THE TRANSNATIONAL (RE)ORGANIZATION OF
LATIN AMERICAN "CIVIL SOCIETIES" IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION *

Daniel Mato
Universidad Central de Venezuela

*** Article in preparation, please quote with caution, or if possible consult the author before ***

Many of us have surely realized that a huge wave of processes for the organization or re-organization of so called "civil societies" has been taking place at a worldwide level, since more or less the time of the "Fall of the Berlin Wall." Although Eastern European experiences have perhaps been the most widely publicized, similar experiences have been also taking place in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. These processes have different origins and show different characteristics in each of these regions, and within these regions country differences are also significant. Nevertheless, most of these processes also show at least two significant commonalities.

The first of these commonalities is the very use of the expression "civil society;" which is itself a significant factor because as we all know this expression is not a "natural thing" to be "naturally" found everywhere, but a socially produced symbolic representation of some social phenomena. We all know that this not a new expression, but we also know that it has become very much in currency only in recent years. We all know that this expression does not have a common and unique meaning for all the social subjects that currently use it, but we also know that --given this polysemic indetermination-- it has acquired a certain status as if it represent a universal feature of human societies. In the light of all these things that we all know, the impressive current worldwide diffusion of the expression "civil society" should at least stimulate our analytical curiosity. It is particularly in this regard that the other commonality that we may observe throughout all these processes may be significant, or perhaps even become more significant. This second commonality is the participation of certain kinds of organizations in almost all these processes, I will for the moment name these organizations only in a very generalistic and imprecise way as "global agents." As I will illustrate in this paper these "global agents" play important roles in promoting the growing political and intellectual status of the idea of "civil society," in disseminating specific representations of this idea, and in facilitating the development of transnational working relations between other social agents that I will for the moment name --also in a very generalistic and imprecise way-- as "local agents," as well as between these "local agents" and themselves. This paper is devoted to illustrate the importance of these facts through the discussion of a few significant experiences.

**Daniel Mato, Director of the Program on Globalization, Cultural Processes, and Sociopolitical Change, Center for Graduate Studies, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Sociales, Universidad Central de Venezuela.
Apartado Postal 88.551, Caracas-1080, Venezuela; fax/phone: (582) 979-8448;
e-mail: dmato@reacciun.ve (preferred); dmato@sagi.ucv.edu.ve (only if the other fails)**

Theoretical Considerations for Analyzing the (Re)Organization of "Civil Societies" in the Age of Globalization

The worldwide importance and transnational character of these processes of (re)construction of "civil societies" do not result surprising if we understand them as elements of the present age of globalization. Although perhaps particularly acute, the case of current processes of (re)construction of "civil societies" is not unique in this regard. In the present age of globalization, social representations and institutions are not shaped in isolated societies, but through transnational processes with the intense participation not only of "domestic" social agents, but also of "non-domestic" agents. The transnational shaping of key social representations and institutions is precisely one of the main aspects of the present age of globalization. Regrettably, the multidimensional complexity of globalization processes, as well as the importance of the transnational shaping of social representations have often been obscured by the prevalence of some economicist, or mass-mediatist one-dimensional perspectives of current processes of globalization. Because of this, we need to develop new and more integrated analytical perspectives to study globalization processes. It has been with such a purpose that in former writings I have contributed some theoretical perspectives that both framed and were proved in the analysis of several case-studies (1994, 1995, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, in press-a, in press-b, in press-c, in press-d).

For the purpose of the present paper, and based on those former studies, it may suffice to present briefly the following statements. Globalization is not a new phenomenon, but a very old one, whose "date of beginning" is subject of debate but is not a significant question for the present purpose. Globalization may be fruitfully studied as a long-range historical tendency toward the growing multidimensional interconnection of the peoples of the planet, their experiences, and the social representations and social institutions that provide meaning and frame those experiences. This interconnections have historically resulted --and currently result-- from numerous and diverse social processes that we may name as globalizing processes, or also globalization processes. These social processes involve aspects that the disciplinary organized academic approaches, as well as those of policy-making and related agencies, regard as one-dimensional. Perhaps one of the most typical examples of this kind of one-dimensional views is the representation of so called "structural adjustment programs" as if they were just "economic" phenomena. But, if we want to speak in terms of "dimensions," then these programs are themselves multidimensional, because they are produced as a consequence not only of purely "economic" relations, but also of both "social" and "political" relations, they both involve and are possible because of social representations and values, thus involving the "cultural" dimension, and they have not only "economic," but also "political," "social," and "cultural" consequences, as I have argued in former writings (Mato 1996a), and it is illustrated in innumerable current studies (1).

Obviously, affirming that globalization is an old phenomenon does not supposed ignoring the importance of the fact that currently almost everyone, and everywhere is speaking of globalization, to a point in which we may call the present era the age of globalization. This age of globalization shows two salient characteristics. The first of them is the development of what we may call a consciousness of globalization, which is expressed and constructed through that overwhelming production and circulation of discourses of globalization. The second is that the scope of those mentioned interconnections among the peoples of the planet become nearly planet-wide, surely for the first time in world history. It is interesting, and relevant to the purpose of this paper, pointing out the most relevant factors that have made these interconnections becoming nearly planet-wide: a) the system of production and exchange of goods and services has become nearly planet-wide, b) the near planet-

wide scope and spread of the application of certain communication technologies, c) the quasi-end of colonial empires and of the associated divisions of the planet, d) the end of the "Cold War" and of the associated division of the planet, e) the increasing importance of international and transnational organizations and associated networks and the near planet-wide scope of their practices (2).

The significance of the participation of international and transnational organizations as well as that of other non-domestic agents in socio-political processes is often ignored in studies on the subject. Although some studies do recognize the importance of non-domestic agents, most of them do not further analyze the participation of these agents. Usually, the diversity of these agents is usually hidden behind the usage of generalistic labels, as those of "non-domestic," or "global" agents. Important differences between the diverse kinds of non-domestic social agents that usually take part in these processes are ignored in this way. In order to contribute to the development of more refined analysis of these issues, I have developed a basic typology of ten different classes of "non-domestic" agents which are involved in most current processes of (re)construction of "civil societies." Before going further, I would like to emphasize that although this typology only includes classes of agents that in any given experience would not be considered "domestic" agents, this must not be understood as an invitation to underestimate the roles play by agents that result to be "domestic" in any given process.

The classes distinguished through this typolgy are:
1) intergovernmental agencies;
2) the multilateral banks;
3) governmental agencies from the U.S., Canada, Japan, and Western European countries (particularly but not only so called bilateral cooperation agencies);
4) large non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and foundations from this same group of countries that have a tendentially worldwide scope of action and whose budgets include significant contributions from their governments, or from any of the main political parties;
5) large NGOs from this same group of countries that have a tendentially worldwide scope of action, and whose budgets do not include significant contributions from their governments, neither from any of the main political parties;
6) large private foundations that have a tendentially worldwide scope of action; 7) small city or regional agencies from this same group of countries which are usually more deeply involved in sociopolitical processes in their own countries than abroad;
8) small NGOs and grassroots organizations from this same group of countries which are usually more deeply involved in sociopolitical processes in their own countries than abroad;
9) diverse kinds of NGOs, universities, and other research institutions, dedicated to providing services to, or advocating on behalf on, populations other than its own membership, from Eastern Europe, Latin America, Africa, or Asia (except Japan), and which are usually more deeply involved in sociopolitical processes in their own countries than abroad;
10) small grassroots or membership organizations from Eastern Europe, Latin America, Africa, or Asia (except Japan), which are usually more deeply involved in sociopolitical processes in their own countries than abroad.

Of course, when applied to the study of any specific process each of these classes may result being constituted by organizations that may even have opposite ideologies and agendas. But my research experience has taught me that most organizations that may be grouped within each of these classes also show an important kind of similarities ---in terms of how their institutional representations and associated agendas are produced, among other significant characteristics--- that

often result significant for analyzing how these agents participate (what and how they promote, share, give, take, learn, negotiate, etc) in specific processes of production of social representations and negotiations of associated agendas for (re)constructing "civil societies" (3).

Three precisions about the vocabulary of this paper are needed. The first of them is that I call "global" those agents which scope of action is "global," this is to say: worldwide, or tendentially worldwide, or at least continental, which in some cases might be regarded as equivalent to "global" from the point of view of the study of Latin American cases, as it would be for instance the case of the Inter-American Development Bank. In this sense, the first six categories of my typology correspond to the idea of "global agents." The second, and complementary, precision is that I call "local non-domestic agents" to those described in the last four categories of the proposed typology. I call "local agents" or also "domestic agents" those that are based in the same country of the study in case. I have to prevent the reader from a potential misleading connotation of the idea of "local agents." It must not be understood as implying that these "local" agents do not participate in any process beyond their local, or country borders, or that they do not hold any kind of transnational relations. Nowadays, many "local" agents regularly develop transnational relations and practices. Significantly they have had to learn to do this as a strategy of political or economic survival, at least in the cases of most Latin American countries, as I have illustrated in some case studies before (e.g., Mato 1996c). Finally, in connection with the latter, and consistently with some orientations in International Relations' studies, I have to make explicit that I call <u>transnational</u> those relations maintained between two or more social subjects across nation-state borders, when at least one of these subjects is not an agent of a government or of an intergovernmental organization (Keohane & Nye 1971). This kind of relations has become specially salient in the present <u>age of globalization</u>, and therefore the expression <u>transnational relations</u> has become necessary in order to differentiate between this kind of relations and that more commonly alluded through the expression international relations. This latter name has been usually applied to relations hold between governments or governmental agents; the name international relations rests on the implicit assumption that governments act on behalf of whole nation-states, which is a problematic assumption that has often been criticized by indigenous peoples' organizations, a matter that I cannot discuss here but have addressed elsewhere (e.g., Mato 1995, 1996c).

Hints of the Ongoing Transnational (Re)Organizing of "Civil Societies" in Latin America

Talking of "civil society" and of "strengthening civil society" have become a common place among political subjects in today's Latin American countries. Representations of the idea of "civil society" inform the agendas and practices of a diversity of "domestic" agents in every Latin American country. These social agents maintain different kinds of relationships not only with other domestic agents, including both governmental and non-governmental agencies, but also with a diversity of non-domestic agents. These agents' representations of "civil society" emerge from their experiences, including their exchanges not only with other domestic social agents, but also with those non-domestic agents. I will devote the rest of this paper to briefly discussing some significant examples of the importance of analyzing the interrelations between "global" and "local" (be they acting domestically or non-domestically) agents in current processes of (re)organizing "civil societies," with particular attention to Latin America.

Global agents, global meetings, transnational networks:

The quantity and variety of global agents currently developing programs more or less explicitly oriented to strengthening "civil societies," "civil society organizations," and/or "civic organizations" in the region is illustrative of the importance that they attribute to the subject. Among other prominent "global" agents developing programs more or less explicitly oriented to strengthening "civil societies," and/or "civic organizations," in Latin America are for example the Inter-American Development Bank, the Organization of American States, the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and other U.N. agencies, the Unites States Agency for International Development (USAID) and other "Northern" governments' bilateral agencies, large foundations and NGOs whose budgets are at least in part endowed by their national governments or the political parties that regularly excercize governmental functions as for example the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs and the Inter-American Foundation, both of the United States, or the Friedrich Ebert Foundation of Germany, etc; large private foundations as the Ford Foundation; etc.

Certain transnational meetings seem to be striking for the initiation of new and the development of already existing transnational relations between global and local agents, as well as for developing representations of the idea of "civil society" and negotiating associated agendas. Not incidentally, many global agents sponsor and/or directly organize these kinds of encounters. Some of these meetings lead to the development of working networks, while others are the expression of more or less already established transnational networks. Currently, events of this kind take place everywhere, some of them involve organizations from all over the world, while others are more regionally focused. Each of them involve intense exchanges of alternate representations of the idea of "civil society," involving coincidences, conflicts, indetermination, and negotiations in this regard; as well as always opening possibilities for the appropriation or adoption of specific representations in ways that theoretically may range between non-critical to fully-critical. I do not have space here to discuss relevant commonalities and differences in the representations of "civil society" that were at stake in any of these meetings, but to describe briefly some of these meetings may at this point be suggestive enough.

For example in 1995 a meeting named "*Civitas*@Prague.1995: Strengthening Citizenship and Civic Education. East and West" was held in Prague, with the participation of more than 400 participants from 52 countries. The gathering, one of the largest in its genre, achieved to creating a transnational network of activists of civic education. *Civitas* was conceived by seven U.S. based organizations: the Center for Civic Education, the American Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation; the Institute for Democracy in Eastern Europe, the National Endowment for Democracy, the National Council for Economic Education, and two university centers, one at the Ohio State University, and the other at Indiana University; and received the support of the United States Information Agency, and the U.S. Department of Education (Civitas 1995: 2). This meeting mainly oriented to facilitate the encounter of representatives from Eastern Europe among themselves and with others mainly from the U.S., and a few from Western Europe, also included the participation of two NGOs from Latin America: *Conciencia* from Argentina, and *Participa* from Chile. With regard to this meeting it may be significant considering a suggestive interpretation of the experience offered by the Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency in a letter of him that has been included as a kind of Preface in the Conference Proceedings: *'Our meeting in Prague was one of those events where a collection of people realizes that it has become a community, a community that has gained the purpose and energy to act instead of simply being acted upon. The declaration signed by the representatives of fifty-two countries called upon governments and international organizations*

"to make civic education a higher priority on the international agenda," and pledged the participants to create and maintain a worlwide network that will work toward this end.' (Civitas 1995:1)

More oriented to address the issue in association to economic development concerns was the workshop "National Programming for the New Global Development Agenda: What Role for Civil Society?." This workshop was held on May 30, 1996 in New York, and was organized by the U.S. based NGO Bread for the World Institute with the sponsorship of the New York office of the Friedrich Ebert Foundation of Germany. This meeting was mainly conceived as an encounter of development agencies' representatives ---although also open to the participation of a few outsiders-- with the purpose of identifying ways of "strengthening government-civil society relations," improving both economic and social policy making, and "harmonizing external assistance." About 60 out of the more o less 70 participants were staff members of the UNDP, UNICEF, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the F. Ebert Foundation, USAID, the Denmark Ministry of Foreign Affairs, most of whom already were part of an inter-agency network on the subject, while the remaining more or less 10 participants were members of diverse kinds of NGOs, and university or research centers from Ghana, Colombia, Guatemala, Denmark, the Netherlands, the United States, and myself from Venezuela. A pre-existing network for the exchange of experiences and ideas about the same issues addressed in this workshop was further consolidated during this meeting, and now about 600 interested individuals are now linked through an electronic discussion list named <u>GP-net</u>, which stands for "global participation network."

Also oriented to address the issue in association to economic development but in this case also to the shrinking of the state concerns, and focusing specifically on Latin America was the "Conference on Strengthening Civil Society" organized by the Inter-American Development Bank in September of 1994 in Washington D.C.. This meeting counted with the highlighted participation of representatives of the UNPD, the USAID, the Organization of American States, the Spanish Institute of Ibero-American Cooperation, jointly with representatives of governments and civic organizations from Latin American countries. The Summary Report of this Conference suggestively states that: *"Although the strengthening of civil society is a fundamentally domestic process set against widely differing and specific circumstances, it needs to be supported by the international community"* (IADB, 1994: 3). The Report also make explicit the connection between the Bank's economic concerns and its new interest in "strengthening civil society": "*There is a close relationship between modernization and reform of the State and the strengthening of civil society ... . In this respect it was recognized that redefining the role of the State and resizing it mean, on the one hand, strengthening its capacity to promote competition, ... , and to promote equity, which is the essence both of its legitimacy and that of the democratic system; on the other, they mean strengthening the capacity of citizens, individually or in partnerships, through profitmaking activities or otherwise, to assume responsibilities --some of them economic-- that the State has been shedding and to monitor and supervise the act of governing*." (IADB, 1994: 4-5)

As I said before, two organizations from Latin America participated in the *Civitas*' meeting at Prague. Interestingly for the purpose of this paper, a related Civitas encounter was held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, between September 29 and October 2, 1996. *Conciencia*, the Argentine based NGO that participated in the Prague's meeting and who is also represented at the Civita's International Committee, played a key role in the organization of this event, that was recognized as a Pan-American Civitas. This new Civitas meeting, like the former, counted on the support of the United States Information Agency, who contacted possible participants in every country and also took charge of their expenses. Other global agents of diverse kinds also participated in the meeting, among others:

UNESCO, the USAID, the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (United States), the Inter-American Development Bank (in this case represented by the chair of the bank's civil society unity) , the Organization of American States, the European Commission. The meeting was attended by representatives of NGOs from almost every Latin American country (except Cuba), some of them represented by the presence of several NGOs. A good number of U.S. based NGOs also took part of the meeting, as well as representatives of one NGO each from three Eastern European countries, four African countries, two Asian countries, and Turkey and Canada. Although it had been originally conceived that the meeting would be attended by five representatives of each country, including in every case one representative of a relevant government agency, for reasons that I could not identify this did not happen, and only the educational authorities of three Latin American countries were represented at the meeting as well as those of Jamaica, and the United States. Instead, professors of about twenty universities or research centers from Latin America, the U.S., and Spain took part of it. This meeting was attended by six representatives from Venezuela, one of them a member of the *School of Neighbors*, which is one of my local case studies, and about which I will provide more details in the following section.

Some illustrative references on local agents' views about global dimensions:

It is illustrative to complement our perspective about the importance of the global dimensions of these processes through a brief discussion of the views of at least a couple of "local" agents. With this purpose, I will present some perspectives offered by representatives of two prominent Venezuelan NGOs, the *Escuela de Vecinos* (*School of Neighbors*) and the *Centro al Servicio de la Acción Popular (Center to the Service of Popular Action)*, this latter better known through its acronyms: *CESAP*. I have to make explicit that what follows are not formalized institutional positions but only the views of some of the leadership of these organizations. Moreover, it should also be taken into account that the views presented in this limited space ---through either quotations, or my paraphrases of these leadership's words---   are necessarily incomplete, since they only represent a small proportion of more abundant elaborations which have emerged during my interviews to them.

The *School of Neighbors* is a small civic organization which combines the profile of a service-provider NGO with that of a pressure group, in this case for the democratization of the Venezuelan society. This two-fold profile is very significant for it has given the *School* a significant independence from the Venezuelan government. It grew up from the experiences of some grassroots neighbor organizations in Caracas. Today it has achieved to develop a very important work in strengthening civil society at a national level, and even sharing its experience with similar organizations in other countries. My ongoing research shows the importance that the leadership of the *School of Neighbors* consciously concedes to what in its vocabulary is named as "international relations" and the "internationalization of the *School*." Several of its leaders regularly travel abroad to link the *School* internationally, learning about other countries' experiences, presenting its experience to foreign audiences, and presumably impacting these other countries' civic organizations' practices. In recent years the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI) of the United States, has played a key role in this regard as an effect of the support the NDI gave to a project of the *School* to strengthen citizen participation in electoral processes at a national level. In connection with this the NDI also made possible for some *School*'s representatives to teach courses and participate in some exchanges held in other Latin American countries, and more recently sponsoring the "III International Meeting: Civil Society and Electoral Reform" held in Caracas on November 22 and 23 of 1996, and organized by the *School* with the support of the Venezuelan National Congress, and the Presidential

Commission for the Reform of the State. The experience with the NDI is no doubt very important, but is not lone. For example a representative of the School has also participated in the already mentioned *Civitas*' meeting held in Buenos Aires in 1996.

Elías Santana, who is recognized as the initial promotor of the *School of Neighbor*s and part of its present leadership team, responded to a question of mine regarding the importance of the *School*'s transnational experience in the following terms: '*Since the beginning of this decade we decided to make contact with experiences in other countries as well as systematizing our experience in order to share it abroad. In fact, we name the year 1996 as the "Year of the Internationalization of the School." In only 18 months we have been represented in 16 countries by 12 different individuals ... We have learned from others. We have systematized in order to teach and compare. We have grown up in experiences that beyond differences have resulted very useful for us. ... We have shared our learning and visions about the civil society. ... During our two most recent assemblies each "traveler" has told her/his experience and formulated recommendations.*' [my translation, D.M.]. Mr. Santana pointed out that the *School* works has been particularly motivated and enriched by the experiences of several comparable organizations from various Latin American countries, about which they learned through each other visits and/or participation in international encounters. He also explained to me that *School* representatives have also assisted sister organizations in Peru and Colombia.

Elizabeth Cordido is also part of the *School*'s leadership team, and she was who participated in the Civitas' meeting in Buenos Aires in her condition of promotor and coordinator of the School's program on Civic Education. In a recent interview Ms. Cordido emphasized the importance that her international experiences have had for her. For example, she told me about the importance of some of her experiences during a 3-week tour organized and sponsored by the United States Information Agency. This particular kind of exchange-tours involves several foreign visitors in visiting selected organizations in the U.S.. In this regard, Ms. Cordido recalled the significance that her conversations with a Paraguayan colleague had for her, who in that context made her "*reflect a lot about the concept of citizen, and the concept of women citizenship.*" She also told me that both her tour in the U.S. and her participation in the Civitas' meeting in Buenos Aires have been sources of ideas for conceiving possible strategies of action. As an example of this, she told me that learning about experiences of the combined teaching of history and the national Constitution in U.S.' schools has made her reflect about it, and in this way fed her current project of civic education in Venezuela. [my translation, D.M.]

When I asked Andrés Cova, also part of the *School*'s leadership team, if he considered that his ideas about civil society have been affected by his international exchanges, he answered: "*Of course, to begin with, it is the very fact of speaking of civil society. We did not talk of civil society before the '90s. The expression civil society is in Venezuela an idiom of the '90s. ... Before 1990, or 1991, we did not speak of civil society, but of non-governmental. Besides, in Venezuela, before the '90s, we very much employed the term neighbors to refer to everything that has to be with citizens in generic terms, even beyond what refers to territorial issues.*"

Andrés Cova's appreciation about the incorporation of the term "civil society" in Venezuelan public vocabulary becomes even more significant when we consider it in connection with the case of *CESAP*. As said above, *CESAP* is the acronyms that stands for the Spanish equivalent of the expression *Center to the Service of Popular Action*. It is not incidental that *CESAP*, which employs the expression "popular" in its very name since about twenty years ago, and that has framed its practice in relation to the word "pueblo" (the Spanish expression to name the economically poor strata

of society), has begun to use the expressions "gente" (the generic expression equivalent to people, that is from any economic strata) and "civil society" since about seven years ago. Importantly, this reflection is not mine but of some members of *CESAP*'s leadership team. At the present stage of my interviews, it may be said that at least those *CESAP*'s leaders are inclined to assume that this change from one key-expression to another key-expression may be related to both the incorporation of the idiom in the Venezuelan context as well as *CESAP*'s exchanges with other countries' organizations.

Regarding *CESAP*'s relations with organizations from abroad Mr. Janssens, who has been repeatedly elected *CESAP*'s director by its membership over the years, maintains that it is necessary differentiating between diverse kinds of organizations. He says that for *CESAP* the most significant relations have been those with similar organizations from Latin America, and places in a second position the significance of the exchanges held with some organizations from Western Europe with which *CESAP* has maintained relationships for a long time. Most of these latter agencies are church related donor agencies (e.g., ICCO from The Netherlands, NCOS from Belgium, EZE and Miserius from Germany) which managed public moneys from their countries. He differentiates as a third kind the case of a very particular U.S. agency, the Inter-American Foundation (IAF), which has since long ago promoted the ideas of grassroots development and grassroots civic organizing. Finally, he states that a different kind of case is that of the multilateral institutions, with which *CESAP* has only more recently get involved in some specific programs. According to Mr. Janssens' conception each of these kinds of agencies is governed by different driving ideas and while the mentioned European agencies and IAF are driven by the idea of "social justice" and the conviction that advancing toward this "social justice" depends on "people's participation." In contrast, he maintains, the multilateral institutions are driven by both the idea of struggling against "poverty," and to do this basically through economic tools. And it is only from this position that the banks seek a relationship with the NGOs.

Final remarks:

The examples offered above partially illustrate about the importance of the involvement of non-domestic organizations of the different classes of the proposed typology in actual processes of (re)organizing of "civil societies" in Latin America. They also illustrate about the importance of the relations held between organizations of some of the different classes of the typology, as well as about the importance of the associated encounters of the social representations and agendas of these organizations for the development of these social processes.

An important issue here is that although these agents result to be "non-domestic" with regard to any given social process that we may be studying and which may be oriented to the (re)construction of the "civil society" of any given Latin American, Eastern European, African, or Asian (except Japan) country, they are not "de-territorialized agents" as often suggested by some current literature on globalization scarcely referred to specific case studies, but of a more speculative character. All the contrary, these agents that result to be "non-domestic" with regard to those countries whose "civil societies" are being (re)organized are "domestic" with regard to other societies, be they of any Western European country, Canada, Japan, or the United States (e.g., agents of the classes 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the typology), or of any other country of Latin America, Eastern Europe, Africa, or Asia (except Japan) (e.g., agents of classes 9 and 10 of the typology). Being "domestic" with regard to certain other societies means that their institutional agendas and practices respond to, and/or are informed by, conflicts and negotiations that take place between the social representations and practices of diverse social agents from those other societies, although, of course, themselves also open to the participation of agents from outside. In other cases (e.g., agents of classes 1 and 2 of the typology), although they are not "domestic" to any other specific society, neither are they "de-territorialized." Their institutional agendas and practices result from processes involving conflicts and negotiations between social agents in

diverse countries, both from so called "the North," and "the South," as well as including the intervention of transnational bureaucracies, all this mediated by diverse institutional mechanisms and relations of power. As it emerges from all the former, the participation of these "non-domestic" agents in any given "domestic" process is not a matter that may be explained by any sort of "conspiracy theory." But a socially complex matter which needs to be explained through theories of social action and social change, taking into account social agents' formation, as well as processes of production of both identities and other social representations, although in this case in relation to these other societies, those that result to be "non-domestic" in relation to the process of (re)construction of "civil society" that may constitute the focus of our case studies.

I have to say that I have not created the typology presented in this article before beginning my research. I have begun my research without it, and elaborated successive versions of what I now call a typology responding to the analytical needs of the development of my research. Up to the present point of this research, this typology has shown that its main advantages are helping the analyst to elicit both the importance of the participation of "non-domestic" agents in these processes, and the existence of significant differences among them. In this sense this typology has helped me in developing what we may call a "microphysics of globalization processes" (4). I mean for this the detailed study of how those social processes that tend to produce globalization ---this is to say to produce closer interrelations between the peoples of the world, their cultures, and institutions--- take place. This microphysics involves analyzing how these processes result from the interrelations between specific social agents from, or based on, diverse transnational, national, or local spaces, and their systems of representations and agendas. Carrying out this microphysics of globalization processes is a necessary step if we want to surmount the limitations of certain studies that only show us fascinating pictures of globalization, but not how it comes to be and changes, neither what is behind and beyond those picturesque images. Which is an enterprise that would very much benefit from the convergent efforts of others.

This article is part of a larger line of research about globalization, cultural processes, and sociopolitical transformations in Latin America. As other parts of this larger project, and particularly in connection with them, this article seeks to advancing discussion on certain political, epistemological, and theoretical issues, which may be useful to make explicit as a way to proposing a certain possible reading of this article. Politically, it seeks to illustrate how sociopolitical transformations are nowadays shaped not just within national borders, but in connection with global processes. Epistemologically, it seeks to show that some current usages of certain analytical categories need to be criticized, because these usages constitute responses to non-formulated questions, and in this way obstruct analysis (5). This may be said, for example, regarding some usages of the ideas of "local", "domestic", and "national", particularly when they appear as undiscussed "realities"--or as implicit assumptions--and therefore block the study of interpenetrations between these analytical levels and with global phenomena. It also seeks to revealing the limitations of one-dimensional disciplinary approaches to globalization processes, and particularly of economicist analysis, by showing the importance of so-called cultural aspects and their interdependence with so-called social, political, and economic phenomena. Theoretically, it seeks to enhancing current theories of both social change and globalization. It seeks contribute to theories of social change through showing how social representations that inform the practices of significant social agents are made and remade by those social agents acting within transnational social fields. It seeks to contribute to theories of globalization through developing a more integrated approach to the study of globalization processes, trying to overcome the limitations of economicist and mass media-tist approaches by integrating them in a multidimensional perspective.

Notes:

helped me in writing the present text. This paper would not have been possible without the collaboration of Elizabeth Cordido, Andrés Cova, Elías Santana, and Liseth Souquet of the *Escuela de Vecinos*, and of Armando Janssens and José Luís López of *CESAP*. They not only generously participated in my interviews and/or provided me useful documentation, but also shared with me their interpretations of my views. Similarly, earlier stages of this research --dedicated to learning about the global dimensions of civil societies' (re)construction processes-- counted with the collaboration of Aileen Allen, Ernesto Castagnino, María Teresa Cerqueira, Ramón Daubon, Amanda Garzón, Jorge Landívar, Charles Reilly, and Jorge Uquillas, who helped me by participating in my interviews, discussing my ideas, and/or facilitating useful documentation. As I said above in the text, the theoretical elements framing this paper are also based on my former research about certain social processes informed by representations of race and ethnicity. That former research and my current studies of processes informed by ideas of civil society constitute related parts of my larger line of research on globalization, cultural processes, and socio-political transformations. In this sense, the theoretical elements framing this paper also owe to the views of the leadership of numerous ethnic and other grassroots organizations, as well as of several advocacy and service-provider NGOs from various Latin American countries, I have detailed their names in former publications, and they are too many to be repeated here. I have developed the general ideas orienting this line of inquiry in the context of a fruitful intellectual exchange with some friends and colleagues who have regularly commented some of my former writings, share theirs, and/or held in-person or electronic conversations, they are Néstor García Canclini, Nina Glick-Schiller, Lawrence Grossberg, Michael Kearney, Alberto Moreiras, Jan Servaes, and George Yúdice. Of course, I am the exclusive responsible for interpretations and mistakes that the reader may find in this article.

(1) I have presented the main elements of this argument in a more developed way in some former writings (e.g., Mato 1995, 1996a, 1996b, in press-a, in press-b).

(2) This paper is part of a larger research endeavor about globalization, cultural processes, and sociopolitical transformations in Latin America. I have analyzed examples of processes informed by ideas of "race" and "ethnicity" in former writings (Mato 1994, 1995, 1996b, 1996c, in press-b, in press-c, in press-d)

(3) I have more discussed further aspects of this typology in a recent article (Mato in press-a).   I begun to elaborate this typology during a former phase of my line of research about Globalization, Cultural Processes, and Sociopolitical Transformations in Latin America. That phase was devoted to field and documental research about the practices of diverse kinds global, quasi-global, and local agents from various Latin American countries in sociopolitical processes informed by representations of race and ethnicity (and, in this sense, spaces of conflict and negotiations between different representations of race and ethnicity). Several publications illustrating partial aspects of the proposed typology have already resulted from that former phase of research (Mato 1996a, 1996c, in press-b, in press-c). I have since then continued refining this tipolgy through my present research-in-progress about processes of (re)construction of "civil societies" in Latin America; that is to say: processes that are the place of conflicts and negotiations between different social agents' representations of "civil society," "citizenship," and "participation." This paper only incorporates a few examples taken from some of the case-studies of this ongoing research.

(4) I have essayed partial contributions to such a **microphysics of globalization processes** in some former writings (e.g., Mato 1995, 1996c, in press-a, in press-b, in press-c). My use of the expression borrows from Foucault's expression "microphysics of power."

(5) The idea of responses to non-formulated questions that obstruct analysis is not mine, but of Gaston Bachelard (1976)

References Cited

Bachelard, Gaston 1976
La Formación del Espíritu Científico. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI (Translated by José Babini. Original: La Formation de l'Esprit Scientifique, n/d) .

Civitas 1995
Strengthening Citizenship and Civic Education, East and West: Conference Proceedings. Prague: Civitas

IADB (Inter-American Development Bank) 1994
Summary Report of the Conference on Strengthening Civil Society, Washington D.C.: IADB

Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye (eds) 1971
Transnational Relations and World Politics. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mato, Daniel 1994
Procesos de Construcción de Identidades Transnacionales en América "Latina" en Tiempos de Globalización.
In: Daniel Mato (ed.) Teoría y Política de la Construcción de Identidades y Diferencias: América Latina y el
Caribe. Caracas: UNESCO-Nueva Sociedad: 251-261

Mato, Daniel 1995
Crítica de la Modernidad, Globalización, y Construcción de Identidades, Caracas: Universidad Central de
Venezuela

Mato, Daniel 1996a
Procesos Culturales y Transformaciones Sociopolíticas en América Latina en Tiempos de Globalización. In:
D. Mato, M.Montero and E. Amodio (eds) América Latina en Tiempos de Globalización: Procesos Culturales
y Cambios Sociopolíticos, Caracas: UNESCO-Asociación Latinoamericana de Sociología-UCV:11-47

Mato, Daniel 1996b
On the Theory, Epistemology, and Politics of the Social Construction of "Cultural Identities" in the Age of
Globalization. In: Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power 3(1-2):61-72

Mato, Daniel 1996c
International and Transnational Relations, The Struggles for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in "Latin"
America and the Transformation of Encompassing Societies. In : Sociotam (UAT-UNAM, Mexico) 6(2):45-
79 (bilingual edition: English and Spanish)

Mato, Daniel in press-a
A Research Based Framework for Analyzing Processes of (Re)Construction of Civil Societies in the Age of
Globalization. In Jan Servaes & Rico Lie (eds) Media and Politics in Transition: Cultural Identity in the Age
of Globalization. Brussels and Louvain (Belgium): Catholic University of Brussels and ACCO Publishers
(1997)

Mato, Daniel in press-b
On Global-Local Connections, and the Transnational Making of Identities and Associated Agendas in "Latin"
America. Accepted for publication in Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power Vol 5 (1998)

Mato, Daniel in press-c
Culture, Development, and Indigenous Peoples in the Age of Globalization: The 1994 Smithsonian's Folklife
Festival and the Transnational Making of Representations. Accepted for publication in Cultural Studies
(London) 12:2 (1998)

Mato, Daniel in press-d
On the Making of Transnational Identities in the Age of Globalization: The U.S. Latina/o-'Latin' American
Case. Accepted for publication in Cultural Studies (London) 12:3 (1998)