Ribeiro, A. (2012) Reflexões sobre a utopia necessária e a universidade brasileira a partir de Darcy Ribeiro e Anísio Teixeira. In: Villar, J. L. & Castioni, R. (Eds.). O projeto da UnB e a educação brasileira. (pp. 27-59). Brasília: Verbená.
- Mignolo, W. (2003) Histórias locais/projetos globais. Colonialidade, saberes subalternos e pensamento liminar. Belo Horizonte: Ed. UFMG.
- Nepomuceno, E. (2010). Apresentação. In: Ribeiro, Darcy. A América Latina existe? Rio de Janeiro: Fundar; Brasília-DF: EdUnB, p. 19-20.
- Quijano, A. (2000) "Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina". In: Lander, Edgardo (Org.). Colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas latinoamericanas (pp. 201-246). Buenos Aires: Clacso/Unesco.
- Ribeiro, D. (2010). A América Latina existe? Rio de Janeiro: Fundar; Brasília-DF: EdUnB. (Darcy no bolso; v. 1).
- Ribeiro, D. (2007). As Américas e a civilização. Processo de formação e causas do desenvolvimento desigual dos povos americanos. São Paulo: Cia das Letras.
- Ribeiro, D. (1988). O Dilema da América Latina: estruturas de poder e forças insurgentes. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Ribeiro, D. (1996). Os índios e a civilização. A integração das populações indígenas no Brasil moderno. São Paulo: Cia. das Letras.
- Ribeiro, D. (1991) Integração, para quem? Carta. Falas. Reflexões. Memórias. Brasília: Gabinete do Senador Darcy Ribeiro, nº 01. (Report restricted distribution of Senator Darcy Ribeiro).
- Ribeiro, D. (1993) Manoel Bomfim, antropólogo. In: Bomfim, Manoel. A América Latina. males de origem. Rio de Janeiro: Topbooks, p. 9-20.
- Ribeiro, D. (1995). O povo brasileiro: a formação e o sentido do Brasil. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Ribeiro, D. (2001). O processo civilizatório. Etapas da evolução sociocultural. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Ribeiro, D. (1982). A Universidade Necessária. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- Santos, T. (2012). Teoria da dependência: um balanço. Ins: Martins, Paulo Emílio M. & Munteal, Oswaldo (Eds). O Brasil em evidência: a utopia do desenvolvimento. Rio de Janeiro: PUC-Rio; FGV, p. 154-161.
- Veloso, M. (2011, May/August). José Martí: modernidade e utopia. Sociedade e Estado, UnB, vol. 26, number 2, May/August 2011, p. 133-53.

- Wagner, A. (2005). Dois caminhos para o capitalismo dependente brasileiro: o debate entre Fernando Henrique Cardoso e Ruy Mauro Marini. Unpublished master's thesis, IFCS/ Instituto de Filosofia e Ciências Sociais, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil.
- Wagner, A. Dois caminhos para o capitalismo dependente brasileiro: o debate entre Fernando Henrique Cardoso e Ruy Mauro Marini. Dissertação (mestrado) – UFRJ/ IFCS/ Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciência Política. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ/ IFCS, 2005.
- Zorzal e Silva, M. (2013). Governança de investimentos externos em países em desenvolvimento: o caso de Moçambique. Trabalho apresentado no Painel 005 “Africa's resource blessing: pathways to autonomy in a conflicting donor world”. 5<sup>th</sup> European Conference on African Studies: African Dynamics in a Multipolar World. Lisboa, CEA-ISCITE-IUL.

#### Author Note

Adelia Miglievich-Ribeiro, Doctor in Human Sciences – Sociology – PPGSA/IFCS/UFRJ. Professor for the Department of Social Sciences and for the Post Graduation Programs in Letters at the Espírito Santo Federal University – Ufes/ Brazil. Chancellor for the “Transculturação, Identidade, Reconhecimento” DGP- CNPq Research Group

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Adelia Miglievich-Ribeiro, Department of Social Science, Prédio IC-2, Centro de Ciências Humanas e Naturais (CCHN), Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Av. Fernando Ferrari, 514 - Goiabeiras | Vitória, ES - Brasil | CEP 29075-910. E.mail: [miglievich@gmail.com](mailto:miglievich@gmail.com).