INTRODUCTION
Anthropology with an Accent

I

Violence and fear are entangled with processes of social change in contemporary cities, generating new forms of spatial segregation and social discrimination. In the last two decades, in cities as distinct as São Paulo, Los Angeles, Johannesburg, Buenos Aires, Budapest, Mexico City, and Miami, different social groups, especially from the upper classes, have used the fear of violence and crime to justify new techniques of exclusion and their withdrawal from traditional quarters of the cities. Groups that feel threatened by the social order taking shape in these cities commonly build exclusive, fortified enclaves for their residence, work, leisure, and consumption. The discourses of fear that simultaneously help to legitimize this withdrawal and to reproduce fear find different references. Frequently they are about crime, and especially violent crime. But they also incorporate racial and ethnic anxieties, class prejudices, and references to poor and marginalized groups. The circulation of these discourses of fear and the proliferation of practices of segregation invariably intertwine with other processes of social transformation: transitions to democracy in Latin America, the end of apartheid in South Africa and of socialism in Eastern Europe, and immigration in Southern California. Nevertheless, the forms of exclusion and enclosure under which current spatial transformations occur are so generalized that one feels tempted to treat them as a formula adopted by elites in large cities everywhere.

This book focuses on São Paulo and presents a comprehensive analysis of the ways in which crime, fear of violence, and disrespect of citizenship rights have intertwined with urban transformations in the last two decades to produce a new pattern of urban segregation. This was the period of democratic consolidation following the military regime that ruled Brazil from

1964 to 1985. The increase in violent crime in São Paulo since the mid-1980s generated fear and a series of new strategies of protection and reaction, of which the building of walls is the most emblematic. Both symbolically and materially, these strategies operate by marking differences, imposing partitions and distances, building walls, multiplying rules of avoidance and exclusion, and restricting movement. Several of these operations are accomplished in the everyday discourses that I call the talk of crime. The everyday narratives, commentaries, conversations, and jokes that have crime and fear as their subject counteract fear, and the experiences of being a victim of crime, and simultaneously make fear circulate and proliferate. The talk of crime promotes a symbolic reorganization of a world disrupted both by the increase in crime and by a series of processes that have profoundly affected Brazilian society in the last few decades. These processes include political democratization and persistent high inflation, economic recession, and the exhaustion of a model of development based on nationalism, import substitution, protectionism, and state-sponsored economic development. Crime offers the imagery with which to express feelings of loss and social decay generated by these other processes and to legitimate the reaction adopted by many residents: private security to ensure isolation, enclosure, and distancing from those considered dangerous.

The talk of crime works its symbolic reordering of the world by elaborating prejudices and creating categories that naturalize some groups as dangerous. It simplistically divides the world into good and evil and criminalizes certain social categories. This symbolic criminalization is a widespread and dominant social process reproduced even by its victims (the poor, for example), although in ambiguous ways. Indeed, the universe of crime (or of transgression or of accusations of misbehavior) offers a fertile context in which stereotypes circulate and social discrimination is shaped, not only in São Paulo but everywhere. This universe of crime and fear is obviously not the only one generating discrimination in contemporary societies. But it is especially important because it stimulates the development of two novel modes of discrimination: the privatization of security and the seclusion of some social groups in fortified and private enclaves. Both processes are changing concepts of the public and of public space that used to be dominant in Western societies until very recently.

The privatization of security challenges the state's monopoly of the legitimate use of force, which has been considered a defining characteristic of modern nation-states (see Weber 1968:54–56; Tilly 1975; Elias 1994 [1939]). In recent decades, security has become a service bought and sold on the market, fueling a very profitable industry. By the mid-1990s, the number of

guards employed in private security outnumbered police officers three to one in the United States and two to one in Britain and Canada (U.S. House 1993:97, 135; Bayley and Shearing 1996:587). Citizens of these and many other countries increasingly depend on private security not only for protection from crime but also for identification, screening, surveillance, and isolation of undesired people, exactly those whose stereotypes are elaborated in the talk of crime.

In São Paulo, the privatization of security is escalating, but security guards do not yet outnumber police officers. Nevertheless, the trend acquires a perverse and worrisome characteristic in the context of the distrust of the institutions of order: the police forces and the justice system. Even under democratic rule, the police in Brazil frequently act outside the boundaries of the law, abusing, torturing, and executing suspects, and the justice system is considered ineffective by the population. As a result, an increasing number of residents of São Paulo are opting for types of private security and even private justice (through either vigilantism or extralegal police actions) that are mostly unregulated and often explicitly illegal. Frequently these privatized services infringe on, and even violate, the rights of citizens. Yet these violations are tolerated by a population that often considers some citizenship rights unimportant and even reprehensible, as evidenced in the attack on human rights that I analyze in later chapters.

This widespread violation of citizenship rights indicates the limits of democratic consolidation and of the rule of law in Brazil. The universe of crime not only reveals a widespread disrespect for rights and lives but also directly delegitimates citizenship. This disrespect for individual rights and justice represents the main challenge to the expansion of Brazilian democracy beyond the political system, where it has been consolidated in recent decades. Moreover, the privatization of security equally presents a challenge for consolidated and traditional democracies such as the United States, as their citizens increasingly choose private policing and private enclaves and, by doing without public services and authorities, delegitimate them.

The new pattern of urban segregation based on the creation of fortified enclaves represents the complementary side of the privatization of security and transformation of notions of the public in contemporary cities. Although segregation has always been common in cities, its instruments and rules have changed over time. They have also obviously varied in different cities, helping to shape each one's particular identity. However, it is possible to identify patterns of spatial organization and segregation and their instruments that constitute repertoires from which the most diverse cities borrow. Examples of widely used models include the Laws of the Indies,[1] corridor

streets, Haussmann boulevards, the Garden City, and the CIAM (Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne) modernist city. The fortified enclaves transforming cities such as São Paulo exemplify a new way of organizing social differences in urban space. It is a model that segregates middle and upper classes around the world. It generates another type of public space and of interaction among citizens. This new model does not use totally new instruments in either its design or its location. Walls are old indeed, various design features are modernist, and the enclaves are usually located in the suburbs, where the middle classes have isolated themselves for decades. However, the new model of segregation separates social groups with an explicitness that transforms the quality of public space.

Fortified enclaves are privatized, enclosed, and monitored spaces for residence, consumption, leisure, and work. They can be shopping malls, office complexes, or residential gated communities. They appeal to those who fear the social heterogeneity of older urban quarters and choose to abandon those spaces to the poor, the "marginal," and the homeless. Because access to enclaves is privately controlled, even if they have collective and semipublic uses, they deeply affect the character of public space. In fact, they create a space that contradicts the ideals of openness, heterogeneity, accessibility, and equality that helped to shape both modern public spaces and modern democracies. Privatization, enclosures, policing of boundaries, and distancing devices create a public space fragmented and articulated in terms of rigid separations and high-tech security: a space in which inequality is an organizing value. In the new type of public space, differences are not to be overlooked, taken as irrelevant, or left unattended. Neither are they to be disguised to sustain ideologies of universal equality or of peaceful cultural pluralism. The new urban environment that enforces and values inequalities and separations is an undemocratic and nonmodern public space. That this type of space often emerges at the moment when a society undergoes political democratization, the end of a racist regime, or social and ethnic heterogenization indicates the complexity of the links between urban forms and political forms. Moreover, it indicates that the built environment may be the arena in which democratization, social equalization, and expansion of citizenship rights are contested. Therefore, this book explores how social inequality is reproduced in contemporary cities and how this reproduction intersects with processes that, in theory, should eliminate discrimination and authoritarianism. However, the fact that private and fortified enclaves are as much a feature of Los Angeles and Orange County as of São Paulo and Johannesburg should prevent us from classifying the new model as a characteristic of postcolonial societies. The new model seems to have spread

widely. The challenges it poses to democracy and citizenship are not restricted to newly democratized societies.

II

This book is about São Paulo, the city where I grew up, spent most of my life, have done anthropological fieldwork since the late 1970s, and worked as a researcher and professor for fifteen years. Its first version was written in California, where I did my doctoral studies in anthropology and now work as a professor. I wrote it in Los Angeles and in La Jolla, and I started to revise it during my commute between La Jolla and Irvine, in the heart of Southern California. I finished the revisions in New York City and back in São Paulo, where I spend about three months every year. My thinking about violence, urban public life, and spatial segregation is marked by my experiences as a resident of these cities, and especially by the struggles and tensions provoked by the confluence of these different experiences and the knowledge they generate. Displacement is at the heart of this book, both as lived experience and as epistemological and critical device.

The struggle over language is probably one of the most frustrating parts of this displacement. I am a native speaker of Portuguese, the language in which I studied up to my master's degree, wrote my first book, and conducted the research for this one. Yet I wrote this book in English. In writing it I faced daily the realization that, more than my words, my thinking was shaped in a certain style and in a certain language. When I write, I can hear the repetitive and eventually exasperated complaint of one of my copy-editors: "What is the subject? Do not write in the passive voice! Can't you learn it?" Useless to explain that a sophisticated academic style in Portuguese is frequently structured in the passive voice and often with an ambiguous subject; pointless to come up with an interpretation of the meaning of the different grammar choices in each academic style. I was no longer writing in that most taken-for-granted language and was no longer allowed the freedom and the security of unconscious constructions. But, obviously, the question was not of words and grammar alone: it was epistemological and methodological. Anthropology and social theory have what one might call an "international style," that is, a corpus of theory, method, and literature shared by practitioners worldwide. Although this corpus offered me a reference point as I went back and forth between Brazil and the United States, I became acutely aware that academic questions have strong local and national biases and that the discipline is, in fact, plural: there are anthropologies, not anthropology. What American academic discussions emphasize as

relevant and exciting is not often among the central concerns of my Brazilian colleagues, and vice versa. At a certain point, the perception of the local framing of questions was so acute that I considered writing two books, or at least two introductions, one for each audience, in Portuguese and English, each addressing different questions. I concluded, however, that this approach also was an impossibility, since my thinking and my perception had already been transformed and shaped by my simultaneous immersion in both contexts and could be squeezed into one or the other mold only artificially and with some loss. My languages, my writing, my thinking, my critiques all had acquired a peculiar identity. I came to realize that as my English has an accent, so does my anthropology; it persists no matter from what perspective I look at it or in which language I write it.

III

> And Polo said: "Every time I describe a city I am saying something about Venice. . . . To distinguish the other cities' qualities, I must speak of a first city that remains implicit. For me it is Venice."
>
> Italo Calvino, *Invisible Cities*

Had I written this book in Portuguese for my Brazilian colleagues, as I did my first book (Caldeira 1984), it would add to the list of studies by anthropologists about their own society, the norm in Brazil and in many of the so-called "national anthropologies" (in contrast to the "imperial" ones).[2] But I wrote this book in English, and I was thinking of my American colleagues in addition to my Brazilian ones. This does not automatically make it a work in the "Euro-American style," however, since I continue to be a "native" investigating my own society and did not experience any of the estrangements and oddities of traveling abroad to do fieldwork. Otherness was definitively not an issue framing my research methodologically, although it was certainly one of its central themes.[3] To talk about my fieldwork among fellow citizens in Brazil as an "encounter with the other" or to invert things and conceive of my experience in graduate school in the United States and of what I learned there as "other" would require some rhetorical and symbolic acrobatics I find little sense in undertaking. In this study, there is no otherness, in the sense that there is no fixed other; there is no position of exteriority, as there are also neither stable identities nor fixed locations. There are only dislocations.

At a certain point in Italo Calvino's *Invisible Cities,* Marco Polo declares that he has told the Great Khan about all the cities he knows. Then the Great Khan asks him about Venice, the only city Polo has never talked about. He

smiles: "What else do you believe I have been talking to you about?" To the Great Khan's argument that he should have made his model explicit in his descriptions, Polo replies: "Memory's images, once they are fixed in words, are erased. . . . Perhaps I am afraid of losing Venice all at once, if I speak of it. Or perhaps, speaking of other cities, I have already lost it, little by little" (Calvino 1974:86).

Anthropologists of the "Euro-American style" usually proceed like Marco Polo: they describe the foreign cities they have visited to people who have never been there, without talking about their own societies and cultures. Like Marco Polo, they frequently make invisible comparisons to their own cultures, the constant hidden references in relation to which the unknown culture can be described as different. For classic anthropologists and Marco Polo alike, this procedure guarantees that their own cultures and cities remain untouched—preserved, perhaps—by their analysis. Like Marco Polo, classic anthropologists transform into method the silence about their own society and the selection of all other cultures around the world as the object of their detailed descriptions and analyses.[4]

Marco Polo's position, however, is not accessible to all. It requires an empire of cities to be described, an emperor eager to know about them, and a nostalgic describer interested in maintaining the image of his or her native city intact. For colonial, postcolonial, and "national" ethnographers, silence about one's native city is often neither a possibility nor a choice. Usually, they do not go abroad because they have neither resources for nor interest in doing so. Instead, they are interested in their own societies and, more important, in their own nations. In contrast to the anthropologies marked by the constitution of empires, peripheral anthropologies are frequently associated with processes of nation-building and therefore are concerned with the internal predicaments of their own societies.

Nation-building engages anthropologists in paradoxical ways. One dimension of this engagement is the role of the intellectual. In Brazil, as in other postcolonial countries, intellectuals have a prominent role in public life. They think of themselves first as public intellectuals, working to influence public debates, and only second as academics.[5] As a consequence, many Brazilian anthropologists study what is politically relevant to them. Moreover, most public intellectuals (including anthropologists) conceive of their work as a civic responsibility. This view shapes their relationships with their fellow citizens and with the subjects of their research. When public intellectuals study their own cities, they tend to write as citizens, not as detached observers. This means that they talk not only to fellow intellectuals but to the broadest public they can reach. It also means that even when they

write in a scientific and authoritative tone, and in spite of all the inherent powers of a professional and social elite, their view of their society is more liable to contestation both by other social analysts and by fellow citizens. Theirs is only one perspective in a public debate, although it is usually a powerful one. Their position is thus different from that of specialists in foreign cultures talking to an academic audience in a debate among specialists about distant places.

When I write about São Paulo in Portuguese for a Brazilian audience, then, I write as a public intellectual and as a citizen, and therefore I approach the city in a certain way. The cities of which we are citizens are cities in which we want to intervene, build, reform, criticize, and transform.[6] We cannot leave them untouched, implicit, unspoken about. Maintaining the imagery of one's city untouched is incompatible with a study (or a project) of social transformation. The cities that remain crystallized in images we are afraid of touching are not cities we inhabit as citizens but cities of nostalgia, cities we dream about. The cities (societies, cultures) we live in are, like ourselves, continuously changing. They are cities to make sense of, to question, to change. They are cities we engage with.

My engagement with São Paulo as one of its citizens—which marks anything I write about it in Portuguese for the Brazilian public—is significantly displaced, however, when I write in English. The position of the public intellectual writing as a citizen concerned with the predicaments of her society is not available to me in American academia. Because the role of intellectuals in the United States does not include the same public perspectives, this type of engagement is not available to other American anthropologists either. In American academia, one's concerns as a citizen are frequently divorced from one's subjects of study, in spite of all the efforts of feminists and minority scholars to unite the two. From the Brazilian concept of public intellectuals, I retain the critical intention. However, writing in English, I lose the public space for engaging in debates with the other citizens of the city. And although I still translate and publish the same works in Portuguese, an undisguisable American accent changes the way in which I am read in Brazil, too.

IV

As "national anthropologists" study their own societies almost exclusively, they can work with the "international style," and its methodological requirements of otherness and comparison, only in problematic ways. The position of researchers trying to be strangers to their own culture is intrinsically dubious. Yet the imperative of otherness has been maintained fairly

uncritically as a methodological device in national anthropologies, even when it cannot be effectively practiced.[7] This paradox exposes two types of power relations framing the practice of national anthropologies such as the Brazilian. On the one hand, the fact that national anthropologists study "themselves" and not "others," and yet insist on the construction of otherness without criticizing it, indicates the power of the international style in shaping the discipline on the periphery. On the other hand, the fact that national anthropologists have long been successfully investigating their own societies and cultures reveals that otherness is less an immutable requirement of method than an effect of power.

Intellectual historians (Corrêa 1982; Martins 1987; Miceli 1979; Peirano 1980) have shown that Brazilian intellectuals, including anthropologists, have usually engaged in nation-building by studying various subaltern social groups who, at different moments, present challenges for the nation. Often claiming to constitute a vanguard, intellectuals identified the Brazilian other to be known (and brought to modernity) as the poor, the black, the Indian, the members of ethnic minorities, and the working-class organizers of social movements—in short, those whose membership in the modern nation might be problematic. As "national intellectuals" are usually members of a social elite, it is evident that the "self" about which these studies frequently keep silent is the elite, secure in its position of leadership.[8] Otherness becomes again a matter of power relations, but in this case the relations are internal to the society of anthropologists.

In contrast with this tendency to a certain kind of silence in national anthropology (as well as in international anthropologies), I assume that my data and knowledge are produced interactively in relationships framed by the social positions of those involved. In Brazil, my middle-class and academic position framed my relationships with people of all the social groups I studied. It framed the detailed answers of working-class people who felt obliged to attend to my requests for interviews and who talked about crime in their neighborhoods even when their fear and insecurity justified refusal and silence. Refusals increased as I talked with people farther up the social hierarchy, who felt confident in saying no to a middle-class person. Interviews with upper-class people were hard to obtain and required introductions.[9] Thus my position equally framed the silence of upper-class people and their frequent dismissal of some of the questions that all working-class people answered: elites assumed I shared their own views and knowledges, and answered my requests for further explanations with "You know what I mean!" Finally, my social position shaped my interactions with politicians and businessmen, who gave me the attention a university professor com-

mands even when they strongly disagreed with me on matters such as human rights.

My research for this book contrasts with the national style in another important way: it is comparative. If Euro-American anthropologies tend to avoid the national self, national anthropologies tend to focus too much on their own nation. Instead of becoming internationalized, they become parochial. National anthropologists read broadly and are well-trained in all international discourses, which they absorb and transform as they look at their own societies. Although they thereby look to the center, they rarely look to the side to make comparisons or to conduct research in other societies. Thus, Brazilian anthropologists do not write or teach about other countries, even about their neighbors in Latin America. This localism significantly narrows the scope of their discussions.[10] As a result, their research tends to emphasize uniqueness. Moreover, localism prevents Brazilian anthropologists (and other national anthropologists) from establishing a critical dialogue with the international literature and the production of the knowledge they consume. This isolation helps to maintain the international style in a form unmodified by local anthropologies. In fact, the strong epistemological critique generated by recent American anthropology has not changed the relationship between national anthropologies and the international ones, even if it has changed the individual relationships of some international anthropologists with the people they study. Rather, international anthropologies still tend to treat national anthropologies as native information, as data, and do not accord it a status equivalent to that of the knowledge produced in the international style and published in the international languages.[11]

V

Although I engaged with São Paulo's problems as a citizen and produced the most comprehensive study I could of the city's current violence and spatial segregation, my intent is not to highlight its unique and national character. Rather, it is to understand and criticize processes of social transformation and segregation that São Paulo exemplifies. This book is about São Paulo, then, but it is also about Los Angeles, Miami, and many other metropolitan regions that are adopting walls, separations, and the policing of boundaries as ways of organizing differences in urban space. These regions are obviously different, but difference does not preclude their use of similar instruments and common repertoires. The combination of fear of violence, reproduction of prejudices, contestation of rights, social discrimina-

tion, and creation of new urban forms to keep social groups apart certainly have specific and perverse characteristics in São Paulo, but they are manifestations of processes of social change taking place in many cities. Therefore, the comparison with Los Angeles has theoretical interest and furthers our understanding of widespread processes of spatial segregation. Moreover, comparison keeps me in check, forcing me to relativize São Paulo's uniqueness and to frame its analysis in terms that make sense to those studying other cities. As I write about São Paulo while living in Southern California and thinking of Los Angeles, and also while living in São Paulo and thinking about Los Angeles, São Paulo does not become "the other" or strange to me. Yet it is certainly not the same as if I had never left. Because of this displacement, my Brazilian colleagues may think that I end up doing what Marco Polo feared: losing São Paulo as I speak about other cities. But I think not. São Paulo already changed for me when I studied its periphery, and it continues to change as I study it in new ways.

VI

My research, conducted in São Paulo from 1988 to the present, relies on a combination of methodologies and types of data. Participant observation, usually considered as the method par excellence of an ethnographic study, was not often viable for this study, for a number of interconnected reasons. First, violence and crime are difficult, if not impossible, to study through participant observation. Second, the unit of analysis for the study of spatial segregation had to be the metropolitan region of São Paulo. An urban area of sixteen million inhabitants cannot be studied with methods designed for the study of villages. I could have studied neighborhoods, as anthropologists have frequently done in cities and as I have done in earlier research on the city's periphery. However, I was primarily interested not in the ethnography of different areas of the city but in the ethnographic analysis of experiences of violence and segregation, and those could not be studied equally in different neighborhoods. Whereas working-class neighborhoods still have a public life and are relatively open to observation and participation, in middle- and upper-class residential neighborhoods social life is interiorized and privatized, and there is little public life. Because observers in these neighborhoods are suspect and become targets of the private security services, participant observation is not viable there. To rely on participant observation in poor areas and on other methods on the rich areas would mean to "primitivize" the working classes and disregard the relationships between class and public space. Finally, because I was interested in a process of social

change that could be only marginally captured through direct observation, I had to use other types of information.

It was necessary, then, to use a combination of methods and types of data, bringing to my anthropology the perspectives of the other social sciences. To understand violent crime in contemporary São Paulo, I analyzed crime statistics. To evaluate these, I had to study the history of the civil and military police forces and uncover how their practice is entangled with the reproduction of violence. To understand changes in patterns of spatial segregation, I reconstructed the urbanization of São Paulo using demographic and socioeconomic indicators produced by different state agencies and academic institutions. To understand the new style of closed collective residences, I analyzed real estate advertisements in newspapers.

Although these and other methods and sources of data provided information about broad processes of change, they could not tell me much about how Paulistanos were living out these processes. For that understanding, I relied on open-ended interviews with residents. I also used newspapers as a source of public debates on human rights and capital punishment. Finally, I interviewed public authorities, human rights activists, journalists, and people involved in the provision of security either in private enterprises or in fortified enclaves. I also draw on my own experiences and memories as a resident of São Paulo to discuss some of its transformations. Most of the interviews were conducted in the years 1989 to 1991. In chapter 1 I discuss the specificity of this period in Brazilian history.

I conceived this research as a cross-class investigation of experiences of fear and crime and their relations with processes of social change. This cross-class perspective is central to my research for three interconnected reasons: because this is a study of social and spatial segregation; because social inequalities are acute in São Paulo; and because violence is a widespread phenomenon that both cuts across class lines and emphasizes class differences. To focus on only one social group or on one area of the city would limit severely the understanding of phenomena that fundamentally affect the relationships between groups and the ways in which the spaces and the possibilities of interactions between people from different social classes are structured in the city. Moreover, to capture the diversity of experiences of violence and crime and understand how associated measures of protection help to reproduce social inequality and spatial segregation, I needed to investigate them in different social contexts.

Although I could have conducted interviews all around the metropolitan region, I decided to concentrate on three areas of the city occupied by people from different social classes. To conduct interviews that would re-

veal in-depth information about experiences of fear and violence, and especially to be able to interpret them, I needed to observe people's everyday lives and the spaces in which they lived. This was more easily done by concentrating my interviews in a few areas of the city, which I came to know well. This study is not, however, an ethnography of these areas. It is rather an ethnographic analysis of experiences of violence, the reproduction of social inequality, and spatial segregation as expressed in some areas and by the residents of São Paulo who live there.

The first area in which I did research was the poor working-class periphery, created through "autoconstruction." This is the process through which workers build their own houses in precarious neighborhoods distant from the center of the city (see chapter 6). Workers thus simultaneously become property owners, urbanize the outskirts of the metropolitan region, and are politicized. In demanding their "rights to the city," the new homeowners of the periphery have affirmed their citizenship rights and organized most of the social movements of the 1970s and 1980s, contributing to the political changes that led to the overthrow of military rule and to democratization. Most of my research on the periphery was conducted in Jardim das Camélias, in the eastern district of São Miguel Paulista. I have been doing research and following the organization of social movements in this area since 1978 (Caldeira 1984). Because of my familiarity with the area, I draw on observations and interviews with its residents from earlier studies, although for this research I conducted new interviews about violence. Moreover, I use interviews and observations from other neighborhoods in the periphery of São Paulo during the years 1981 through 1983, when the concern about crime started to increase. These interviews were part of a research project on the expansion of the periphery and the political mobilization of its inhabitants, in which we paid special attention not only to the process of democratization but also to the problems shaping everyday life on the periphery.[12]

The second area in which I did fieldwork was Moóca, a lower-middle-class neighborhood close to downtown. Moóca became an important part of São Paulo at the beginning of the twentieth century, when it was one of the first areas to be industrialized. However, it is no longer an important industrial area. Although its landscape is still marked by decaying warehouses and industrial buildings, most of the traditional textile and food factories have closed down. Moóca's deindustrialization began in the 1950s, when new industries were placed in other municipalities or on the periphery. The industrial workers who settled in Moóca around 1900 were European migrants: mostly Italians, but also Spanish, Portuguese, and eastern Europeans. Most

of their children never became industrial workers but instead took jobs in commerce and service. By the 1960s, Moóca had become a lower-middle-class neighborhood. The deindustrialization of the area was accompanied by a displacement of residents who rose socially and moved to other parts of the city. This out-migration, which has continued for four decades, reduced the local population. Currently, although Moóca still retains its warehouses and factories and many of its old working-class houses, and although its population still cultivates an Italian accent and ethnic identity, two new and contradictory processes are reshaping the neighborhood. On the one hand, many old and large houses have been transformed into *cortiços*, a type of tenement occupied by workers who cannot afford to own a home, even through autoconstruction. On the other hand, the construction of a subway line has led to reurbanization and gentrification. The construction of luxurious apartment buildings, mansions, and a more sophisticated commerce cater to a richer part of the population that prefers not to move out and to wealthier residents from other neighborhoods who are moving in. All these processes have produced a social heterogeneity and a social tension previously unknown in the neighborhood. This tension is clearly expressed in the talk of crime.[13]

Finally, I did research in upper- and upper-middle-class neighborhoods in the western part of town, specifically in Morumbi and Alto de Pinheiros. Until the 1970s these were areas with a small population, many green areas, and immense houses on large lots. After the mid-1970s, they were transformed by the construction of high-rise apartments, many built on the model of the closed condominium. Morumbi represents most clearly the new pattern of urban expansion that I describe in chapters 6 and 7. Today rich people who used to live in traditional central neighborhoods move to Morumbi to live in fortified enclaves. Morumbi is also more socially heterogeneous than those traditional areas because the rich enclaves are adjacent to some of the largest favelas (shanty towns) of the city, where its poorest residents live. As a consequence, Morumbi expresses most clearly the city's new pattern of spatial segregation. Alto de Pinheiros pioneered the construction of closed condominiums in the 1970s, but the pace of construction was slower, and today it has fewer favelas than Morumbi.

I conducted all interviews on condition of anonymity. In marked contrast to other research projects I have done, in which residents were eager to talk to me and to see their words and ideas in printed form, in this project I faced resistance and reluctance toward discussing crime and violence. Many times people initially asked me not to tape-record the interviews, although they always gave me permission to take notes. In most cases they

eventually gave me permission to record as well. When people fear the institutions of order, and when they feel that their rights are not guaranteed by the justice system, this reaction is understandable. I decided not to use fictitious names to identify the interviewees: since I cannot acknowledge their real names, I prefer to omit names altogether as a sign of the fear in which they live. This rule of anonymity does not apply to state officials, members of human rights groups, journalists, and private security businesspeople, who talked to me in their capacity as public figures and in full knowledge that I could make their statements public.

VII

This book is divided into four parts. Part 1 focuses on the talk of crime. In chapter 1, I analyze the structure of narratives of crime and the way in which they symbolically reorder a world disrupted by experiences of crime. I also give an overview of Brazilian political, social, and economic transformations in the 1980s and 1990s. Chapter 2 focuses on some of the specific themes articulated by the talk of crime: the economic crisis of the 1980s and 1990s, the end of the era of progress and social mobility, the images of the criminal and of the spaces of crime, and conceptions of the spread of evil and its control by strong authorities and institutions.

Part 2 deals with crime and the institutions of order. In chapter 3, I analyze statistics of crime to demonstrate the significance of violent crime after the mid-1980s. Chapter 4 traces the history of the Brazilian police forces and shows their routine abuse of the population, especially of those in subservient social positions. Chapter 5 continues the analysis of police abuse, demonstrating how it escalated during the transition to and consolidation of democratic rule in the early 1980s. These abuses are associated with the population's distrust of the justice system and their adoption of private and violent measures of security (which help to boost a private industry of security). Moreover, this association has contributed to persistent violence and to the erosion of the rule of law. The abuses by the police, the difficulties of police reform, the discrediting of the justice system, and the privatization of security generate what I call a cycle of violence. This cycle constitutes the main challenge to the consolidation of democracy in Brazilian society.

Part 3 analyzes the new pattern of urban segregation. It indicates how discourses and strategies of protection intertwine with urban transformations to create a new model of segregation based on enclosures and a new type of public space. Chapter 6 presents the history of São Paulo's urbanization during the twentieth century and its three patterns of spatial seg-