

Name: Ana Flávia Grajefe Baptista - Challenges of globalization

Encontro com Milton Santos: O mundo global visto do lado de cá (The global world seen from here)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ifZ7PNTazgY>

CULTURAL GLOBALIZATION?

The documentary by the Brazilian filmmaker Sílvio Tandler, discusses the problems of globalization from the perspective of the peripheries (third world, developing countries or community in need). The reflection takes place on the thought of how perverse it may be for those who live the shadows of dominantes. The script is driven by an interview with Bahia's geographer and intellectual Milton Santos (1926-2001), who advocated a fairer globalization for minorities, analyzing contradictions and economic and cultural paradoxes. The documentary entangles the other side of globalization and how the minority has faced and confronted the still dominant power since the colonization of Brazil. The text is not a reflection or summary of the documentary itself, but rather on the topic in general, instigating the thinking about the tenuous line between the process of cultural homogenization brought about by globalization and vestiges of the colonizing feeling of the dominant classes and society.

The beginnings of globalization can be found in territorial conquests of the planet, where migration is the driving force for global conquest, in the ancient globalization with the agricultural revolution and I bit more forward on the old globalization, when the Old and New worlds become to connect trough the navigations and conquest of the sea. From this point, man left aside the superstitions and fears of the cursed ocean and set out on a great adventure in search of gold, silver and easy wealth.

The discovery of America is a feat considered by many to be greater than the arrival of man to the moon. When they arrived, the discoverers found about 80 million natives. A century later, this number was reduced to 10 million, which is one of the greatest genocides in history. From this perspective, globalization, should be seen not only from the positivist point of view, there are other nuances that must be emphasized,

so that not only the idyllic aspect of this process that transformed cultures and habits, but also decimated so many other cultures and lives.

If we correlated, the connection of the old and the new, can be seen as the start of colonialism- at least in Latin America- which was characterized by the occupation of the territories. Later, at the end of the 20th century, it is symbolized by the fragmentation of territories and the progress of transnational corporations, as a consequence of this advance, poverty, social exclusion and increasing inequality also advanced. In the hyper globalized era, the world is more integrated than ever, unimaginable technologies becoming possible, and all the good things it brings, including the hope of a better world. However, what we also see today is the dismantling of states in the name of freedom of commerce, a freedom that is, by the way, synonymous with conditions that favor laissez-faire.

In the walk of the globalization phenomenon, the diffusion of the habits of certain cultures considered dominant, therefore, these habits and idioms are standardized, which promotes a superficial cultural homogenization. but what we see are more and more similar individuals in terms of preferences and habits. A lot its being said about diversity, but what we actually see are more and more similar individuals in terms of preferences and habits, they like the same songs, go to the same events, wear the same clothes, watch the same movies, buy the same products in the same stores, and finally get a psychosocial behavior dictated by the marketing of big companies.

In the past if we thought that "global villages" would be broadcasted by television, today we have the smartphones and internet to show a bidirectional communication, leaving behind the mono directional model. Along with the innumerable possibilities and good things brought by model of globalization we live today, is perceptible standardization of opinions and the synchronization of emotions and affections, from this perspective its possible to understand why we grieve or be happy with events that not necessarily part of our daily context, but in parallel, to be emotionally refractory to the social ills of the region where we live, for example.

While globalization introduces diversity, the same phenomenon of brings with it individualism and isolationism, while declaring that economic frontiers should be open to transnational capital, closes its humanitarian borders.

Some economically hegemonic nations demand the opening of other nations' markets to their capital and products, while closing their physical borders to prevent the influx of immigrants who are trying to enter their territories in search of employment and better living conditions. As an example of this, we can cite the US that proclaims the free market, but closes its borders to the Mexican neighbors, another curious fact to see how the world watched and applauded the fall of the Berlin Wall, but silenced the wall the Israelis had built to separate from the Palestinians, those events sound like a selective memory dictated by the interests of the most powerful.

As commercial transactions between countries led by large transnational corporations, advance xenophobia and prejudice against other cultures and peoples. Although we are in a society where consumption and habits are massified, we also witness the massification of individualism. Even with certain habits in common, individuals are self-centered. By this logic, globalization also shows a brutal and exclusive side of the process, the idea that national states are diminishing in importance is sold by the hegemonic nations to the poorer nations as if it were feasible. If the state really shrinks in size and gave way to private enterprise, the US governments wouldn't be spending on armaments and getting even more powerful in this sense.

A recent example on this topic is the facilitation of weapons in Brazil and the Brazilian's desire to adapt to the USA culture, where once again brings a very problematic fact, especially to the minority that suffers the intolerance of the ruling classes and the entitled in Brazil as a 'good citizen', only reinforces the implicit desire to dominate, to colonize the other, by force. Brazil still blinds itself to the dazzle of adapting and simply ignores the social side and the condition of the majority of the population, which is vulnerable, needy and unimpressed. Today, we can notice the social chaos provoked by the policy of exclusion of rights and the economic crisis and how they fomented the hope of an extremist and segregating slope, where the armament is defended and the social and political flags are left aside.

One point that secretly reinforces ideas that may continue to exclude minorities is for example, the rise of the poor in the PT government, where more people had more access to more education, travel, food and leisure. This simple use of rights by the poor people was viewed with discomfort, expressed through jokes or aggressive comments

from those who felt uncomfortable with the possibility of equal rights. Considering the whole political context of facilitation and weapons as segregator and flattening of the less favored classes, It's a very naive thought to think that the elite will allow the access of the arms to the poor classes, as example of this is the price for a legal gun. Behind the speech promoting self-defense and framing the US, the "good citizen" deep down this part of the population only wants somehow to express his "colonizing" desire, that is, to feel himself capable of dominating. That being said, the question is: up to what point these processes are results of a homogenization brought about by globalization (even considering that those who preach this standardization are at the same time those who most exclude) or the will of dominant people and society of maintain in power through a "modern colonization"?